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Abstract

In colonised countries such as Australia and New Zealand, Indigenous peoples are working hard to reclaim their systems of knowledge and have them recognised and included in every aspect of contemporary society. The centralisation of Indigenous Knowledge in military curricula can play a fundamental role in contributing to broader educational and societal change. In the context of a Western military establishment, the relationships that exist between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people are crucial in order to understand the complexities involved when and embedding Indigenous Knowledge systems in educational practice. As the military is the largest government institution in both Australia and New Zealand, the need to better understand these relationships is important. Moreover, the interests of the Australian Defence Force (ADF) and the New Zealand Defence Force (NZDF) are similar in that both groups have previously identified the need to maintain strong relationships between Indigenous and non-Indigenous communities. However, the interests and experiences of each group in this study differed markedly, as each country has different socio-political goals and experiences related to colonisation. In the case of the NZDF, the centralisation of Indigenous Knowledge in military curricula has taken considerable time and has not occurred without many challenges. Despite the difficulties and differences, various lessons and benefits can be shared with the ADF, as signposts of exploring how and to what extent Indigenous Knowledge is acknowledged and valued within military educational practice should the ADF choose a similar path.

This study demonstrates that while there are diverging and differing interests, the underlying issues that affect Indigenous and non-Indigenous relationships and the centralisation of Indigenous Knowledge systems in the ADF and NZDF, irrespective
of their differing locations, are complex. This thesis explores some of the complexities in order to understand the benefits. A qualitative research approach using interviews, focus groups, observations and surveys with ADF, NZDF and remote Indigenous community members in the Northern Territory was utilised to provide a rich, triangulated picture of some of the challenging and rewarding aspects. This study demonstrates that embedding Indigenous Knowledge in ADF educational curricula can contribute significantly to an overall improvement in members’ military learning experience, and an enriched organisational culture.

ADF and community members identified a range of benefits that would result from centralising Indigenous Knowledge systems in military education. While many of the benefits identified by ADF and community members aligned, such as the perceived improvement in respect and understanding, the experiences of NZDF participants either confirmed or exceeded ADF and community views. This was evident in the sense of a shared NZDF military identity, heightened morale and institutional pride. Impacting significantly on ADF and community relationships, however, were the differing perceptions and expectations in relation to ‘Reconciliation.’ This included the differing values and perspectives related to Indigenous Knowledge systems held by each group that were heavily influenced by ruling relations, personnel attitudes, and societal norms. Issues of cultural and epistemological dominance and lack of understanding about the value of Indigenous worldviews were not uncommon amongst the experiences of ADF personnel. Moreover, the broader political goals of ‘respect, relationships and opportunities’ when applied to the context of Indigenous Knowledge education were found to hold little relevance with regard to ADF education. Findings suggest that while there was majority support for embedding Indigenous Knowledge within the ADF, much more
needs to be achieved in order to align organisational values and community goals. Based on the findings, some possible suggestions have been made. Firstly, ‘respect’ for Indigenous Knowledge systems was considered vital for improving relationships between non-Indigenous and Indigenous personnel, and their communities. Secondly, understanding the effects of cultural dominance and ‘ruling relations’ in the context of a Western military establishment is imperative if successful ‘relationships’ are to be established; and finally, ‘opportunities’ for Indigenous Knowledge education are critical if equitable relationships are to be achieved. This study suggests that positive relationships can be promoted at the individual, instructional, and organisational levels, by adopting a proactive approach to military education, and implementing further research using a participatory action framework.
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Chapter 1

Setting the context
Chapter 1 Setting the context

A brief auto-ethnograph

Later in life, when I was already a mother, a grandmother and a teacher, I joined the Australian military. Working as an education officer in the Australian Army, I became aware of the historical, socio-political and economic influences that neo-liberal policies are having in the field of education, and how these impact upon mainstream institutions such as the military. Even though my life in the military was rewarding and full of opportunities, I began to question the part I was playing in the rapidly changing field of education and the pending crisis that will inevitably ensue as market forces become more important than the ability to think critically, and espouse democratic and human values. I began to wonder why the principles that we were seeking to uphold and defend in the military such as democracy and freedom, including the right to express one’s identity through language and culture and other non-commoditised forms of knowledge, were not extended to Indigenous Australians within the military learning environment.

Herein lay my dilemma. I either continued down the widening track that neo-liberal influences are having on education, becoming part of this system and the larger ideological force whose values (or lack thereof) caused me considerable concern, or I take the time to explore and critique my own worldviews and the complex ways in which Indigenous Australian voices are absent in the context of a Western military establishment founded on British colonial structures and Eurocentric ideals. The alternative was bleak. If I continued down my current path, I too would be complicit in perpetuating the invisibility of Indigenous Knowledge systems in Australian Defence Force (ADF) curricula, thus ignoring the benefits that
these systems would have for personnel and the institution. I would also be complicit in perpetuating epistemological dominance by suppressing the democratic right of Indigenous Australians to exercise freedom of expression through Indigenous languages and cultures in educational practice. As an Indigenous person, this was not a position I took lightly. As I grappled with trying to articulate this difficult but strangely familiar dilemma, coming from a country with a similar colonial history, I began to question the ideologies that are shaping Australia’s current political agenda on Reconciliation. Reconciliation became the focal point for this journey. To me, there were some very important questions that needed to be asked. Firstly, how can Australia, as a nation, reconcile with its Indigenous peoples who have yet to be formally recognised in any way? Secondly, how was Reconciliation affecting, or not affecting, the learning experiences of military personnel? Finally, how can educators in a Western military establishment, that espouses diversity and inclusion, engage productively with critical and Indigenous pedagogies, while implicitly reinforcing dominant mono-culturalism? These important questions, and many others, have guided me through this research.

1.1 My personal motivations to conduct this research

The motivation to conduct this work perhaps dates back to my high school days in Aotearoa (New Zealand). In the late 1970s, I learnt about the anti-apartheid movement in South Africa, the land rights movement in Australia, and civil rights issues in the United States. In the wake of the Vietnam War, I followed human rights issues, particularly to do with segregation laws and the effects these laws had on educational outcomes for minority groups. At the time, Aotearoa was undergoing its own political change. Increased pressure by Māori scholars, academics and their
supporters to have access to education that was grounded in Māori worldview led to major repercussions within the education sector. After the Māori Language Act became official policy in 1987, Māori language initiatives, bilingual and total immersion schools were implemented within government institutions, and mainstream education programs. The Māori language was subsequently promoted as a ‘living language’ for all New Zealanders and protected under Te Tiriti o Waitangi (The Treaty of Waitangi, 1840), and the Treaty of Waitangi Act 1975. Aligned with international Acts aimed at eliminating racial discrimination and providing equal employment opportunities in every workplace, Aotearoa began working towards a national bicultural identity between Māori, the tangata whenua (Indigenous people of the land) and non-Māori, the kaiwhakanoho whenua (more recent arrivals).

Graduating from Te Whanau o Ako Pai Ki Te Upoko o Te Ika, (Wellington Teachers College) in 1991 was an exciting time for those working in education. It was during the early years of my teaching practice that I was lucky enough to teach in both bilingual and mainstream classes, which provided an opportunity to experience the benefits and difficulties of teaching in these environments. However, I have come to realise that the development of equitable education practices that provide multi-perspective and multi-practice learning opportunities for all students, continues to be largely contested in colonised societies. Therefore, working with Indigenous soldiers from remote Northern Territory communities from 2008, where English is the primary mode of instruction, provided a particular focus for this study. At the time, I was completing a master’s degree in professional studies, specialising in Indigenous education, at the University of New England and contemplating further study. The ADF had just released the first of its Reconciliation Action Plans, 2010-2014, which coincided with the opening of the Australian Centre for
Indigenous Knowledges and Education (ACIKE). Increased pressure by Indigenous Australian scholars to have access to education grounded in Indigenous worldview, similar to Aotearoa’s situation, and the importance of Indigenous languages and pedagogies in educational practice underpin the courses on offer at ACIKE. Enrolment in a doctoral thesis provided the opportunity to explore my current dilemma and align my own educational values with others working towards similar goals.

Having an insight into the journey to include Māori Knowledge in New Zealand institutions, and the New Zealand Defence Force (NZDF), in particular, provided an important background for this research. Unlike the NZDF, there are few examples of institutions taking a proactive approach to valuing the knowledge of Indigenous peoples in education (Ma Rhea, 2004). While this research was conducted on three different levels, one as an ADF member conducting individual study (insider perspective); two, having an insight into education and the military in Aotearoa (insider/outsider perspective); and three, as an outsider to the Indigenous community involved in this study, meant that I needed to remain cognisant of the researcher’s responsibilities to and the worldviews of each group (see Innes, 2009). It was also important that I was aware of my own ontological position and of alternative positions, in order to place the research in context (Wegner, 2007; Wilson, 2008). As the study evolved, and various interests and concerns either converged or rejected the topic, what did become apparent was the alignment of experiences and aspirations. Emerging as the predominant theme was the urgent need for a paradigm change that encompassed respect for Indigenous Knowledges and languages in ADF educational practice.
Ehara taku toa te toa takitahi, engari he toa takitini.

*My strength is not mine alone, it comes from the collective group.*

*(Morrison, 2011, p. 237)*
1.2 Introduction

Once education is seen as something that provides profit that which provides profit will soon be confused with education (Nietzsche, cited in Society and Change: a Sociological Introduction to Contemporary Australia, Furze & Stafford, 1994).

My expectation of a good Australia is when white people would be proud to speak an Aboriginal language, when they realise that Aboriginal culture and all that goes with it, philosophy, art language, morality and kinship, is all part of our heritage … all they have to do is reach out and ask for it (Charles Perkins, cited in Songman: the Story of an Aboriginal Elder, Randall, 2003).

In order to understand Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander representation in the Australian military, it is necessary to reflect briefly on the societal, educational, and political implications of over two-hundred years of colonisation (Beresford & Omaji, 1998; Buti, 2004; Manne, 2010; Pilger, 1985; Reynolds, 1987, 1989 & 1990; Rigney, 1997; Shaw, 1992). Exclusion from almost every aspect of Australian public life, including the military, until well after WW II (Ball, 1991; Hall, 1995; Hall, 1997; Jackomos & Fowell, 1993; Riseman, 2008a & 2013; Stasiuk, 2002 & 2004) has had devastating intergenerational effects for many Indigenous Australians. Government sanctioned policies of exclusion, discrimination and sub-standard services, which had been supported throughout most of the twentieth century, have resulted in major socio-economic gaps between Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australians. Gaps are evident in health, mental health, education, incarceration rates, suicide rates, political representation, employment statistics, and military participation (ABS, 2006; Altman 2007 & 2010; Bennett, 1989; Bergin et al. 1993; 1

1 The Secret Country (Pilger, 1985) provides essential viewing for an overview of Australian history, and the impacts that this history continues to have for many Indigenous Australians.
A brief look at Indigenous Australian education statistics during the latter part of the previous century show that inferior education practices have resulted in achievement levels far below the national standards (Arbon, 2008; Beresford, 2003; Hughes & More, 1997; Lippmann, 1994; May & Aikman, 1999; Parbury, 1999; Welch, 1996). Findings from the Aboriginal Education Policy task force in 1988 found that the main reasons for the disparity between ‘black and white’ Australians in schools was racism, discrimination, alienation, and the inappropriateness of curricula and presentation (Beresford, 2003; Bin Sallik, 1990; Fredrickson, 2002; Lippmann, 1994; Malin, 1997; Nakata, 1991; Parbury, 1999). Poor understanding about the importance of Indigenous worldviews and low expectations by non-Indigenous teachers and instructors have further contributed to the lack of Indigenous success in many Australian classrooms (Arbon, 2008; Collins & Lea, 1999; Egan, 2008; Hughes & More, 1997; Hughes & Hughes, 2010; Nakata, 1991; Osborne, 2001 Sarra, 2011 & 2012; Shimpo, 1978).

Since the late 1990s, however, evidence suggests that some areas in Indigenous education are improving. Concentrated efforts such as increasing the numbers of Indigenous teachers and role models combined with accelerated literacy and both-ways learning programs, and better education for non-Indigenous teachers, are contributing to higher Indigenous educational success rates (Arbon, 2008; Blekbala Wei et al. 1991; Creative Spirits, 2015; Fogarty, 2010; Grimes, 2009; Harris, 1990; Keefe, 1992; Ma Rhea in Cree (n.d); May & Aikman, 1999; Ober, 2009; Osborne,
Greater access, curricula relevance, celebrating Indigenous successes, closing gaps, the development of Indigenous monitoring and evaluation frameworks, and the creation of policies and practices to unlock Indigenous potential at the higher education level are also proving beneficial.\(^2\) However, while areas such as increased year 12 attainment and Indigenous retention rates to year 10 are slowly improving, overall Indigenous peoples aged 15 years and over were still half as likely as non-Indigenous Australians to have completed school to Year 12 in 2006 (23% compared with 49%), and were also twice as likely to have left school at Year 9 or below (34% compared with 16%); these relative differences have remained unchanged since 2001 (Human Rights Commission, 2014).

Another area that has impacted significantly on Indigenous education lies in the field of educational research. In neo-liberal societies such as Canada, the United States, Australia and New Zealand, the recent focus of educational research has returned to the much discredited form of research known as methodological fundamentalism (Lincoln & Cannella, 2004; Ryan & Hood, 2004). Methodological fundamentalism is concerned with seeking ‘governmental regimes of truth’ (Denzin, 2010; Lincoln & Cannella, 2004; Ryan & Hood, 2004), and it is produced almost entirely from a non-Indigenous background (Kovach, 2012). Research borne out of methodological fundamentalism then shapes and informs government policy and educational reforms, where issues are taken up in debates surrounding regionalisation, globalisation, and the state. While Indigenous theorists present markedly different accounts of the development of the world (Stewart-Harawira, 2001; Rigney, 2003; Sarra 2005, 2011 & 2012).\(^2\) See also Bishop (2008); Kanu (2011); Perez (2000); Tangihaere & Twiname (2011); Tocker (2007); Youngblood Hendersen (2002) for a brief overview of Indigenous education matters in other colonised countries.

\(^2\) See, for example, Behrendt et al. (2012), Review of Higher Education Access and Outcomes for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander People Final Report.
2005, p. 16), much of the work that is produced by the dominant culture discredits or disregards the importance of Indigenous Knowledge in academic work and pedagogy in practice (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 2008).

What has emerged in current educational discourse is known as the knowledge economy. The knowledge economy has resulted in the categorising of knowledge and the development of a competitive state, where curricula development and restriction on accessibility to these sites is problematic (Battiste, 2008; Kovach, 2012). Educational discourses are subsequently determined according to one's affordability, while the knowledge economy operates as a new form of exclusion/inclusion, amplifying the discourse of deficit (Stewart-Harawira, 2005, p. 220). Seddon, Billett and Clemans (2004) believe that learning spaces have never been neutral sites, free from the relations of power. Unless partnership frameworks are based on shared goals, purpose, and trust, education becomes little more than an exercise in achieving government targets based on ‘conformity, compliance and control’ (Billett et al. 2008, p. 13).

Despite these difficulties, there is a growing awareness and expectation that state institutions and educational responses should enhance, rather than diminish, the cultural wellbeing and identity of all students (Battiste, 2008; Benham & Cooper, 2000; Bishop, 1999; Egan, 2008; Ford et al. 2014; Gunstone, 2008; Rigney, 1999, 2003 & 2006; Sarra 2011 & 2012). Societal equality can only be achieved when education curricula supports the knowledge systems and identities of all Australians. As shown by the New Zealand Defence Force, NZDF (see Chapter 7), embedding Indigenous Knowledge in military curricula can play a fundamental role towards achieving societal goals. Learning from difference, rather than about difference (Hall, 2014), promotes a sense of shared identity, which is an extremely important
aspect of military ethos. It is therefore necessary to provide a brief overview of Indigenous Knowledge systems to place the research in context as follows.

Indigenous Knowledge systems are perhaps best described in non-Indigenous terms as the systems or bodies of knowledge found in local geographical settings (Grenier, 1998; Latz, 1996; Mama, 1997; Mapara, 2009; Mohamedbhai, 2013; Smith, 2014; Stewart-Harawira, 2005). Pertaining to every aspect of the human endeavour, Indigenous Knowledge systems include the intellectual knowledge, histories, spirituality and oral traditions of First Nations people, including their sovereignty rights, the metaphysical links, and connections which are maintained with the earth and greater cosmos. While some Indigenous Knowledge systems have diminished during the past century, others continue to sustain Indigenous peoples since they have done for thousands of years. Those that have survived have usually adapted in a number of ways, and some are currently being developed and taught in contemporary settings.

It has been understood that Indigenous Knowledge systems have much to offer contemporary society. Western academics, for example, are increasingly turning to Indigenous people for alternative answers to some of the world’s most serious problems, including biodiversity and environmental sustainability (Aikenhead, 1997; Altman & Kerins, 2012; Doxtater, 2004; Dwyer, 1994; Grenier, 1998; Latz, 1996; Michie & Linkson, 1999; Mohamedbhai, 2013; Simpson, 2004; Warner, 2009; Wilson, 2004). Indigenous scholar Marie Battiste (2008) believes that one of the primary reasons for including Indigenous Knowledge in modern curricula is that non-Aboriginal peoples are sorely in need of what Aboriginal knowledge has to offer. Alongside Western approaches to knowledge, Indigenous ontologies provide a
framework for a socio-political response grounded in eco-humanism and alternative approaches towards a new global order (Stewart-Harawira, 2005, p. 250). They also contain ‘... the derived ontologies and epistemologies that provide a way of understanding about what it means to be an Indigenous person’ (Grieves, 2009, p. 200), and a profound way to think and plan for a more harmonious and sustainable future (Smith, 2014). Battiste (2008), Kanu (2011), Wilson (2008), and many others, suggest Indigenous Knowledges are particularly useful in the areas of teaching and learning, morality and kinship, collaboration, problem-solving, and relational accountability.

However, one of the key factors in creating changes within an organisation is the ability of management to create a world of shared meaning (Whitely, 1995, p. 27). Therefore, individual and institutional changes must be found at the philosophical level that challenge the ideological certitude of what counts as valuable knowledge and worthwhile research (Cooper, 2012; Kovach, 2012; Stewart-Harawira, 2005; Wilson, 2008; Yosso, 2005). In order to experience the benefits of Indigenous Knowledge within the context of a Western military establishment, the organisational culture must be receptive to change (Scoppio, 2007). Within institutions such as the armed forces, the Catholic churches and the police, however, ‘Institutional cultures will tend to protect themselves from change’ (Evans, 2013, p. 117; Scoppio, 2007). While Indigenous scholars and critical theorists have been instrumental in creating the spaces which are necessary for decolonising thought and engagement in contemporary practice (Dei & Kempf, 2006; Kovach, 2012; Rigney, 1997; Smith, 1997; Smith, 2014; Stewart-Harawira, 2005; Wilson, 2008), the literature suggests that decolonising practices have yet to be applied in the military academy:
Historically, organizations such as the military, with hierarchical structures, a chain of command, and linear planning and operating procedures, have a more ‘closed’ culture; as such, they are less open to change, and view diversity as a problem to be solved, or a legislative requirement to be addressed through reactive measures (Scoppio, 2007, pp. 4–5).

Implementing cultural change within the armed forces is not considered to be an easy undertaking. Understanding how Indigenous Knowledge can promote positive cultural change within the military, however, can provide a useful framework for demonstrating the benefits they may have for other organisations. Apart from the increase in knowledge, the socio-political and ideological benefits include but are not limited to: stronger relationships, increased productivity and improved institutional and national pride (Hohaia, 2015; see the NZDF experience Chapter 4 and 7). This thesis attempts to problematise not only the ‘taken for granted’ (Barbour, 2008, & 2008a) absence of Indigenous Knowledge in ADF curricula, but also the word ‘inclusion.’ As the detail will be shown in the following chapter, and throughout the study more specifically, rather than interpret inclusion as a binary or linear journey from one point to another, with the propensity to engage in tokenism or cultural ‘addons’ (Nakata, 1991; Pearson, 2009), the focus of this thesis has been set to analyse data that sought to centralise Indigenous Knowledge systems and embed them within the military ethos. To be open to the possibilities, there are some fundamental differences between the content and locality of Western and Indigenous Knowledge systems that need to be understood.
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4 See also Nancy Taber’s (2010) study which explores some of the ‘taken for granted’ cultural and gender practices that can occur in Western military establishments.
Firstly, Indigenous Knowledge systems are generally holistic (Arbon, 2008; Kanu, 2011; Kovach, 2012; Smith, 1999b; Smith, 1997; Wilson, 2008) and are taught within context (Fogarty, 2010; Michie & Linkson, 1999; Warner, 2009). This is unlike the Western pedagogical approach to knowledge that historically universalises and atomises systems of knowledge into un-related subjects and disciplines (Kovach, 2012; Michie & Linkson, 1999; Stewart-Harawira, 2005), for instance, English, math, science, which are usually taught out of context. Drawing on the work of Cree educationalist, Frankie Wilmer, Stewart-Harawira (2005, pp. 35–36) writes ‘In Indigenous ontologies, knowledge is both accumulated and applied in ways that involve the “inner technologies” of heightened consciousness as well as biodiversity and ecosystem management.’ Contextualised and holistic learning provides, amongst other things, knowledge that is ‘intrinsically connected’ to the lives of human beings (Stewart-Harawira, 2005, p. 36).

Secondly, difficulty lies wherein Indigenous Knowledge systems are not easily explained using a non-Indigenous discourse, but are best learned through experiences and placed-based pedagogy (Fogarty, 2010). Indigenous approaches to learning are based on respect and non-competitive learning environments, where Indigenous Elders play a pivotal role in the education process (Battiste, 2008; Sarra, 2005 & 2011). With improved technology, non-Indigenous people, communities, and organisations are moving towards a better understanding of Aboriginal cultures in contemporary society (Battiste, 2008; Bishop, 2008; Bishop & Glynn, 1999; Ford et al. 2014; Grieves, 2009; Maddison; 2011; McGregor, 2011; Ravenscroft, 2012, Shahjahan, 2005; Simpson, 2004; Stanner, 2009; Tangihaere & Twiname, 2011). Improving Indigenous Knowledge content in Australian curricula was also one of the recommendations listed by the Council of Aboriginal Reconciliation (CAR) in its
final report to the government in 1994 (CAR, 2000; Ford et al. 2014; Gunstone, 2008; Short, 2008; Williams, 2003). Australian universities, including Edith Cowan in Western Australia, James Cook in north Queensland and Charles Darwin in the Northern Territory are currently developing, or have already implemented, Indigenous Knowledge systems into their education and teacher training programs. The informal use of Indigenous Knowledge within military contexts dates back to the 1890s, early 1900s and historically demonstrates its value (see Chapter 2).

Communities in Western Australia, Queensland, and Arnhem Land, for instance, continue to provide valuable local knowledge in support of military operations (Ball, 1991; Rosenzweig, 2001; Chapter 2). In matters related to local military history, survival, sustainability, situational awareness, reconnaissance, geographical knowledge, flora and fauna, medicinal knowledge, bushcraft, hunting and tracking skills, ceremonial protocols, linguistics, cultural intelligence, to name a few, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders’ community knowledge is rarely matched (Ball, 1991; Hiddens, 1980; Peterson, 2003; Reynolds, 1990; Riseman, 2008; Rosenzweig, 2001; Stanner, 2009). Many Indigenous groups are also willing to share aspects of their knowledge in a variety of settings (Aikenhead, 1997; Battiste, 2008; Latz, 1996; Michie & Linkson, 1999; Semchison, 2001; Warner, 2009). Using a collaborative approach to documenting and monitoring natural resources and landscapes in the Northern Territory, the Working on Country programs have been extremely successful (Altman & Kerins, 2012).

The formal acknowledgement of Indigenous Knowledge systems in military curricula could create the impetus for organisational change. To begin, an in depth interrogation of the dominant history, educational practices, and a theoretical framework for anti-colonial historiography and thought needs to occur (Kempf,
2006, p. 129; McLaughlin & Whatman (n.d); Nakata, 2007; Pearson, 2014; Rigney, 1997 & 1999). A conceptual framework that encompasses multiple understandings, epistemologies, and ontologies which are based on a partnership pedagogy, is an appropriate place to begin.

1.3 Conceptual framework

When the metaphor of the expanding circle and debates about the influence of the self and prejudices in understanding and constituting the past are reframed in terms of a ‘spiral of understanding,’ the transformative potential of critical hermeneutics becomes manifest (Stewart-Harawira, 2005, p. 51).

The ‘spiral of understanding’ referred to by Māori philosopher and academic Makere Stewart-Harawira in her recent work The New Imperial Order: Indigenous Responses to Globalization is relevant to this thesis. For Stewart-Harawira (2005, p. 50), and many other Indigenous scholars and philosophers, the spiral represents ‘… both the potentiality of being and the actualizing of potential into beingness.’ In contrast to the circle of understanding, originally articulated by the German philosopher Friedrich Schleiermacher, developed by others, in which the inherent problematic of circular understandings was that they always returned to their point of origin, the spiral of understanding progressively moves forward, never returning to the same position (Stewart-Harawira, 2005, pp. 49–50). Central to Māori philosophies, representations of the spiral are found throughout the natural world, signifying constant evolution and the essence of life itself (Stewart-Harawira, 2005, p. 50). Murri scholar, Robyn Ober, and her peers at the Batchelor Institute in the Northern Territory apply the concept of the spiral of understanding in their work to depict teaching and learning pedagogy, using the ‘both-ways’ methodology (Grimes,
2009; Harris, 1990; Hughes & More, 1997; Ober, 2009; Rigney, 2006). Hence, both-ways, or multiple-ways, methodology highlight the transformational possibilities of this work (see Chapter 6–8).

Embedded within the conceptual framework, the hermeneutic spiral is played out as a visual metaphor, constantly adding new meaning and understanding to the narrative. During discussions with Dr David Bennett in January 2015, Dr Bennett suggested that with each successive loop or level in the spiral, the familiar has been used but something new is added to make it richer or better understood. The concept of the spiral is grounded in the understanding that spiritual values that express the fundamental interconnectedness of all realms of being are inseparable from the human experience (Stewart-Harawira, 2005, p. 250). However, the interconnectedness of the human experience can easily become fragmented where Eurocentric education isolates, or separates it into parts. Nancy Sherman (cited by Halstead, 2003) writes of this sense of separation when she states: ‘We are each parts of ourselves of an extended commonwealth and risk our individual integrity, our wholeness, when we sever ourselves from the fellowship of that community.’ Acknowledging the values of stoicism, steadfastness, courage, bravery and integrity, the educative role of the military should also be one that enhances one’s sense of self:

If you have ever seen a dismembered hand or foot cut off, lying somewhere apart from the rest of the trunk, you have an image of what a man makes of himself … when he … cuts himself off and does some unneighbourly act … For you come into the world as a part and you have cut yourself off (Marcus Aurelius Meditations, 8.34, Sherman in Halstead, p. 71).

The importance of the spiral comes into play when one recognises the role that researchers play in bringing forward a wealth of experiences, analytical approaches, and differences, which get taken up in the research process (Wegner, 2007, p. 21). What we see, what we learn, and how we engage and interpret knowledge and understanding is constantly evolving and discursively connected to the lives of others. This means that a researcher can engage with their inner and Indigenous knowing, rather than relying entirely on the outward knowing commonly found in Western research (Kovach, 2012, p. 68). Māori cosmology is centred within the spiral when it brings forth from the past that which will transform the future (Stewart-Harawira, 2005, p. 251). When a parity of esteem for Indigenous Knowledges and languages emerges in such a meta-physical way (Kovach, 2012, p. 76), research and education becomes more about the journey and transformation than simply gathering and presenting data.

The analysis of this research drew on the concept of the spiral where an awareness of my own subjectivities and biases as a researcher were challenged. As the different theoretical positions emerged, the role values, respect, and opportunities for Indigenous Knowledge in military curricula came to the fore (see Chapter 6–8). In order to critique the emerging themes, the analysis drew from the work of the late Professor Derek Bell (1980), and the Interest Convergence Theory. Interest Convergence was used as an analytical tool to understand the absence of Indigenous Knowledge systems in ADF curricula. Historical literature regarding Indigenous military participation, combined with contemporary education policies and practices and government Reconciliation initiatives (Chapter 3 and 4) were analysed through the Interest Convergence lens, in order to seek institutional change.
Moral educator and researcher J. Mark Halstead (2003) stated there are three key elements that can be used to describe a metaphor: the exercise of the imagination, the grounding in bodily experience, and the construct of meaning. Readers of this thesis may be required to engage in all three elements. In order for the research to be transformative, one needs to explore outside the realms of current military education practices, and the positivist paradigm’s objective search for truth. This will require the legitimisation of multiple subjective realities and grounded experience to construct new ways of meaning and existing in the military context. Such analyses will embed one’s understanding in the conceptual framework, where the thesis can then be understood. The study explores the capacity of the participants to engage in further dialogue, regarding the potentiality and possibilities of Indigenous Knowledge in military curricula, and found that while there are many aspects that are indicative of Bell’s Interest Convergence Theory, more work is required by critical scholars and theorists, and a vested commitment to educational partnership is warranted in the ADF.

1.4 Interest Convergence Theory

To explore my current dilemma (see setting the context 1.0), an understanding of the Interest Convergence Theory and how it relates to military curricula and educational practice was required. Interest Convergence Theory, or material determinism, as it is sometimes known, is one of the basic tenets of a larger body of theoretical knowledge known as critical race theory. Interest Convergence Theory, in particular, takes the position that racism is perceived to be the usual way in which a society operates. In today’s society where race is deemed irrelevant, in actuality, ‘… everything is about race’ (Goldberg, 1990). Delgado & Stefancic (2012, p. 3) believe
racism serves an ulterior purpose in that it advances the interests of ‘whites (materially),’ and ‘working class people (physically),’ whereby large sections of the dominant society have little incentive to eradicate it. Moreover, majority groups or institutions will ‘… tolerate advances for racial justice and greater equity only when such advances suit the self-interests of the majority group …’ (Castagno & Lee 2007, p. 4). Similar to institutional methodology (see Chapter 5), critical race and interest convergence theorists seek to affirm and legalise the everyday experiences, histories, and counter narratives of people of colour and ethnic minorities as they try to make sense of their world (Delgado & Stefancic, 2012; Smith, 1999a & 2006).

Perhaps the most commonly known example of the Interest Convergence Theory was Professor Derek Bell’s (1980): the 1954 landmark case of Brown versus Board of Education. In Brown versus Board of Education, the interests of ‘Blacks’ to have access to equal educational opportunities, converged with the interests of ‘Whites’ to be shown in a positive political light in relation to civil rights issues. In what proved to be one of the most controversial cases of its kind, the United States Supreme Court ended state-mandated racial segregation in public schools:

The Brown decision represented an unstated understanding that legally sanctioned segregation no longer furthered and in fact was now harmful to the interests of those whites who make policy for the country (Bell cited by Allen, 2007, p. 65).

Almost 30 years after Brown versus Board of Education, Bell offered an explanation as to why the subsequent desegregation of public schools had failed to deliver. Bell found that the majority of African-American children still attended racially isolated and inferior schools and that Demographic patterns, white flight and the inability of the courts to effect the necessary degree of social reform, rendered further progress
in implementing the recommendations from *Brown versus Board of Education* almost impossible (Bell, 1980, p. 1).

In 2007, Dominique Allen applied the Interest Convergence Theory to a landmark case in Australia. The potential of the courts to serve the interests of mainstream Australia over Indigenous Australia is apparent in the case of *Mabo vs Queensland (No 2)* 1992, in which Australia’s High Court recognised in common law that Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders had existing rights prior to white settlement. Allen’s analysis found that the *Mabo* decision primarily served Australia’s political interests at a time when Australia was coming under increased international pressure over the poor treatment of its Indigenous people. Prior to *Mabo*, Professor Erica Daes said Australia’s original inhabitants are living in ‘poverty, misery and extreme frustration’ and that Australia stands in violation of the international human rights obligations relating to non-discrimination and unequal treatment of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders (Allen, 2007, pp. 74–75). Similar to the lack of social change in the case of *Brown versus Board of Education*, even though the Australian government actively promoted the *Mabo* decision on the international stage, the decision itself has not diverted political power, economic interests (Allen, 2007), or Indigenous equality in Australian society.

The first principle of Bell’s Interest Convergence Theory that will be highlighted throughout this study relates to the prevalence of racial inequality in Australian education. The non-recognition of Indigenous Knowledge systems and the right to be educated in a manner that enhances cultural identity continues to be complex, and is largely inhibited by a lack of epistemological understanding. In simple mathematical terms, Bell’s view of interest convergence can be expressed as follows: ‘White Racism + Justice = White Racism. In other words, when white
racists are confronted with issues of justice, the end result is an expression of racism not justice. However, if the equation is White Racism + White Self-Interest = Justice, such as when white racists are confronted with protecting their economic interest, the outcome will be named justice, even though justice is a secondary result’ (Johnson, 2013, p. 152). In reviewing the work of Charles Black, Bell (1980, pp. 522–523) claimed that Whites have great difficulty in envisioning their responsibility and the inherent sacrifice that is inevitable in granting racial equality for Blacks, as it involves the relinquishing of White privilege.6 While the Australian governments are committed to addressing Indigenous educational concerns, gaining an understanding as to how governments seek to protect the status quo of Western dominance is required. As Battiste (2008, p. 498) argues, this challenge requires educators ‘… to reflect critically on the current educational system in terms of whose knowledge is offered, who decides what is offered, what outcomes are rewarded and who benefits…’. More importantly is the need to review how these processes are achieved in an ‘ethically appropriate manner’ (Battiste, 2008, p. 498; see also Cooper, 2012; Dei, & Kempf, 2006; Hinkson, 2007; Mahuika, 2011; Worby et al. 2010). With respect to educational equality in curricula content and pedagogy, the military is little different as a nationally representative institution.

In 2012, Jacinta Maxwell from the University of Southern Queensland utilised the Interest Convergence Theory to better understand the consultative relationships, between Indigenous Australian communities and schools. Maxwell found that ‘racial sacrifice,’ or knowledge sacrifice, in particular ‘… the most commonly experienced outcome for non-white people,’ refers to the process of policy making whereby in order to ‘... settle potentially costly differences between two opposing groups of
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6 The use of the terms ‘black’ and ‘white’ are taken from within the context of the references cited, and may be considered inappropriate in Australian and New Zealand contexts today.
whites, a compromise is effected that depends on the involuntary sacrifice of black rights or interests’ (Bell, 2004, cited by Maxwell, 2012, p. 1). Even though Australian education appears to have come a long way since imperial and colonial first encounters, Maxwell pointed out that ‘... little is being done outside of policy rhetoric to enable movement away from the assimilation model’ (Maxwell, 2012, p. 13; Dodson, 2007; Hinkson, 2007; McConaghy, 2000; Rowse, 2005).

Recent critiques of Indigenous education policies (Arbon, 2008; Nakata, 1991 & 2007) and trends to promote Reconciliation as an educational panacea to systemic racism in Australia reiterate Bell and Maxwell’s concerns (Pearson, 2014; Short, 2008). Without dealing with the fundamental flaws that still exist in the Australian constitution, the non-recognition of Indigenous Australians and the provisions that allow Australian governments to discriminate on the basis of race (Pearson, 2014), ensures that a number of discriminatory processes and practices remain (see Chapter 3; Dodson, 2004; Dodson, 2007; Maddison, 2011; McGregor, 2011; Pearson, 2014 Sarra, 2011). Fethi Mansouri and Louise Jenkins (2010, pp. 93–94) wrote that rises in ethnic minority groups combined with inter-cultural tension has led to ‘... negative consequences for students who, either as a victim or perpetrator, experience racism at school’ (Lewis, 2001; Malin, 1997; Sarra, 2011). With no sizable ethnic majority in Australia, incidents of racial unrest are not uncommon (Inglis, 2004, p. 187), thus, the subsequent presence of racial tensions can serve to undermine the development of a healthy racial identity (Mansouri & Jenkins, 2010, pp. 93–94; Maddison, 2011). The absence of an Indigenous critical mass within Australian society and the military are important aspects in the context of this study (Scoppio, 2007). Without constitutional recognition, increases in multicultural education, teachers' cultural competencies and critical multiculturalism theorists (Anthias et al.
1993; Harris, 1995; Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1997; Mansouri & Jenkins, 2010; Webster, 1997) are not enough to challenge the imbalance of power that still exists in Australian public life (Hollinsworth 2006; Inglis, 2004; Maddison, 2011; Maxwell, 2012; McGregor, 2011).

The second feature of Bell’s Interest Convergence Theory worthy of note is the lack of commitment towards social justice change (see Chapter 3, 6, and 8). As it will be argued throughout this study, Reconciliation without Indigenous constitutional and political recognition will continue to subvert the knowledge systems and identities of Indigenous Australians (Dodson, 2007; Hinkson, 2007; Maxwell, 2012; Nakata 1991, 2007; Pearson, 2014; Worby et al. 2010). Johnson (2013) writes that the undermining of Indigenous interests and minority group interests in Western societies is problematic because it is often masked by expressions of justice. It should therefore come as no surprise that the reigning paradigm of this thesis, the critical paradigm, espoused in civil rights thought, and the theories that have fallen out of it such as the Interest Convergence Theory, have not escaped criticism in recent years. Themes relating to issues of pessimism surrounding the intractability of racism (Delgado & Ernesto in Driver, 2011), the critique of merit, truth, objectivity, and matters of voice (Delgado & Stefancic, 2012) amongst others are not uncommon.

Critical theorists have also been found lacking for failing to theorise a way out of their current situation. Locating this thesis argument in the spiral of understanding highlights the transformative possibilities of this work by actualising its potential into ‘beingness’ (Stewart-Harawira, 2005, p. 50). Taking an anti-colonial standpoint
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7 See the collection of articles written by scholars in *Indigenous Sovereignty Matters*, Aileen Moreton-Robinson, 2007 that discuss the issues surrounding lack of political recognition of Indigenous people in Australian society.
has also resulted in the ability to explore the historical journey of Indigenous Knowledge use in the NZDF (Chapter 4 and 7), and how far Indigenous and non-Indigenous ADF experiences and aspirations converge (Chapter 6, 8, and 9). A paradigm shift that seeks ‘… theoretical formulations that stand outside of liberal-humanist discourses …’ (Nakata, 1991, p. 74) is necessary, where a partnership pedagogy founded in constitutional and political recognition is required.

1.5 Research question and objectives of this thesis

The aim of this research was to gain and analyse information that either supported or did not support the argument to centralise Indigenous Knowledge systems in Australian Defence Force (ADF) education and training. This was an exploratory study that highlighted the training experiences of ADF and New Zealand Defence Force (NZDF) members, in particular where Māori Indigenous Knowledge is included in the training of all members; it was also an opportunity for members from an Indigenous community in the Northern Territory to provide their opinions on the topic. The underlying research question that underpinned this study was Would the inclusion of Indigenous Knowledge systems in the Australian Defence Force (ADF) education curricula strengthen and improve ADF members’ educational experiences?

The objectives of this research were:

- To explore the educational experiences and attitudes of NZDF and ADF members regarding Indigenous Knowledge systems in military curricula.
- To provide a better understanding of the benefits and/or the difficulties of the inclusion of Indigenous Knowledge systems in ADF curricula.

- To elicit views and provide opportunities for discussion from members’ of a local Northern Territory Indigenous community and identify ‘what’ and ‘how’ Indigenous Knowledge systems could potentially be centralised within the ADF curricula.

- To critique current policies and reports, for example, the Defence Reconciliation Action Plan (DRAP), and the Indigenous Employment Strategy (IES), in accordance with members learning experiences, and to identify strengths or barriers that affirm or detract from Indigenous identity in educational practice.

To answer the research question and achieve the outlined objectives, this thesis used a qualitative research approach that was best situated within the Critical Theory paradigm (Wegner, 2007). Dorothy E. Smith’s (1999a & 2006) institutional ethnography was used as a method of inquiry whereby participants’ attitudes and experiences provided an entry point into the social phenomenon being studied. Avoiding the ‘comparative and deficit-based’ approaches to the reporting of research and information about Indigenous people, and using an interest convergence lens, institutional ethnography allowed the findings to speak from the members’ experiences on its own terms (Babbie, 2007; Khayatt, 1995; Smith, 2006). This approach was well suited to the study because evidence suggests that experiences
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and their associated behaviours are significantly influenced by the environment in which they occur (Fitzgerald, 2005; Wilson, 1977, cited in Gay, 1996). Discursive analysis and reflexive writing was undertaken to identify emergent themes and underpinning concepts. Participants provided detailed accounts of what they perceived to be the individual, organisational and community benefits that have resulted, or may result, from embedding Indigenous Knowledge systems in military curricula. The study was:

... committed to exploring the society from within people’s experience of it, rather than objectifying them or explaining their behaviour, it would investigate how that society organizes and shapes the everyday world of experience. Its project is to explicate the actual social relations in which people’s lives are embedded and to make these visible to them/ourselves (Smith, 1999a, p. 74).

The research was not merely concerned with ‘describing the way things are,’ but rather sought to link with the bigger picture. Linking to the bigger picture provided the hermeneutic ability to interpret the findings through abstraction, interpretation and value-mediated exploration to discover the meaning beyond simply what was said (Bryant & Charmaz, 2012; Wegner, 2007). The methodological and theoretical approaches were woven throughout the chapters, where experiences were analysed in accordance with institutional texts and societal goals that either supported, or refuted, the literature and thesis argument.

1.6 Challenges facing Indigenous Knowledge inclusion

Despite a growing awareness of the value of Indigenous Knowledge, government institutions generally fail to provide education that adequately represents the worldviews and practices of Indigenous peoples. Today, most education in
Australian institutions remain Eurocentric and assimilationist in nature (Arbon 2008; Bin Sallik, 1990; Hughes & More, 1997; Lippmann, 1994; Malin, 1997; Ma Rhea, 2004; Martin, 2008; May & Aikman, 1999; McConaghy, 2000; Parbury, 1999; Rigney, 1997). The extent of resistance to acknowledge and advance the interests and aspirations of Indigenous and ethnic minority groups in education was theorised by Bell (1980, p. 523, & 1992) when he stated: ‘The interest of blacks in achieving racial equality will be accommodated only when it converges with the interests of whites.’ In spite of recent developments, failing to acknowledge the knowledge systems of Indigenous people in education is evidenced in the Australian Defence Force (ADF) and the New Zealand Defence Force (NZDF) experiences, to varying degrees, where knowledge practices and pedagogies are largely influenced by the settler societies.

Current military education and training practices in the ADF are heavily aligned with national qualifications to meet neo-liberal skills shortages in the civilian context, where knowledge and skills are bought and sold as commodities in a competitive market place (Parkin, 2005). Packaged or commoditised knowledge, created to fill a specific industry skills gap, however, bears little resemblance to the critical and analytical education that is required to contest workplace inequalities which identify and challenge those injustices that contradict the fundamental principles of ‘freedom, equality, and respect’ (Apple, 1987; Battiste, 2008; Department of Defence Reconciliation Action Plan, DRAP, 2009; Dewey, 2008; Giroux and Giroux, 2008; Holborow, n.d; Osborne, 2001). Academic educator Cathryn McConaghy (2000) believes that current educational discourse which is based on neo-liberal skills shortages is akin to colonialism. In her book *Rethinking Indigenous Education*, McConaghy claims that education has become an economic
imperative rather than a public concern (see also Stewart-Harawira, 2005). Critical theorists J. McLaughlin & S. Whatman (n.d) argue that ‘... the success of decolonisation of education depends upon the efforts of non-Indigenous peoples to re-examine their positions and the control they exert over curriculum decision-making and reform.’

While mainstream educational institutions are under pressure to make education accessible and relevant to Indigenous people (Battiste, 2008), the ADF is now able to seek members whose Western qualifications are higher than ever before (Harper, in Furze and Stafford, 1994). Russell Parkin (2005), an expert in Defence matters, believes that education in a market driven economy can also focus too heavily on the pragmatic skills of efficiency, logistics and management. Failing to promote the more abstract and philosophical disciplines required by military commanders may lead to what Brigadier J. Wallace terms as Big Picture Blindness, when a commander finds him/herself in a situation of battle stress unable to operate in anything but a pragmatic way (Parkin, 2005). However, opening up the spaces necessary for Indigenous voices to be heard in traditional Christian, heterosexist, male-dominated institutions is no easy task. Like the dominant culture that it describes, Eurocentric education was never meant to include those who fall outside the powerful majority (Wilson, 2008; Smith, 1999b; Moreton-Robinson, 2007; Martin, 2008). Many researchers believe that contemporary colonialism persists wherever governmental and institutional hierarchies sustain systems of power that seek to uphold the colonisers’ sense of reason, authority, and control over the colonised (Choudry, 2003; Cooper, 2012; Dei, 2006; Freire, 2014; Kovach, 2012; McConaghy, 2000; Moreton-Robinson, 2007; O’Sullivan, 2007; Ravenscroft, 2012; Rigney, 1997; Shahjahan, 2005; Smith, 1999b).
One example of contemporary colonialism can be found within the Northern Territory Emergency Response (NTER). The NTER, which involved military assistance, was implemented in the north of Australia in 2007, and has seen a number of controversial restrictions imposed on remote Aboriginal communities. Lawyer and writer Stephen Gray (2011) describes military involvement in the NTER as the latest instalment in the ‘long, close, and fraught relationship’ between the Australian Army and some Northern Territory Aboriginal communities. Gray (2011) cites the NTER as simply another example of the hidden agenda currently embedded within government discourses that seeks to manage and control Indigenous communities.

Understanding the guises and expressions of colonialism is pertinent for military educators and instructors. Even though best practice teaching methodologies and efforts to ‘de-Anglicise’ the ADF have been implemented since the late 1990s (Bergin et al. 1993, Parkin, 2005; Silk et al. 2000; Stewart, 1993), military curricula content and pedagogy remains largely Eurocentric and non-inclusive. Empirical research shows that relationships of power, discrimination, coercion, and control are constantly at work within institutionalised space. Furthermore, Indigenous exclusion and subjugation have not been brought about on their own but have been systemically created by oppressive structures, and unjust social political power relations (Arbon, 2008; Attwood & Arnold, 1992; Bennett, 1989; Martin, 2008;
Ruck-Simmons, 2006; Rigney, 1999; Rowley, 1986; Stewart-Harawira, 2005; Smith, 1999b). Australian race relations scholar David Hollinsworth (2006) writes that much more work is required at the institutional and structural levels to find out just how institutions work. Anti-colonial educator Professor George Sefa Dei (2006, pp. 9–11) finds that this is because ‘We often fail to look at structures and how institutions function to create marginality for racialized subjects.’ Given that the coloniser and the colonised, particular the coloniser, remains oblivious to sites of oppression and domination (thereby showing limitations in knowledge and knowing), there is an epistemic saliency of the Indigenous voice (see also Schlink, 2009; Sinatra & Murphy, 1999).

Applying an anti-colonial framework, which recognises the importance of Indigenous Australian languages, in the context of military education is an important part of the decolonisation process. To decolonise the mind, Indigenous languages can provide powerful and necessary tools to name issues for what they are; they demonstrate not only resistance to the discourse of deficit and disadvantage, but the ability to use language as a critical tool for claiming cultural and political capital to challenge continued domination (Dei, 2006, p. 11; Battiste, 2008). The ‘colonial,’ in all of its contemporary manifestations, is then reconceptualised as that which is imposed and oppressive. The absence of Indigenous Knowledge and languages in education can then be seen to support the colonialists’ agenda. The necessity for opening up these spaces to alternative ways of knowing and being in contemporary contexts is fundamental to resisting continued colonial oppression, and to help resuscitate one’s self and community from mental bondage (Dei & Asgharzadeh, 2001, p. 302; Smith, 1999a; Smith, 1999b).
As Bell (1980) opines, ‘… advances toward racial equality do not happen because they are just or altruistic, rather, they occur because they secure political and economic interests’ (Allen, 2007, p. 64). Exploring how the interests of the military to be seen as an inclusive organisation converge with the aspirations of Indigenous Australians to pursue a military career can help to explain the current situation. Reconciliation seen primarily as a political and economic interest, however, will result in Indigenous aspirations being compromised in favour of the common norm. Professor Bell (1980, see 1.4), for example, has suggested that blacks and ethnic minorities would focus on the remedy obtained, rather than the factors which had led to it. Celebrating the remedy as proof that society is just and eventually that all injustice will end is premature because the remedy will often provide short-term benefits which prove to be of a symbolic rather than a substantive value (Allen, 2007, p. 64). This finding was evident in this study where government policies to increase the participation rates of Indigenous Australians in institutions such as the military is seen as a positive step, although without an in-depth critique of the systemic processes that have caused the current situation, they are likely to have minimal effect.

Meanwhile, efforts to recruit and retain personnel from non-Anglo backgrounds in the ADF have increased in recent years.\textsuperscript{13} Initiatives have included targeted education pathways and programs to attract and retain Indigenous personnel (Department of Defence, DRAP, 2010–14). While efforts to increase diversity are key factors for achieving change, evidence suggests that joining an institution that is steeped in British colonial history usually comes with the price of sacrificing one’s Indigenous identity (Arbon, 2008; Bishop, 2005; Carnoy & Lingard, 2000; Dei,

\textsuperscript{13} See the Navy News at \url{http://news.navy.gov.au/en/Aug2013/People/326/Strong-Navy-voice-at-indigenous-conference.htm#VGP0Y_mUen8}
2006; Rigney, 1997; Scoppio, 2007; Smith, 1999b; Stewart-Harawira, 2005). The rhetoric of cultural diversity, while allowing for ‘intergroup diversity,’ places little emphasis on ‘intra-group diversity’; thus priority to cultural relevance subordinates individual members, their interests and needs in favour of a common norm (Nakata, 1991). Professor Linda Tuhiwai Smith (1999b) reiterated this point when she wrote that many Māori exist in institutions in New Zealand that are founded not only the collective denial of their existence as Māori, but actively continue to assimilate and compete with them and the worldview they represent.

In 2007, 1.4% of permanent ADF personnel and 1.8% of all reservist members identified as Indigenous Australian; Defence Almanac findings indicate that there is a noticeable lack of Indigenous representation in the senior officers’ ranks (Khosa, 2010). Even though representation of Indigenous personnel is gradually improving, and by 2011, 1.7% of personnel in the Army identified as Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander (Riseman, 2013), the latest Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS, 2011), find that Indigenous Australians now make up 3% of the total population, with an expected increase in growth at around 2.3% per year (compared to non-Indigenous growth rate at 1.5%). This finding suggests that Indigenous Australian military representation reflects approximately half of the Indigenous representation in the civilian population. With predicted unprecedented growth rates to the year 2026 (ABS, 2011), efforts to recruitment and retain Indigenous personnel will need to increase significantly in order to keep pace and social relevance with the general population (Bergin et al. 1993; Cheatham, 1988; Cowen, 2008; Neill, 2004; Silk et al. 2000; Williams & Gilroy, 2006; Yagil, 2007). Efforts to recruit more Indigenous personnel present an opportune time to explore inclusive alternative pedagogies that position the right to freedom of expression and cultural identity (Kincheloe &
Steinberg, 1997; Rigney, 2003). As stated by Indigenous scholar Margaret Kovach (2012, p. 12) ‘Cultural longevity depends on the ability to sustain cultural knowledge.’ Therefore understanding and applying the conceptual framework of this work is important:

If students, research participants, local subjects, communities, teachers, academics and others are to contribute to, and be useful within the social and political contexts of our work, then we must seek to better comprehend sources and sites of agency as well as oppression. Analysis of the ways in which people experience these phenomena is one important place to start (Dei & Kempf, 2006, p. 314).

Opening up the permeable spaces that are already established within the military to embed Indigenous Knowledge in daily practice not only has the potential to achieve the paradigm shift that is referred to within the institutional literature (see the DRAP, 2010–14), but it would provide opportunities for critically examining the benefits and limitations of objective and subjective knowledge systems (Dei, 2006; Gray, 1989; Grenier, 1998; Grieves, 2009; Goodman, 2001; Hage, 1998; Kearins, 1988; Kempf, 2006; Kendall, 2006; Kovach, 2012; Kurfiss, 1988; Inglis, 2004; Milner, 2008; Rigney, 1999; Rupesinghe & Tishkov, 1996; Stromquist & Monkman, 2000; Tangihaere & Twiname, 2011; Wilson, 2004; Wilson, 2008). In accordance with an institutional ethnographic study (see Chapter 5), some of the impacts that neo-liberal policies are having on military education (Parkin, 2005), and a critically defined notion of social justice, are explored.

14 The Australian Government Department of Defence Pathway to Change: Evolving Defence Culture, A Strategy for Cultural Change and Reinforcement, 2012 outlines the Defence’s commitment to recognising the cultural strengths of all its members, and closing gaps in terms of inclusiveness, as identified strategies for change.
1.7 Thesis structure

This thesis has nine chapters as follows.

**Chapter 1** sets the scene for the study beginning with a brief ‘autoethnography’ and the researcher’s personal motivations for completing the project. The chapter explains the conceptual framework and explains how Professor Derek Bell’s Interest Convergence Theory provides an appropriate analytical lens within the context of a Western military establishment. This chapter includes the research question and objectives, discusses some of the challenges facing Indigenous Knowledge education, and concludes with the thesis structure.

**Chapter 2** discusses Indigenous Knowledge systems and their uses within military contexts. Many of the examples provided show the extensive use of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander local knowledge in World War Two, and provides a meaningful historical context for the current discourse of Reconciliation. The historical backgrounds, along with participants’ experiences in later chapters, act as the entry point into the study and a discursive institutional context to the issues at hand. By understanding historical perspectives, the study shifts focus to the complex relations of institutions and how the military learning experience is, or is not, being shaped in accordance with societal goals.

**Chapters 3 & 4** provide brief histories of Indigenous Australian and New Zealander military participation, and the current political debate surrounding knowledge and education from both Indigenous and non-Indigenous perspectives. While the chapters do not focus on one particular area of education from the available literature, such as adult education or military education, they provide rather a holistic account of some of the complex issues. Chapter 4 particularly makes a valuable contribution to
understanding the benefits of a partnership pedagogical approach to military education that goes beyond the limitations of Western Knowledge.

Chapter 5 outlines the research approach, paradigm, design, and methodology of this thesis. The considerations and strategies that were used in the different research contexts are provided, as well as an overview of data collection, and analysis. Outlining Dorothy E. Smith’s (1999a) method of inquiry institutional ethnography, this chapter describes how the research is committed to exploring the society from within people’s experience of it, rather than objectifying the participants or explaining their behaviour. Its central project is to explicate the actual social relations in which people’s lives are embedded, and to make these visible to them and ourselves.

Chapters 6 & 7 are discussion and analyses of the data obtained from the Australian Defence Force and New Zealand Defence Force members, including instructors and some ex-members and have been viewed through the Interest Convergence lens. These chapters highlight examples of where differing interests converge with respect to institutional and societal goals, but also identify issues of unresolved cultural and epistemological dominance. Without genuine acknowledgment and respect for Indigenous Knowledge use in daily practice, Interest Convergence helps to explain the reasons why the issues of power and educational inequality remain.

Chapter 8 provides discussion and analysis from the interviews and surveys conducted with Indigenous community members from Galiwinku, Elcho Island, East Arnhem Land, in Northern Territory, Australia. Reinforcing the findings of previous chapters, the experiences of the participants’ are explored in accordance with Reconciliation. Similar to Jacinta Maxwell’s 2012 study that highlights the need for
more collaborative approaches to Indigenous community consultation, the key findings suggest that much more work needs to be done to align political, institutional and community goals.

**Chapter 9** the last of the discussion chapters, suggests how centralising Indigenous Knowledge systems in military curricula can make a valuable contribution towards achieving an inclusive multi-logical educational change. The chapter presents the findings and conclusions from the three different phases of the study, and discusses these in accordance with the study’s objectives, and the Defence Reconciliation Action Plan. With a particular emphasis on highlighting the benefits that centralising Indigenous Knowledge systems would have on members learning experiences, the institution, and Indigenous communities, in general, it also discusses some of the identified difficulties. The implications of these findings have been linked to possible opportunities for further Indigenous Knowledge exploration, using a participatory action research approach.
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[Reconciliation] .... must remain flexible enough to incorporate contradiction, opposition and slippage without losing sight of its primary objective: to bring people and their different as well as common histories, interests and aspirations together, in a just and progressive cause, through thorough examination of privilege and ‘progress’ on the one hand and redress, rights and needs on the other (Worby et al. 2010, p. 201).

2.1 Introduction

Indigenous Knowledge use within the Australian Defence Force (ADF) is nothing new. As will be shown throughout this chapter, many Indigenous people have willingly shared their knowledge and skills in times of military necessity, albeit informally, and continue to do so today, particularly in the three Regional Surveillance Units (RFSUs). These units are responsible for patrolling some of the most inaccessible and remotest regions of northern Australia and contain a large number of Indigenous Australians. As Western militaries are under increased pressure to address gender and racial inequities within their organisations (Bergin et al. 1993; Cheatham, 1988; Cowen, 2008; Neill, 2004; Scoppio, 2007; Silk et al. 2000; Williams & Gilroy 2006; Yagil, 2007; Zoroya, 2014), it makes good sense to explore where Indigenous Knowledge continues to be used in various military contexts. Based on the available literature, this chapter highlights specific examples of where Indigenous Knowledge use has contributed to improved military capability. In doing so, it also positions Indigenous worldview as critical for improving Indigenous and non-Indigenous relationships in the military learning environment.

The journey to embed Indigenous Knowledge in military curricula is not a solitary journey but is part of a worldwide anti-colonial movement to counter-
balance the detrimental impacts of Western hegemonic education (Arbon, 2008; Dei, 2006; Doxtater, 2004; Dwyer, 1994; Fogarty, 2010; Martin, 2008; Nakata, 1991 & 2007; Rigney, 1997; Sarra, 2012; Simpson, 2004; Warner, 2009; Wilson, 2004; Wilson 2008; see also Chapter 1 and 7 of this thesis). Far from being irrelevant in the modern world, traditional Indigenous, social, political ontologies are extremely important in contemporary contexts (Harawira, cited in Arbon, 2008). Not only do Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Knowledge systems and histories need to be formally valued and developed alongside Western Knowledge systems in modern military organisations, but these systems can inevitably change relationships for the better (Phillips & Scherr, 2009; Scoppio, 2007). Moreover, the alignment of interests and values is a fundamental characteristic of the Interest Convergence Theory (Bell, 1980) and is an essential component of institutional change (Whiteley, 1995).

2.2 First encounters

In order to understand the historical use of Indigenous Knowledge systems within the Australian military, it is helpful to provide a broad overview of the north region of Australia. Prior to WW II, the seas around the northern coast line of Darwin remained largely unknown to non-Indigenous Australians. Frequently travelling back and forth to the main land from many of the surrounding Islands, local Indigenous people were extremely accurate in pinpointing positions and distances taking into account weather and sea conditions. Anthropologist Donald Thomson claimed Aboriginal men from the area possessed an infallible sense of direction in inshore waters (Mulvaney, 1992). Royal Australian Navy records from the 1920s show that at least six Indigenous men served on board the ship HMAS
Geranium, helping to chart hydrographical surveys maps, and assisting with navigational tasks (Perryman, 2011).

Other first encounters were of a different nature. When George Booth and two other RAAF soldiers crashed their plane near Caledon Bay in May 1942, a local Indigenous man named Matui rowed for 13 hours over 20 miles in an epic journey to save their lives. However, coverage released by the press in June 1942 essentially erased Matui’s part in the rescue (Riseman, 2008). The lack of recognition for Indigenous military involvement is not an uncommon experience and serves as a reminder of the need to explore Indigenous war experiences.

One story of rescue and survival was recorded by historian Jeremy Long, almost twenty-five years after the event. In 1967, Long interviewed Narritjin Maymuru of Yirrkala and Djaragbi (Cape Shield) about his involvement in the rescue of crew of the auxiliary minesweeper HMAS Patricia Cam. The HMAS Patricia Cam sunk off the Wessel Islands as a result of a Japanese float plane bombing on 22 January 1942. Evidence suggests that there were 10–12 white men and one Aboriginal man with Narritjin when the vessel went down. Narritjin was about 30 years old at the time and it was his care and intimate knowledge of the area that helped to save the lives of the crew. Survivors were left floating and clinging to debris but with Narritjin’s assistance, they managed to paddle to shore. Most of the men were very tired and some were wounded quite badly. After Narritjin had rested, he collected bush-tucker and gathered the crew around a fire to keep them dry. Narritjin took the men down to the water and taught them how to collect oysters and other seafood. He showed them which foods could be eaten raw, and which foods needed to be cooked. After two days of minding the men, and nobody coming to their rescue, Narritjin decided to take the other Aboriginal survivor, a man named
Babawun, and walk south west to try and get help. The two men walked down to Guluwuru Island and then swam the strait (Gugari Rip) between Guluwuru and Raragala Island. Eventually they came across a group of people who were able to assist. Narritjin directed them to the spot where he had left the survivors, and then made his way back to Yirrkala Mission on foot (Long, 1992). Without Narritjin’s assistance and invaluable knowledge of the area, it is unlikely these men would have survived.

In addition to navigational and survival skills, Indigenous warrior tactics were well-practised until the mid-twentieth century. Aboriginal warriors were not loath to take up arms, with many continuing to be experts in the tactics of stealth and situational awareness today (Ball, 1991). The Indigenous men from Caledon Bay, for example, were known as fearless warriors and by far the best travellers and hunters in the region. Prowess for hunting, laying ambushes and knowledge of the environment made them a formidable enemy. This knowledge was critical in disrupting colonial life and halting European settlement until the early 1900s (Lever, 2011). In the Hawkesbury River region north of Sydney, the Darug people fought for a period of at least 20 years keeping British settlers from stealing their lands. Fort Dundas, 1824–29 on Melville Island, and Fort Wellington, 1827–29 in the Coburg Peninsula, Northern Territory, were also abandoned partly due to the successful attacks made by local Indigenous clans (Lever, 2011). When the threat of war became a reality in the Territory on 19 February 1942, Australians were thrown head-first into WW II (Beaumont, 1996). Indigenous geographical knowledge of the region was subsequently viewed as a great military asset (Hall, 1991b). Producing food crops, clearing runways strips, loading planes, boats and trucks, rescuing stranded allied pilots and crew, and reporting enemy activity were many of the ways
in which Indigenous Australians made a valuable contribution during WW II (Hall, 1981, 1985). Even though consultation procedures and working relationships have developed between the military and Indigenous communities, particularly since the establishment of the Regional Force Surveillance Units in the 1980s, a more positive and proactive approach to strengthening these relationships is required (Ball, 1991).

2.3 Indigenous Knowledge and military survival

Australian settlers made little effort to learn from local Indigenous peoples when arriving in Australia. Unable to find food or water, or to keep themselves warm, many explorers perished on ill-fated expeditions attempting to cross the Australian continent, when often bountiful food and water supplies were well within reach (Ball, 1991). In Cooper's Creek, for instance, where the Yuntruwunta People lived, members of Robert O’Hara Burke and William John Wills’ expedition travelling from Melbourne to the tip of the Gulf of Carpentaria ended in disaster in August 1860 (Ball, 1991; McEwan 1985). With the exception of the assistant explorer, John King, Burke and Wills’ party eventually succumbed to their fate at the base camp Depot LXV (McEwan, 1985). Surrounding the camp itself was a shady stream with plenty of fish, flocks of pigeons, and rats, which could have been caught and eaten as a valuable food source (McEwan, 1985). Even though the Yuntruwunta People were friendly and brought the men fish and nardoo cakes, made from the pounded seeds of the local nardoo plant, Burke’s lack of trust and his disbelief that the food offered was providing the sustenance needed, eventually contributed to their fate (McEwan, 1985). Prior to being found by a rescue party, King, at least, showed some appreciation of Yuntruwunta knowledge, by surviving for two months on the skills and generosity of the local people (Ball, 1991).
In the Botany Bay region, a similar story is told. Rather than setting about trying to utilise the knowledge and skills of the local people, European settlers were prepared to ration the foods they had brought with them from England. Due to ignorance, and the desire to grow imported plants, virtually no attempt was made to discover the diversity and biological value of the local flora (Hiddins, 1980). Even when plagued with scurvy, the settlers did not believe that the Australian landscape, nor the local people, could offer the knowledge and skills required to stay alive. Learning the local knowledge of Indigenous communities, embedded in a civil-military approach, would provide a commitment to partnership over the longer-term (Altman & Kerins, 2012; Ball, 1991; Phillips & Scherr, 2009). Finding ways to engage and build these relationships (Fogarty, 2010; Maddison, 2011; McGregor, 2011) provides a framework for cooperation and collaboration against foreign exploitation and infiltration and is essential for strengthening interpersonal networks (Phillips & Scherr, 2009 pp. 128–129). Teaching from country is also a beneficial way to break down negative misconceptions about what life is actually like in Indigenous communities (Phillips & Scherr, 2009, p. 129).

Contrary to popular belief, Indigenous Australians have done more than simply eke out an existence. Peter Latz (1995), a senior botanist and photographer, who has lived with Aboriginal people all his life in the community of Hermannsburg west of Alice Springs, notes that Indigenous Australians have lived a comfortable life rich in ceremony and culture. Actively working and changing the environment by means of fire, Aboriginal clans have survived some of the worst droughts, only to reap the benefits of more fruitful times (Latz, 1995). The ability to survive and make good use of the environment, preserving its natural benefits for future generations, has major beneficial implications for the Department of Defence (Ball, 1991;
Hiddins, 1980). As ex-military officer Les Hiddins (1980), alias Bush-tuckerman describes, one of the factors that increases a soldier’s ability and will to survive is the degree of competency and equation with an unfamiliar environment.

2.4 Indigenous Knowledge and the Regional Force Surveillance Units

Today, the three Regional Force Surveillance Units (RFSUs) rely heavily on the individual and collective knowledge that is held by the Indigenous soldiers in these units. When Norforce (the first RFSU), was officially raised in 1981, Lieutenant Colonel Doug Gibbons and Colonel Hammett stated that in order for the unit to be successful, it was absolutely necessary to enlist personnel from the more remote areas because they are the ones with the local knowledge and expertise (Rosenzweig, 2001). Reflecting on the first twenty years of operations, Paul Rosenzweig provides numerous examples of where Indigenous Knowledge has been fundamental to military capability. Patrolling over 1.8 million square kilometres of land, many of the Aboriginal soldiers possess knowledge that far exceeds their counterparts: ‘…they know where you can cam up vehicles, and where to find water and food …’ (Rosenzweig, 2001, p. 46). Figures 2.1 and 2.2 on the following page highlight some of these capabilities.
Figure 2.1: Finding food in the local environment

Lance-corporal Vinnie Rami, from NORFORCE, removes turtle eggs from a nest on Wigram Island, part of the English Company Islands, located inside Arnhem Land in Northern Territory on the 18 July, 2013 (adapted from source REUTERS/D., Gray, 2013).

Figure 2.2: Making best use of the environment

Lance-corporal Danny Daniels uses fire to remove bark from a 'spear tree' during a surveillance and reconnaissance patrol around Astell Island, part of the English Company Islands, located inside Arnhem Land in Northern Territory on the 17 July, 2013 (adapted from source REUTERS/D., Gray, 2013).
Besides being adept in the local environment, the RFSU soldiers provide a multifaceted, stable longer term ‘situational awareness’ (SA) relationship between Indigenous communities and the ADF (Phillips & Scherr, 2009). SA is a fundamental skill for military personnel, providing the ability to read, adapt and survive in known and unknown terrain. In remote communities, Aboriginal soldiers, using their exemplary SA skills, play an integral informal role teaching local knowledge and disseminating important information to the military (Ball, 1991; Hall, 1981, 1985 & 1987). During a conversation with a former Commanding Officer of Norforce in February 2012, the Commander described a recent example of just how valuable this knowledge is. When out on patrol with a section, one Aboriginal soldier suddenly signed for the patrol to halt and go to ground. The Commander said he could not see or hear anything and was fairly sure that the patrolman had just seen an animal or a bird moving through the bush. After waiting for a while, the Commander was convinced that it was nothing and gave the order for the patrol to resume. No sooner than this happened when again, the soldier motioned for the section to go to the ground. The Commander said that he still could not see or hear anything, even though he was no stranger to patrolling the area. However, trusting the instincts of the soldiers under his command, once more they waited. When they eventually started walking again, they immediately came across a group of people that the Commander swore he would never have been able to detect on his own. From that day forward, the Commander never doubted the knowledge and SA skills possessed by the Aboriginal soldiers under his command.16

15 section – A ‘section’ in military terms is a small team of infantry soldiers, usually made up of eight soldiers comprised of two four-men teams.
Learning formally from Indigenous RFSU members could have a number of positive advantages. Overseas the ability to operate in diverse and multi-ethnic situations is becoming more critical for Western coalition forces who have been slower to adapt to the longer-term strategic asymmetrical attacks used by adversaries (Mousley, 2009). Dr Melanie LeGoullon (2012), a Human Factors Scientist at the United States based contractor Perceptronics, Inc claims that SA skills are extremely valuable in today’s military contexts. SA is ‘being mindful of the variables in your environment, and understanding how they change over time’ (LeGoullon, 2012). Developing good SA skills and combining these with practical survival skills will increase soldiers’ likelihood of survival. Similar to Rosenzweig’s (2001) findings, the literature suggests that SA can be used at the individual or the team level, and can be applied in familiar and unfamiliar territories if adequate training, past experience, and gut instincts are well understood (Ball, 1991; Hall 1991a & 1991b; Hiddins, 1980, LeGoullon, 2012; Mousley, 2009).

2.5 The Navajo Code Talkers

Another remarkable story regarding the successful use of Indigenous Knowledge in military history is the case of the Navajo Code Talkers. In 2000, amid controversy surrounding its belatedness, the United States Government formally recognised the significant contributions made by the Navajo Code Talkers, during WW II. Designed to honour and commemorate the bravery and ingenuity displayed by the 400 Code Talkers, the Honoring the Navajo Code Talkers Act was passed and the Congressional Gold Medal was awarded to the few surviving veterans and their families. The Navajo Code Talkers used their Indigenous language to create a

indigenous-army/ and http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/07/31/australia-borders-norforce-idUSL4N0FU1JF20130731
military code, specific to their local people, which consequently saved the lives of thousands of American troops in the South Pacific region (Nez & Schiess Avila, 2011). This code was fundamental to military success. However, due to the fact that the information surrounding the code, its development and use, including the actual code itself was classified military information until 23 years after the war ended in 1968, the Code Talkers’ dedication to duty remained largely unknown (Nez & Schiess Avilla, 2011). When the information was declassified, and the surviving Code Talkers were finally allowed to speak about their experiences, they had to rely on memories that were nearly a quarter of a century old (Nez & Schiess Avilla, 2011).

2.6 The Papua New Guinean carriers

Another group who contributed significantly to WW II, again with minimal recognition for their efforts, was the Papua New Guinean carriers. The carriers assisted with the transportation and provision of supplies to Australian and allied troops. Assigned to the carriage and care of the wounded along the historical Kokoda Trail (Hawthorne, 2003):

The Papuan carriers were critical to the Australians' success in the Kokoda Campaign. Their practical experience on the Track, combined with their invaluable bush skills, physical strength and dedication, enabled the Diggers to create and maintain a human supply line between the frontline deep in the jungle and the base at Port Moresby (anon, 2012, The Kokoda Track Foundation).

Similar to Indigenous Australians living in the remote communities at the time, the Papua New Guinean carriers knew best how to survive in the Papuan jungle. With minimal Army rations and specific knowledge of the area, they were able to
supplement the meagre rations provided by the authorities by finding local foods along the Kokoda trail. They also applied their ingenuity when caring for the sick and injured by modifying the difficult to carry Army stretchers with their own bush made ones using local materials. Despite being greatly affected by the war, there was never a case of an Australian soldier being abandoned by the Papua New Guinean carriers (anon, 2012, Kokoda Historical).

2.7 Diversity and today’s military

This distinct Ngati Tumatauenga (NZ Army iwi/tribe) identity will enable the Army to develop its own cultural practices and ceremonial protocols within the bounds of Tikanga Māori and European custom, and to focus on those professional ethics which are essential to the well-being of the Service (source Ngati Tumatauenga, 4 April 2011, New Army Leadership Team officially welcomed, retrieved 05 January 2015 from http://www.nzdf.mil.nz/news/media-releases/2011/20110404-nzltow.html).

Today Western militaries are under increased pressure to increase the participation rates and value the diversity of their Indigenous populations. Major General Kelly McKeague from the United States military is no stranger to diversity (Soucy, 2010). Born to a Caucasian father and a Hawaiian mother, and growing up in Hawaii often referred to as ‘the Crossroads of the Pacific,’ McKeague claims that in order for a leader to be successful, civilian or military, he or she must get out of their comfort zone and expand their horizons (Soucy, 2010). Organisations that value their members’ backgrounds and promote the active transfer of knowledge between groups are more likely to achieve a healthier workplace than those where knowledge flows in one direction (Soucy, 2010). McKeague believes working in a diverse
environment also allows one to see things from others’ perspectives. Working with those from different governmental, joint and international agencies, organisations that can effectively use cross-cultural and cross-functional teams that capitalise on the ‘deep reservoir’ of knowledge possessed by all members is going to have a distinct strategic advantage in the global marketplace (Dansby et al. 2001; Phillips & Scherr, 2009; Scoppio, 2007; Soucy, 2010; Zoroya, 2014).

However, to capitalise on the diversity of knowledge that personnel bring to an institution, an organisation must deal effectively with racism and discrimination. Racial discrimination is known to be a significant barrier to achieving ethnic diversity and equality. Over the last 40–60 years, the United States military has adopted a range of programs that deal specifically with racism and discrimination. These training initiatives are underpinned by a philosophy that seeks to address contemporary issues, and improve intercultural and ethnic relations (Dansby & Landis, cited in Dansby et al. 2001).

In 2000, the Australian Defence Organisation (ADO) released a report known as: The case for Cultural Diversity in Defence 2000, (from herein referred to as the CRAMN Report) to explore similar issues (Silk et al. 2000). The CRAMN Report found that discriminatory policies still existed within the ADF and that these were found to be actively discriminating on various grounds. Issues included matters of security; nationality; gender reassignment; gender, in some roles; physical fitness, in some employment categories; age; and educational qualifications. To establish a proactive approach to diversity, the CRAMN Report identified a number of key findings. Amongst other recommendations, the findings concluded that focus should be on eight key areas: lead from the top, set realistic diversity objectives, improve communications, recruit and retain personnel from an increased talent pool, apply
effective Human Resource practices, train and educate on anti-discrimination and cross-cultural awareness issues, provide support for individuals who may become targets of negative reactions to diversity initiatives, and address and manage these concerns (CRAMN, 2000). These approaches are discussed throughout this thesis.

2.8 Conclusion

Let no one say the past is dead. The past is all about us and within (Indigenous Australian Army veteran, Ooderoo Noonuccal, 1970).

Today military organisations are using different approaches to increasing the levels of diversity within their organisations. Some of the major inhibiting factors to achieving diversity, however, are unjust institutional power structures, lack of meaningful education concerning Indigenous people, and overcoming negative stereotypical attitudes towards ethnic minorities. Understanding colonial first encounters and the ongoing nature of its manifestations within current military educational practice, sheds some light onto these issues. Associate Professor Russell McGregor suggests, even though the post-war period saw a changing of attitudes towards European immigrants and their cultural differences, there is no reason to suppose that the long-entrenched attitude of indifference towards Indigenous Australians has transcended (Maddison, 2011; McGregor, 2011, p. 120; Stanner, 2009). While this chapter has provided a range of situations where Indigenous Knowledge has contributed significantly to military success and capability, issues of discrimination and educational inequality remain. Developing and sharing Indigenous Knowledge within the context of the military learning environment is one way to address some of these issues and would help to create a strategic advantage in the global marketplace. The following chapter provides a brief overview of
Indigenous Australian participation in the military from a historical and educational perspective.
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The aboriginal now has no status, no rights, no land and, though the native is more loyal to the person of the King and the throne than is the average white he has no country and nothing to fight for but the privilege of defending the land which was taken from him by the white race without compensation or even kindness … (excerpt of a letter written by the Honorary Secretary of the Australian Aborigines’ League to John Mc Ewen, the Minister for the Interior in January 1939, cited by Hall, 1991a, p. 31; Hall, 1995, p. 9; see also Jackomos & Fowell, 1993).

3.1 Introduction

Amid concerns regarding the Anglo-centric nature of the Australian Defence Force (ADF), the Report the Ethnic Composition of the Australian Defence Force: Measurement, Attitudes and Strategies was released in 1993 (Bergin et al. 1993). The report suggested that the ADF needed to take a more active approach to increasing diversity within the organisation. Military historian, Dr Robert Hall noted that the ADF presented an ‘uncompromising European image,’ whereby the primary reason for the lack of Indigenous participation was that Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders were still the victims of widespread discrimination (Hall, 1991b pp. 208-209 & 1995). Even though explicit racial barriers that prevented Indigenous Australians from participating in Australia’s military have now been removed, the ongoing nature of racism in all its overt and covert forms should not be underestimated (Docker & Fischer, 2000; Dodson; 2007; Frederickson, 2002; Hollinsworth, 2006; McConnachie et al. 1989; McGregor, 2011; Pearson, 2014; Short, 2008). Recommendations noted in the recent The Case for Cultural Diversity
Report pointed to the need for anti-discrimination education and education that taps into the diversity of all military members (CRAMN, 2000).

This chapter provides a broad analysis of the historical nature of Indigenous Australian participation in the military. It also draws attentions to the ways in which the dominant society racializes Indigenous people, in response to shifting societal goals, such as the war effort, the labour market and Reconciliation. By providing a brief overview of current Indigenous Australian education initiatives, this chapter demonstrates how assimilationist attitudes can be reinforced through institutional policies, limited interpretations of Reconciliation, and unchanged power differentials.

3.2 A brief history

Indigenous Australians are known to have served in every Australian conflict, since the Boer Wars in the 1890s (All in – Indigenous Service, 2011; Ball, 1991; Hall, 1989, 1995 & 1997; Riseman, 2012 & 2013; Stasiuk, 2002 & 2004; Williams, 2013; Winegard, 2009). During the last 35 years, they have also served in Cambodia, Rwanda, Mozambique, Bougainville, Kosovo, Sierra Leone, the Gulf War, and more recently Iraq, Afghanistan, East Timor, Solomon Islands, Sudan, Yugoslavia and on national border patrols (Department of Defence, Defence Reconciliation Action Plan, 2009). Table 3.1 on the following page shows the different international conflicts in which Indigenous Australians are known to have served.
Table 3.1: Aboriginal involvement in international conflicts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>War</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Boer War</td>
<td>1880–1881</td>
<td>Transvaal, South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Boer War</td>
<td>1899–1902</td>
<td>Transvaal, South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World War I</td>
<td>1914–1918</td>
<td>mainly Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World War II</td>
<td>1937–1945</td>
<td>Europe, SE Asia, Middle East, Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation of Japan</td>
<td>1946–1951</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean War</td>
<td>1950–1953</td>
<td>Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malayan Emergency</td>
<td>1950–1960</td>
<td>Malaya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian Confrontation</td>
<td>1963–1966</td>
<td>Indonesia, Malaysia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Conflicts</td>
<td>1973–present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from the *Creative Spirits* website, 18 September 2011

Indigenous Australians continue to serve proudly in full-time and part-time units in all three Services: the Royal Australian Navy (RAN); the Royal Australian Air Force (RAAF); the Australian Army, and the Regional Force Surveillance Units (RFSUs). Enlistment into the services, however, has never been an easy process for many Indigenous men and women (Bergin et al. 1993). In the past, those wanting to enlist have had to contend with discriminatory acts and legislation that made it very difficult to enlist, either voluntarily or by conscription (Ball, 1991; Hall, 1995 & 1987; Riseman, 2008a & 2013; Stasiuk, 2004; Winegard, 2009). Today, Western education practices present another significant challenge.
Standardised recruiting practices that rely on Western educational qualifications and psychometric testing continue to be major obstacles for many Indigenous Australians who wish to obtain a military career. While extensive evidence suggests that the continued use of psychometric tests for Indigenous people is suspect, because it has been proven to be discriminatory and largely inappropriate when used on certain ethnic groups, psychologists are reluctant to change their approach (Bergin et al. 1993; Davidson, 1988; Davidson, 1995; Drew, et al 2010; Exley, 2010; Kearins, 1988). Not surprisingly, there is a deep sense of distrust and suspicion surrounding Western assessment practices. Much of this mistrust derives from enforced institutionalisation, and the political misuse of assessment as a process of exclusion, and social and cultural control (Blekbala Wei et al. 1991; Coram, 2008; Davidson, 1995; Exley, 2010; Welch, 1996). Particularly problematic is the testing of ethnic groups with materials developed and administered by members of different cultural groups; in this situation, the tested are ‘more likely to appear less competent than they actually are’ (Christie, 1987; Goodnow, 1988; Malin, 1997). Paradoxically, throughout both World Wars, when manpower shortage was at its peak, psychometric testing and standardised recruitment policies were not rigorously enforced by the military (Hall, 1995). Cathryn McConaghy (2000, see section 1.6), and many other Indigenous scholars, academics, and educators believe that the lack of acknowledgement of Indigenous Knowledges and languages in Western institutions is a form of ‘contemporary colonialism.’

17 Throughout the late nineteenth century, and up until the 1970s, many Indigenous Australians were forced off their lands into missions and government institutions. Children of mixed descent were subsequently removed from their parents under inhumane and racially discriminatory laws and practices, underpinned by the belief of white supremacy (Beresford & Omaji 1998; Buti, 2004; Day, 1994; Kidd, 1997). For more information on some of the effects social engineering policies and neo-liberal reforms have had, and continue to have, for Indigenous people and people of colour with reference to military organisations, see Cowen (2006); Davis (1998); Enloe (1980); Hall (1981 & 1985); Holm (1997); Krouse & Dixon (2007); La Duke with Cruz (2013); Williams & Gilroy (2006); Yagil (2007).
During WW II, Charles Mene, a Torres Strait Islander originally from Mabuiag Island said he spoke little English (about the level of Grade 4) at the time of enlistment. Like other Indigenous Australians, he learned very quickly what needed to be done and went on to serve in the Australian Army for over twenty years (Hall, 1995). Near the end of his career, he was awarded a military medal for bravery in the Korean War. Life in the military provided new opportunities and relationships for those who were able to disguise their Aboriginality, and serve in the conventional units. Life in the military held promise of pay, sometimes equal to that of White Australians, and was seen as a way to re-open the doorway to freedom that was taken away during the process of colonisation (All in, Indigenous service, 2011; Hall, 1987; Jackomos & Fowell, 1993) and by the White Australia policy regime. One of the most notable of the WW II ‘Aborigines,’ and the first Indigenous non-commissioned soldier to gain promotion as an officer, Reginald Saunders, stated that he did not encounter any racism while serving in the Army (Hall, 1995, p. 77). Personal accounts from other Indigenous servicemen and women show a similar trend (Riseman, 2013; Stasiuk, 2004).

Figure 3.1 shows Lieutenant Reg Saunders, after successful graduation from the Officers Cadet Training Unit at Seymour, Victoria, 25 November 1944.

Figure 3.1: Lieutenant Reg Saunders being congratulated by Lieutenant Tom Derrick VC DCM (source, All-in Indigenous Service, website) [AWM 083166]
However, Lieutenant Saunders and other Indigenous ex-service men and women discovered that racism was never far away when the National President of the RSL, Brigadier Alf Garland, called for ‘the blood testing of Aborigines as a method of determining individuals’ entitlements to benefits’ after the war (Hall, 1995, p. 88).

The main act responsible for preventing Indigenous Australian enlistment was the Defence Act 1903. While this act did not use racial origins to exclude persons from military service, it required that ‘all personnel take an oath of allegiance, thereby restricting enlistment to British subjects’ (Hall, 1987). Indigenous Australians were considered British subjects, making it legal for them to voluntarily enlist. However, the act was confusing because persons not substantially of European origin or descent were exempted from call-up for war service under section 61(1) (h) of the act, and from compulsory training under section 138(1) (b) (Hall, 1987). Recruiting centres interpreted the regulations differently, which made it possible for some Indigenous men and women to join. The inconsistency in the policy was pointed out by the Department of Native Affairs and other interested parties during the early twentieth-century and forced the Military Board to review its policy. The Board decided to continue enforcing the official ban on the service of non-Europeans but decided to take a more flexible approach by giving the final decision responsibility to medical officers based on suitability of the applicant, and guided by practices of the State or Territory from where the member enlisted (Hall, 1995). The prevention of mass enlistment of Indigenous Australians throughout both World Wars was based on a number of racist and discriminatory concerns; one of the main reasons was the assumption that Europeans would not tolerate service with non-Europeans (Hall, 1989a).
Entirely dependent on the prevailing attitudes of White Australians, negative societal attitudes were therefore reinforced through Military Regulations and Orders. Most White Australians considered military service for Indigenous Australians to be neither ‘necessary nor desirable’ (All in – Indigenous Service, 2011; Hall, 1987, p. 13). Ironically, the services had their own recruitment policies, which were altered when the need arose. After heavy losses in WW I, No. 177 of the Australian Military Regulations and Orders was relaxed allowing persons who could prove they had at least one parent of European descent the ability to serve overseas (Hall, 1987; Winegard, 2009). Timothy Winegard (2009) writes this change in policy resulted in a significant increase of Indigenous enlistment after May, 1917, including at least three ‘full-bloods.’ During WW II, the Air Force was found to be the most lenient of the three services because they had a special need to fill thousands of positions for ground crew and support staff for the British under the Empire Air Training Scheme (Hall, 1995). Providing evidence of how Western institutions can work to marginalise certain groups over others, Land Headquarters, the headquarters of the Australian Army, was able to manipulate the discriminatory section of their Regulations and Orders when it suited (Ball, 1991; Hall, 1987), thus highlighting the need for a more in depth, up-to-date critical analysis at the institutional level (Hollinsworth, 2006). As anti-colonial educator Professor George Sefa Dei (2006, p. 11) suggests this is because: ‘The site from which we oppress is the site on which we least cast our gaze’ (see also Foucault, 2000; Freire, 2014; Smith, 1999b; Bell, 1980; Cooper, 2012).

In addition to discriminatory recruitment practices, when Indigenous Australians returned from overseas service, they were denied their rightful place in
Australia’s military history. \(^{18}\) The Australian War Memorial ignored pressure to include articles and facts about Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders’ war service for an extensive period (Hall, 1989; McGregor, 2011; Stasiuk, 2004). In 1993, speaking out about the non-recognition of Indigenous Service men and women, Mr Terry Garwood wrote: ‘Whatever the fate of the ANZAC legend, Aboriginal people were given no place in it’ (Jackomos & Fowell, 1993). The daughter of an Aboriginal Volunteer Garrison Service man, Marie Butler, claims ‘Aboriginal soldiers did very well ... they did just as much as white soldiers did but they didn’t get recognised when they should have’ (Stasiuk, 2004, p. 194). Information continues to be discovered about the involvement of Indigenous Australians in WW I. Even though the latest figures suggest 300 to 1000 Indigenous men and women served, there are possibly many more under alias names and identities.\(^ {19}\)

### 3.3 World War Two to present: a northern perspective

During WW II, the number of enlisted Indigenous Australians (Australia wide) was known to be at least 3000. Historical data that is slowly emerging reveals that there were at least another 3000 employed as labourers in support positions (Hall, 1989; Darian-Smith, cited in Beaumont, 1996). The peak enlistment period was from December 1941 to February 1942 where 36 Indigenous men were known to have officially enlisted (Hall, cited in Ball, 1991). In the Northern Territory, the Army

---

\(^ {18}\) In the Boer War, it is known that some Aboriginal men were despatched to Africa as trackers. Evidence suggests, however, that some of these men may have been left to their fate after the war in 1902, due to the Immigration Protection Act. Known as the White Australia Policy, the Immigration Protect Act disallowed the entry, or re-entry in this case, into Australia of non-Whites (see Maynard (2015); ABC PM, Charlotte Glenny reports on the findings of Dr Dale Kerwin, see https://audioboom.com/boos/981042-50-aboriginal-trackers-left-behind-after-the-boer-war-abc-pm-audio).

\(^ {19}\) Winegard (2009) claims there are at least 545 men of Indigenous descent who served in WW I. See also the 2007 updated list of Australian Indigenous Servicemen WW I Bringing Them Home Project AWM, National Archives of Australia, and/or contact Mr Gary Oakley, Indigenous military historian at the Canberra War Memorial, or Dr Noah Riseman at Noah.Riseman@acu.edu.au
became the employer of the largest number of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders, although much of this was carried out under ‘defacto’ terms (Hall, 1987; Hall, 1989). At the time, the Northern Territory Aboriginals Ordinance Act was in place, which meant that the majority of Aboriginal families were forced into missions and placed under strict governmental controls. Many families were re-located to labour settlements around Darwin to construct the infrastructure required for the war effort (Hall, 1985). Highlighting the exploitive nature of their relationship with the military, anthropologist Donald Thomson opposed the Inspector General of Administration of the Defence Division of the Department of the Treasury, G.S McIlroy’s plan to exploit every possible avenue in respect to Indigenous manpower. Intending to gather all available Indigenous Australians into a centralised labour pool, Thomson claimed that such a plan would amount to little more than slavery (Hall, 1987).

In general, enlisted Indigenous Australians received the same pay as non-Indigenous Australians. However, the evidence suggests that the pay and conditions were sometimes manipulated and in breach of the relevant regulations (Hall, 1985). Members who served in the Special Conditions Units of the Torres Strait Island Defence Force, and others serving under special conditions in the Northern Territory Special Reconnaissance Unit during the 1940s, for example, encountered an entirely different experience than those who served in the full-time services (Hall, 1985 & 1987; McGregor, 2011; Pascoe with AIATSIS, 2012; Riseman, 2013). In the Torres Strait Islands, the Army had planned to segregate units with up to 1300 men

---

20 Many Indigenous Australians who contributed to Australia’s war effort in the north were not formally enlisted in the services but were employed under defacto terms. Men from units such as Thomson’s Northern Territory Special Reconnaissance Unit and others on Bathurst Island, Melville Island and the Cox Peninsula, for example, received no pay, or were paid in amounts of tobacco or rations; the existence of the units was also kept secret, as far as possible, until after the war (Ball, 1991; Hall, 1987, 1989 & 1997; McGregor, 2011).
employed to protect and report on enemy activities in the north. Approximately 770 Islanders eventually enlisted and went on to serve in units such as the Torres Strait Light Infantry Battalion, the Coastal Defence Artillery, The Torres Strait Pioneer Company, and three Water Transport groups, although many of these men were never paid. The amount of underpayment in wages, together with repatriation liability, was £30,000,000.21 During the 1980s, after seeking the legal opinion of the Attorney General, there was a major effort to recompense these members and their families. Due to much of the evidence being destroyed by the military, the majority were either ‘never’ or only ‘partially paid’ (Hall, 1985, Appendix F; Pascoe with AIATSIS, 2012; see also Stasiuk, 2002; Riseman, 2013).

The nature of the relationship that existed between the military and Indigenous men and women throughout WW II depended largely on the function performed. Even though the services appeared to have met the policies set down by the States and Commonwealth authorities, with minor exceptions, it could be argued that they failed to meet moral requirements, and that this failure could form the basis of claims against the Commonwealth in the future (Hall, 1985). In the Northern Territory, for example, enlisted soldiers had an entirely different experience than those who were employed as labourers (Hall, 1987). The literature suggests that the military reinforced the negative attitudes of White Australians towards Indigenous Australians, and exploited them when the need arose (Hall, 1987). Discriminatory practices were enforced by the sanctioning of exclusionist enlistment policies, the exploitation of Indigenous labour, and the underpayment, and in some cases non-payment of Indigenous wages (Hall, 1987, p. 34).

21 (AWM, series 54, CRS A2663, item 628/1/1: Torres Strait Islanders — Enlistment, pay, cited by Hall in Ball (1991); Hall (1985, p. 24)
Associate Professor of History, Russell McGregor believes that the military could have done more to support Indigenous Australians: ‘In the Second World War, the Australian military could have fulfilled such a role in the national incorporation of Aboriginal people but the authorities inhibited it from doing so’ (2011, p. 53). This was because the rationale for the employment of Aborigines and their conditions of employment were strongly influenced by racism (Hall, 1987). However, not all Australians agreed with their discriminatory treatment. As Saunders stated: ‘[I think many of the officials] just closed their eyes to it once you were sworn in ... that’s the ball game’ (Saunders cited in Hall, 1995, p. 68). Despite the resistance on the part of the institution to employ Indigenous members on an equal basis, written and oral accounts of those who did manage to serve only illustrate the irony of the situation:

The natives ... did everything the whites said they could not do. They ... threw live grenades, shot exceptionally well with the service rifle and manned a trench under intense machine gun fire ... they entered into the spirit of ambushes and simple tactical schemes and on night patrol; exercises were the eyes and ears of the whites (Longmore, 1999, cited by Stasiuk, 2004, p. 192).

The advent of WW II brought some advantages to Australia’s north. Because the Territory is so vast, and much of it was still unknown to Europeans, the Army found itself in an interesting situation in that it needed to seek the assistance of the local people. This paved the way for a new type of relationship between Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australians (Hall, 1987). Indigenous Knowledge such as navigation, tracking, reconnaissance skills, bush craft, medicinal knowledge, and survival skills were suddenly sought after by the military (Ball, 1991; Hall, 1987; Peterson, 2003).
Members from the North Australia Observer Unit (NAOU) found that the biggest problem was finding water:

… the Blacks22 showed us how we could dig alongside a nearby swamp and get beautiful clear water. We would never have known unless the Blacks had shown us (R. & H. Walker, in Curtin’s Cowboys, cited in Ball, 1991, p. 14); and

The Aborigines taught the Nackeroos [i.e. the men of the NAOU] how to supplement their predictable (and often dwindling) army rations with the wild food that surrounded them. ‘Living off the land’ meant eating goannas, snakes, kangaroos, buffalo, witchetty grubs, turtle eggs, flying fox, geese, ducks, fish, sharks, crocodiles and dugong. Some men tried various grasses, berries, pigweed and yams (R. & H. Walker, in Curtin’s Cowboys cited in Ball, 1991, p. 14).

Aboriginal people’s knowledge and their ability to identify intruders in the area was critical to the military. Unbeknownst to many Australians, it was Tiwi Islander Matthias Ulungura who captured the first Japanese prisoner of war on Australian soil, after he crashed his plane on Melville Island in 1942, and turned him over to the authorities (Forrest & Forrest, 2001).

The relationships that were formed with many of the remote Indigenous communities during the war continue today (Riseman, 2013). The Army’s three RFSUs are integrated units made up of approximately 50% Indigenous reservists, and 50% full-time Army members (predominantly non-Indigenous). There is generally no shortage of people wishing to enlist in the RFSUs (Rozensweig, 2001). However, the low level of Western academic achievement amongst the Indigenous

---

22 The word ‘Blacks’ is taken from within the reference cited and may be considered inappropriate in Australian and New Zealand contexts.
soldiers, combined with the lack of technical competence means that they are often regarded as ‘not suitable’ for promotion into the senior ranks, and ‘unsuited’ to particular jobs in even the lowest levels of the organisation (Hall, 1991b, p. 217). The first Indigenous RFSU soldier to gain promotion to a senior non-commissioned officer rank was Sergeant Pat Thomas from Minjiilang on Croker Island in June 1993 (Rosenzweig, 2001). The reluctance of the organisation to formally recognise the knowledge of Indigenous Australians combined with the low representation of Indigenous soldiers in the senior ranks could be perceived as an example of contemporary colonialism and needs to be urgently addressed. Failure of the organisation to achieve equitable representation of minority groups can lead to defence being seen as the province of sectional interest as well as to accusations of racism and ethnocentrism (Hall, 1991a). Glyn Harper writes:

If the Australian military is to retain a well-accepted institution in Australian society, it must come to terms with the sweeping social changes which have occurred within that society over the last twenty years. To ignore them could result in the institution becoming socially irrelevant. Such a development would have a profound, and undesirable impact (Harper, 1994, p. 207).

The historical impact of failing to address Indigenous Australian worldview is evident in the following comment:

The ethnocentrism of our Army blinded it to the potential for developing an indigenous military tradition within the Pacific Islands Regiment. … Australia, too, through Aborigines and Islanders, and the services of Australians from all racial groups in the First and Second World Wars, possesses a unique tradition, yet this tends to be ignored in favour of an ‘imported tradition.’ This is because the Defence Force is in the hands of white Australians.
Aborigines and Islanders are unlikely to be attracted to institutions which apparently deny their heritage (Hall, 1991b, p. 210).

In order to avoid becoming a ‘socially irrelevant’ institution, the educational and political needs of Indigenous Australians must be given equal consideration in the military learning environment.

In 2006, the ADF Learning Culture Inquiry reported on various military training establishments. Findings noted that there was insufficient coaching of those needing help, few rewards for trainees to excel, and more emphasis placed on negative rather than positive reinforcement (Australian Government, DOD, 2006). These are important findings in relation to this study. While the ADF has campaigned extensively to attract employees from a greater talent pool particularly in recent years (CRAMN, 2000; section 1.6), empirical evidence shows that English second language learners are unlikely to do well in negative and unsupportive environments (Arbon, 2008; Benham with Cooper, 2000; Bin Sallik, 1990; Bishop, 2005 & 2010; Blekbala et al. 1991; Christie, 1987; Crawford, 1988; Day, 1994; Egan, 2008; Giner, 2007; Grimes, 2009; Hughes & More, 1997; Kanu, 2011; Malin, 1997; Ma Rhea in Cree, (n.d); McConaghy, 2000; Moreton-Robinson, 2007; Murphy, 2000; Perez, 2000; Welch, 1996; Yu, 1994).

Programs that encourage greater participation of Indigenous people but do nothing to alter organisational structure, power dynamics, and curricula content to accommodate such change are inadequate for Indigenous cultures and experience (Altman, 2007; Arbon, 2008; Bishop & Glynn, 1999; Cooper, 2012; Lewis, 2001; Murphy, 2000; Sarra, 2011 & 2012; Smith, 1999b; Rigney, 1997 & 1999; Welch, 1996). Peter Yu (1994) defines such programs as bureaucratic welfare colonialism, while Jeremy Beckett (1987) sees it as nothing more than the state’s attempt to
‘manage the political problems posed by the presence of a depressed and disenfranchised Indigenous population in an affluent liberal democratic society’ (see also Coram, 2008; Welch, 1996; McConaghy, 2000). As employment initiatives are closely linked to education, the following section explores some of these issues in light of current educational reforms.

### 3.4 Indigenous education: an overview

We are really sorry for you people. We cry for you because you haven’t got (the) meaning of culture in this country. We have a gift we want to give you. We keep getting blocked from giving you that gift. We get blocked by politics and politicians. We get blocked by media, by process of law. All we want to do is come out from under all of this and give you this gift. And it’s the gift of pattern thinking. It’s the culture which is the blood of this country, of Aboriginal groups, of the ecology, of the land itself (David Mowaljarlai, senior Lawman of the Ngarinyin people of the West Kimberley, addressing a gathering of White people in his country ABC Radio 1995, cited in Grieves, 2009, p. 200).

Prior to 1992, Australia used the legal fiction of *Terra Nullius* meaning that Aboriginal people were not recognised as a civilisation before the arrival of White settlers. One of the major implications of the denial of Indigenous sovereignty was that education for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders was used to oppress and assimilate them into Western society (Australian Education Union, AEU, Policy on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Education, preamble, 2002; Lippman, 1994; McConaghy, 2000; McGregor, 2011; Parbury, 1999; Rowse, 2005). Arguing that little has changed since 1992, academic Tim Rowse, in his 2005 publication
Contesting assimilation, states that current policy is little different from the broad assimilationist aims of the past 50 years (Altman & Fogarty, 2010).

Under increased national and international pressure and providing an example of the Interest Convergence Theory, see 1.4, the Australian Federal Government officially adopted the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People in 2009. Article 14 of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People states:

- 1. Indigenous peoples have the right to establish and control their educational systems and institutions providing education in their own languages, in a manner appropriate to their cultural methods of teaching and learning.
- 2. Indigenous individuals, particularly children, have the right to all levels and forms of education of the State without discrimination.
- 3. States shall, in conjunction with indigenous peoples, take effective measures, in order for indigenous individuals, particularly children, including those living outside their communities, to have access, when possible, to an education in their own culture and provided in their own language (See the Australian Human Rights Commission website https://www.humanrights.gov.au/publications/un-declaration-rights-indigenous-peoples-1).

As will be highlighted throughout this section, however, Australian governments and their representative institutions have so far ignored their responsibilities where Indigenous rights and education are concerned (Day, 1994; Havemann, 1999; Maddison, 2011; Ma Rhea, 2004; Pearson, 2009; Tickner, 2001; Sarra, 2011).
notion that inequality arising out of over two hundred years of colonisation can be closed through increased access to education and employment opportunities and the building of community capacity, while continuing to deny Indigenous educational rights, unduly puts the onus on Indigenous Australians to overturn the historical effects of structural arrangements (Coram, 2008, p. 1). Drawing from the work of Taylor (2004), Coram (2008) finds that focusing primarily on educational access is also the erasing of history and the reframing of class inequality as economic disadvantage that obscures the systemic social engineering that has led to current patterns of inequality. This finding suggests that initiatives to mainstream Indigenous Australians through greater access to unchanged education practices will only obscure the institutionalising of inequality even further.

This section will discuss some of the current initiatives in Indigenous Australian education. Even though a determined effort to increase educational outcomes for Indigenous Australians has occurred, the outcomes envisioned are based on Eurocentric ideals and failed rhetoric (Allen, 2007; Hughes & Hughes, 2010; Rowse, 2005). Three critical factors which have not been addressed adequately in the latest educational reforms are: the inclusion of Indigenous languages and cultures in education curricula; failure to implement fully Reconciliation; and the formation of a treaty, or a legislative document that protects and promotes the knowledge systems of Indigenous Australians in Australian institutions.23

The findings demonstrate how Indigenous Australian educational aspirations are undermined by the current political agenda and limited interpretations of

23 For an example of a ‘contemporary inclusive education framework’ see the ‘objective’ statement, and education programs available at The Australians Centre of Indigenous Knowledges and Education, School of Indigenous Knowledges and Public Policy, Charles Darwin University, http://www.cdu.edu.au/sikpp
Reconciliation. Discursively linking these findings to military education practices, it also provides further evidence that a human approach to education based on respect and partnerships, which exist outside of the neo-liberal agenda, is required.

Perhaps two of the most important documents relating to Indigenous education today are *The Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Education Action Plan (ATSIEAP 2010–14)* and *The Australian Education Union (AEU) Policy on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Education, 2002* (from herein referred to as the *AEU Policy*). The ATSIEAP 2010–14 builds upon Australian Directions in Indigenous Education 2005–08 established by the Ministerial Council for Education, Early Childhood Development and Youth Affairs (MCEEDYA, 2006) and is underpinned by the Council of Australian Governments’ (COAG) national effort to improve Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander educational outcomes. This is to be achieved by ‘closing the gaps’ between Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australians’ English literacy and numeracy achievements at every level of the education sector. By contrast, the policy on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander education focuses on education that is important for achieving self-determination, and restoring the human rights and dignity of Indigenous Australians. Indigenous languages, cultures and heritages play a critical role in this process. When discussing the importance of Indigenous languages, cultures, and identities in education, Aboriginal Elders who attended the Assembly of First Nations (AFN) project in 1993 agreed that:

> Our native language embodies a value system about how we ought to live and relate to each other … It gives a name to relations among kin, to roles and responsibilities among family members, to ties with the broader clan group. There are no English words for these relationships … if you destroy our languages, you not only break down these relationships, but you also destroy other aspects
of our Indian way of life and culture … Without our languages, we will cease to exist as a separate people (Taylor, in Hébert, 2000).

The lack of value awarded to Indigenous Australian languages and cultures in education is in breach of the United Nations Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. While the ATSIEAP 2010–14 is said to be a nationally agreed document, it is essentially a reform agreement underpinned by economic objectives and Western ideologies. Focusing on English literacy and numeracy skills above and beyond the retention and revitalisation of Indigenous language and cultures the ATSIEAP 2010–14 undermines the concerns Indigenous people have with regard to their own educational needs (Pearson, 2009). The reforms outlined in both the policy, and its draft document the Indigenous Education Action Plan 2010, are based on Western ‘imperatives that are oppositional to indigenous systems of belief.’ Such systems value individualism over collective community achievements and decision-making processes (Dodson, 2007). The identified areas for increased improvement are: readiness for school, engagement and connections, attendance, literacy and numeracy, leadership, quality teaching and workforce development, and pathways to post-school options. While MCEECDYA’s concerns in terms of targets and measurable outcomes are contained within the ATSIEAP 2010–14, the document is similar to past ethnocentric policies. There is no commitment to increase Indigenous languages and culture in education, no mention of the lack of progress made with respect to Reconciliation, a treaty, or the implementation of the United Nations Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, and no critical examination of the dominant epistemological foundations of the current system (CAR, 2000; Giroux & Giroux, 2008).
Not only does the ATSIEAP 2010–14 breach Article 14 (and many others) of the United Nations Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, but it is driven from the top down, and ignores the human rights and diversities of Indigenous Australian cultures at regional, local, and community levels (Altman & Fogarty, 2010; Nakata, 1991; Pearson, 2009; Sarra, 2011). The only real mention of Indigenous concerns is that ‘Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students and communities are empowered through the promotion of their identity, culture, and leadership in community partnerships with providers of early childhood and school education’ (ATSIEAP 2010–14). This statement is problematic because it is borne out of an unchanged reform system (see Nakata, 1991), where there is no mention of ‘how’ Indigenous empowerment will be achieved. Until specific targeted outcomes for Indigenous Knowledge systems are included in all government policy and education documents, it is unlikely that meaningful Indigenous Knowledge education will become a priority in Australian institutions (AEU Reports, 2002, 2007 & 2009, also Altman, 2007; Altman & Fogarty, 2010; Grimes, 2009; Ma Rhea, 2004 Rigney, 2003; Waller, 2012).

By contrast, the AEU Policy 2009 clearly outlines the direction the AEU wishes the government to take with regard to Indigenous education. The AEU Policy emphasises the importance of community education, community curriculum, teacher professional development and cultural accountability, employment of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander staff, and community orientated goals. Most importantly, however, the guiding principle is that Indigenous Australian students must have access to education that is in accordance with their own worldviews. Moreover, the AEU Policy focuses on the human rights and the inalienable rights that people of First Nation status should enjoy through the enactment of Reconciliation and a treaty.
While this document demonstrates commitment on behalf of the AEU to advocate for the implementation of Indigenous pedagogy, the reality is that it has been largely ignored. The absence of Indigenous Knowledge content in government institutions then reinforces the undermining of Indigenous interests in Australian society.

3.4.1 Reconciliation as education: transformation or more of the same?

During 1991, the Council of Aboriginal Reconciliation (CAR, 2000) recommended an approach towards Reconciliation based on education. Similar to the findings in the previous section, however, a brief look at the Reconciliation literature suggests that education programs, anti-discrimination laws and mechanisms to combat racism in Australian institutions and public life have had little effect (Dodson, 2007). Some Australians have displayed a blatant disregard and intolerance towards Reconciliation labelling it as ‘reverse racism’ (Hollinsworth, 2006). Reinforcing Professor Bell’s (1980) findings about the permanence of racism in Western societies (section 1.4 and 1.6), many Indigenous Australian scholars and educators believe that racism is one of Australia’s core values (Arbon, 2008; Dodson, 2004; Pearson, 2009; Rigney, 2009). Furthermore, Indigenous lawyer and academic Noel Pearson claims that the entrenched nature of racism has resulted in the miserable failure of cultural awareness programs (Dodson, 2004; Dodson, 2007; Hollinsworth, 2006; Maddison, 2011; McGregor, 2011; Moreton-Robinson, 2000; Nakata, 2007; Pearson, 2009). Bernhard Schlink (2009) and Sarah Maddison (2011) believe that many of the challenges still facing Australia arise out of lack of truthful education about the past and inadequate superficial attempts to address complex issues. Cultural awareness programs which are not ungirded by moral engagement, and programs that do little to rectify unresolved historical grievances, are inadequate
to challenge complex issues. Many Australians are therefore shocked when they discover the truth about Australia’s past.\textsuperscript{24}

Politicians’ obliviousness towards ‘white privilege’\textsuperscript{25} is another inhibiting factor to achieving societal change. During Prime Minister John Howard’s term in office,\textsuperscript{26} 1996 to 2007, the repeated refusal of the Australian governments to accept Indigenous languages, cultures, and heritages as both local and national issues has left a legacy of socio-political and economic disasters. Any last vestiges of hope that may have formally contributed to the nation’s ongoing respect and nurturing of the cultural renaissance of Indigenous worldviews, during this period were very nearly destroyed (Dodson, 2007; Rigney, 2003). One suggestion that speaks to the slow progress of Reconciliation is that transformative and revolutionary praxis that brings about dialogical change stands in opposition to the prescriptive methods of the dominant elites, and can only proceed with the action and reflection of those whom the elite have sought to dominate (Freire, 2014). To achieve a view of the Australian nation that is more shared than contested, a collective adaptive approach and a genuine commitment to change is required (Maddison, 2011; Rigney, 2003). Over time Indigenous and non-Indigenous people will then come together to understand each other better, making genuine connections, through meaningful engagement (Maddison, 2011; Pearson, 2014; Worby et al. 2010). Instead of moving closer together as a nation, however, what has emerged as a result of Howard’s term in office is ‘coercive Reconciliation.’

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{24} Maddison (2011), see also Henry Reynolds extensive writings on Australia’s frontier and colonial histories.
\item \textsuperscript{25} See the works of Kendall (2006), Lewis (2001) and Malin (1997) for an understanding of how white privilege and colour-blind ideologies work to protect the interests of dominant groups.
\item \textsuperscript{26} See \textit{The Howard Years} edited by Robert Manne (2004), Black Inc Agenda, Melbourne, Australia.
\end{itemize}
Coercive Reconciliation is embedded in the ‘Intervention program’ (Gray 2011; Willis, 2012) that has seen restrictions, deprivation of rights and civil liberties imposed on many remote Indigenous communities (see sections 1.6 and 3.4). Research shows that government imposed programs are often unrealistic, problematic and doomed to failure (Altman, 2007; Shimpo, 1978; Tickner, 2001). A recent example is the intention to transform Indigenous Australia into mainstream Australia, based on Noel Pearson’s model from the Cape York Peninsula. The Cape York model is assisting Indigenous people to become economically viable, while retaining the benefits of Indigenous life styles, on Indigenous lands. This model is proving successful in Cape York, although Professor Altman (2007) suggests that it is radical to assert that the same affluence found in mainstream Australia can be replicated by all Indigenous communities (Altman & Fogarty, 2010; Brough, 2009). While some Indigenous communities could be well-placed to look forward to an economically sustainable future, there are others with absolutely ‘no chance’ (Brough, 2009).

The latest political reforms have a specific agenda to bring to an end Indigenous Australians living in remote communities (Hinkson, 2007). Clearly devised to normalise and assimilate Aboriginal people into the mainstream society, the Intervention focuses on individual property rights, career orientated lifestyles, and conformity to mainstream values (Altman, 2010; Brough, 2009; Hinkson, 2007; Willis, 2012). The 2015 plan to close many remote Indigenous communities, cutting off basic services, thereby forcing thousands of Indigenous people into towns and

regional centres is a clear example of coercive Reconciliation.\textsuperscript{28} Families with children in receipt of welfare payments are subject to their payments being linked to school attendance (ATSIEAP 2010–14). Such bureaucratic intervention is reminiscent of forced removals of the past and is definitely not the answer (Altman, 2010; Altman & Fogarty, 2009; Dodson, 2004; Dodson, 2007; Gray, 2011; Hinkson, 2007; Hughes & More, 1997; Maddison, 2011; May & Aikman, 1999; Semchison, 2001; Short, 2008; Tickner, 2001).

### 3.5 Conclusion

This chapter has provided a broad analysis of the historical nature of Indigenous participation within the Australian military. It has also provided an overview of some of the educational issues that continue to affect Indigenous Australian military participation. For example, despite the introduction of Reconciliation initiatives, neo-liberal educational reforms continue to undermine Indigenous aspirations by ignoring the basic human right of having access to education that includes Indigenous Knowledges and languages. Understanding how this contributes to the legacy of institutional discrimination is important for military educators and instructors. Even though the ADF is not strictly bound by the educational policies mentioned in this chapter, it would be counterintuitive to ignore the part that educators play in addressing, or exacerbating, Indigenous concerns. A brief critical analysis of some of the current initiatives shows that issues of epistemological dominance and coercion are not uncommon. This was evidenced by the lack of Indigenous Knowledge content in mainstream curricula, lack of

\textsuperscript{28} See reports in Western Australia of the social consequences and human rights violations, that Australian governments are causing, and will continue to cause, by closing communities mostly populated by Indigenous people, available at http://www.abc.net.au/news/2014-11-12/indigenous-communities-closures-will-have-severe-consequences/5886840
commitment to enforce the educational rights of Indigenous people, and the latest intent to close hundreds of remote Indigenous communities. Moreover, limited theoretical understandings of Reconciliation, and unchanged military education practices are unlikely to achieve significant change. The following chapter introduces the New Zealand Defence Force experience, and explores a different theoretical approach.
Chapter 4

Māori participation in the New Zealand Defence Force
Tikarohia te marama – Seek out that which is most important (anon, Māori whakatauāki, cited in Morrison, 2011, p. 238).

### 4.1 Introduction

Other than rugby, the military is one aspect of New Zealand society that can claim to be truly shared by Māori and Pākehā alike. There were few places in early New Zealand social life in which Māori sought to participate and were accepted by the Pākehā majority’ than warfare (King, 1989). Māori proved, during the Musket and New Zealand Wars of the 1800s, that they were innovative and resourceful warriors, who outwitted their European opponents on a number of occasions (Belich, 1998; Houston, 2006; King, 1989; Scott, 2008). This chapter provides a brief overview of Māori military participation, as well as some of the current issues surrounding Māori education and social justice concerns. It not only highlights how historical issues continue to impact on Māori military participation, but also how changes in societal goals surrounding education have influenced military educational practice in recent years.

With the advent of the uprisings in Sudan, 1894, Samoa in 1899, and the South African war in 1890, James Carroll, the first Māori to hold a European Parliamentary seat in 1887, was keen to show Māori commitment to the Queen by deploying Māori troops overseas (King, 1989). Even though Carroll volunteered to lead a contingent of Māori to Samoa himself, neither of his proposals were accepted in London as official Imperial Policy at the time refused to allow ‘native’ troops to
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29 Non-Indigenous New Zealander
deploy in a ‘white man’s war’ (King, 1989; Ministry for Culture and Heritage NZ, *Māori and the war - NZ in the South African War*, 2012). However, similar to Indigenous Australians in the Australian military, those that did manage to serve are known to have served with distinction (King, 1989). During the First World War, Walter Callaway, one of the first Māori soldiers to be sent overseas, wrote a haka that became the official war cry of the New Zealand Māori contingents:

\[ \textit{Kia kaha nu Tereni} \]
\[ \textit{Wha whai maea mo to Kuini to Kaianga} \]
\[ \textit{Ake Ake Ake} \]

*Be strong New Zealand*

*Fight bravely for your Queen, For your country*

*Ever! Ever! Ever!*

(Māori and the war - NZ in the South African War, 2013)

### 4.2 Māori and the military

While Pākehā greed for land, racism and cultural superiority forged the basis of early relationships between Māori and the Crown, Māori political representation greatly influenced the successful enlistment of Māori personnel, during the late 1800s and early 1900s. By the time World War One (WW I) arrived, however, the tribal response from Māori to military participation was divided. Māori resistance to military service arose over unresolved grievances due to confiscation and loss of lands as punishment for rebellion against the British Crown (Ministry for Culture and Heritage NZ, 'Māori Units of the NZDF,' 2012). Māori chiefs from the Taranaki,

---

30 Haka - Māori word for war dance, performed prior to a planned attack.
Maniapoto, and Tainui-Waikato regions, for example, chose not to support the war effort during WW I (King, 1989). As the Imperial Government’s need for manpower increased, the discriminatory rules that permitted the recruitment of Māori for garrison duties only were relaxed allowing Māori into combat roles by the end of the Gallipoli Campaign. The four Māori members of Parliament remained supportive throughout both World Wars, and believed military participation was one way in which they could prove Māori were equal to Pākehā (King, 1989).

### 4.3 A brief history

During WW I, Māori from many different tribal areas served together in what was known as the *New Zealand Pioneer Māori Battalion*. Over 2200 were known to have enlisted, while the majority came from Te Arawa, Ngati Porou, and Ngai Tahu tribes. However, over half were killed or wounded in action due to high casualties (King, 1989). With the significant contribution of Māori personnel, and the high rate of casualties, the Māori members of Parliament were kept busy travelling the countryside encouraging tribes to contribute more than their rivals (King, 1989). The fact that many Māori deployed together helped them to keep their cultural traditions alive whenever the opportunity arose. Aspects of Māori Knowledge were therefore embedded within the New Zealand armed services from an early stage (Ministry for Culture and Heritage NZ, n.d, *Māori Pioneer Battalion haka, 1918*, 2012).

Unlike the general restrictions placed on Indigenous Australian enlistment in Australia, at the same time, Māori participation in the armed forces, particularly during World War II, was not restricted to the non-commissioned officer ranks. The

---

31 See *The Story of Parihaka* in which prime Māori land in Taranaki was confiscated by the Imperial Forces and distributed to Europeans for settlement and pastoral reasons (Scott, 2008).
first known Māori officer, Major Kepa, served in the allied forces against Titikowaru, a prominent South Taranaki leader in the New Zealand Wars of 1867–69; Major Kepa was put in charge of a mixed force of personnel comprising officers, troops and allies (Houston, 2006). Māori members of Parliament such as Sir Apirana Ngata and Sir Peter Buck also served commendably alongside their Pākehā peers. Like many Māori, they experienced battalion life as equal to that of non-Māori. On their return from overseas, however, the sense of equality and camaraderie that was experienced in battalion life did not spill over into civilian life. Discriminatory legislation that prevented Māori from buying alcohol, and accessing the farm and housing development schemes reserved for Pākehā soldiers, combined with the poor recognition they received on their return, led many to join the Ratana Movement. The Ratana movement is a religious movement that promoted hope and a sense of trans-tribal unity amongst Māori (King, 1989).

4.4 World War Two to present

Despite the lack of recognition during WW I, when war was again declared in 1939, Māori military participation increased dramatically. Without any resistance this time, Māori voluntarily enlisted in what became known as the 28th (Māori) Battalion. Conscription was still only applied to Pākehā, with the exception of the Waikato tribe who were conscripted as punishment at the end of WW I (King, 1989). The 28th (Māori) Battalion was sent to prepare in North Africa, where many of the soldiers’ fathers had trained during the previous war (King, 1989). Representing the country was a great source of pride for Māori, and they continued to fight with a gusto that at times exceeded their Pākehā compatriots. By the end of WW II, the Māori Battalion was widely known as one of the most decorated and successful units
in the New Zealand Army (Scoppio, 2007). This sense of pride and achievement which has been carried over from previous generations continues to have a beneficial impact on Māori recruitment and retention efforts today; the sense of shared NZDF identity that was evident amongst the participants in this study can be largely attributed to these early experiences (see Chapter 7).

While over 17,000 Māori are known to have enlisted in WW II, another 11,500 assisted in essential industries. To care for Māori soldiers overseas and their families at home, Cabinet Minister Paraire Paitea established the Māori War Effort Organisation (King, 1989). Recruiting centres consisting of 407 tribal communities and 60 executives were set up to recruit Māori, and mobilise men and women working in the essential industries. One of New Zealand’s most famous Māori soldiers was Second Lieutenant Moana-Nui-A-Kiwa Ngarimu. Ngarimu was posthumously awarded the Victoria Cross for showing spectacular courage in the face of adversity on a small hill named Tebaga Gap, in Mareth (New Zealand Army 2007). During the night of 26 March 1943, outnumbered by the Germans and undeterred by the intense mortar and machine-gun fire, Ngarimu destroyed two machine gun posts and led his men straight up the face of the hill; from there he successfully led a series of counter-attacks on the Germans (King, 1989; New Zealand Army, 2007). Wounded several times during the night, Ngarimu defied the enemy and led a final counter-attack before being fatally shot at the break of dawn (New Zealand Army, 2007). The hui32 that followed his return home to Ruatoria in October 1943 was not only an opportunity to celebrate Ngarimu’s awarding of the Victoria Cross, but also an opportunity to commemorate the significant contributions and sacrifices made by Māori troops from all tribes (King, 1989). Sir Apirana Ngata

32 Hui – Māori word for meeting or gathering.
presented the medal to Ngarimu’s parents and established the ‘Ngarimu Scholarship Fund,’ which was set up to assist Māori educational achievement beyond primary school.

When Māori soldiers returned from overseas, they were well-respected leaders who had proven themselves on the battlefields. While some returned ex-servicemen from WW I received assistance on their return (Gould, 2013), this time the majority of Māori were eligible for the soldiers’ rehabilitation schemes. One of the outcomes of serving in the Māori Battalion was that Māori were able to envision a stronger identity for themselves. On their return to civilian life, many Māori completed university studies in order to fight for equality and justice at home. Determined to eliminate racism and discrimination in New Zealand society, Māori ex-servicemen promoted the betterment of their people through the development of Māori identity and education. Successful participation in New Zealand’s wars not only altered the standing of Māori in Pākehā opinion, but made it more difficult for government leaders to discriminate against them as they had done in the past (King, 1981).

Perhaps one of the most substantial pieces of post-war Māori legislation was the Māori Social and Economic Advancement Act 1945. Under this act, ex-servicemen became Māori Welfare officers and set up a system of tribal committees and executives concerned with welfare and Marae (Māori meeting area) administrations. For a number of reasons, however, the Māori Social and Economic Advancement Act proved largely unsuccessful at a time when Māori families were moving to the cities in search of employment. Additionally, the Act and its approach were not entirely what the four Māori Members of Parliament desired. They were more in favour of a national organisation that was based on the model of the Māori War Effort Organisation: ‘… under their own influence and independent of the
Department of Māori Affairs’ (King, 1981). The establishment of the Māori Women’s Welfare league in 1951 was much more successful. Helping Māori families with welfare issues, accessing higher education, and increasing awareness of Māori needs, the Māori Women’s Welfare League helped to alleviate many of the problems associated with urbanisation (King, 1981). Malcolm Fraser, the Minister of Māori Affairs at the time, stated that one of his goals was to achieve ‘an independent, self-reliant and satisfied Māori race working side by side with Pākehā and with equal incentives, advantages, and rewards for efforts in all walks of life’ (King, 1981).

4.5 Māori education post WW II

The emphasis of Māori education during the twentieth-century was to civilise and assimilate Māori into mainstream society. In 1960, the Acting Secretary for Māori Affairs, Jack Hunn compiled a comprehensive report of Māori social life, and report of the Māori Affairs Department. This report became widely known as the Hunn Report 1961 and was produced at a time where the primary role of education was to Europeanise Māori by replacing te reo (the language) Māori with the English language (Simon & Smith et al. 2001). This was achieved largely through the enactment of the Native Schools Act 1867, where urbanisation combined with the intent of the act significantly reduced Māori ability to maintain their language and cultural connections (King, 1989).

Criticized by articulate Māori, the Hunn Report became one of the most contentious reports ever commissioned by the New Zealand government. It assumed that the future of Māori was to integrate and blend with Pākehā, and that this was a desired goal. Māori people did not want to blend with Pākehā, and were quite adamant that they would not (King, 1989). There were also other issues. While the
Hunn Report was the first official act of ‘recognition’ of the process of Māori urbanisation (National Library of New Zealand, n.d, Te Ao Hou, 2013), it subsequently constructed a negative three-tiered Māori typology where Māori were seen to exist between either a completely detribalized group with a vestigial culture and those content to live a backward life in primitive semi-civilised conditions (Mahuika, 2011). The Hunn Report also criticised Māori parents for what it termed as ‘Māori apathy’ towards education, and subsequently called for the abolition of Native schools, transferring their authority over to Board control.

Integration of Māori students into state schools was inevitable. By the late 1960s, the majority of Māori students were moved into mainstream schools (Metge, 2008), where despite legitimate concerns regarding the closure of the Native schools (Simon & Smith et al. 2001), one of the positive outcomes was that it resulted in rigorous debate over Māori education matters. A number of articles and reports discussing both sides of the argument were produced, including the Assistant Director of the New Zealand Council for Educational Research, John Watson’s article *Horizons of Unknown Power* in 1967 followed closely by *Accommodating the Polynesian Heritage of the Māori Child* in 1972. Other valuable contributions included Barry Mitcalfe’s 1968 *Polynesian Studies* and Jack Shallcrass and John Ewings 1970 *Introduction for Māori Education* (Metge, 2008). These articles began to explore the detrimental effects of assimilationist education for Māori students and the concerns they raised over curricula content.

Another positive outcome of the Māori education debate was that more pathways into employment were created. Initially proposed for ‘the elite of Māori scholars,’ the Māori Education Foundation extended trade training facilities and provided hostel accommodation and pre-employment courses for young Māori
arriving in the cities (King, 1989; Metge, 2008). Although many Māori took advantage of these opportunities, none of the outcomes addressed the real concerns that Māori were facing, which was the rapid loss of Māori language and cultural identity. Highlighting the reluctance of the dominant society to change (see section 1.4) and to make matters worse, the more Māori articulated their concerns, the more they were resented by the public service and the New Zealand systems of government (King, 1989). When numerous cases were presented to the government concerning the teaching of te reo, increased Māori content on radio and television, and ways to deal with Māori offenders in court, Māori proposals were subjected to the Pākehā veto and frequently dismissed as a potential source of social divisiveness. Pākehā-oriented institutions could see neither the value, nor the necessity of learning or teaching te reo Māori (King, 1989).

Providing evidence of how governments work to undermine minority group interests (see sections 3.4 and 3.4.1 in the Australian context), by the 1970s, the New Zealand government began to visualise ‘integration’ as the ideal ‘cultural blueprint’ for New Zealand. The concept of integration and its predecessor assimilation both required Māori to become Pākehā, enforcing them to learn everything about the English language and Western culture but with no real pressure placed on Pākehā to reciprocate. There were also few Pākehā who were prepared to walk the two-way street by learning Māori language and customs (King, 1989). Māori values and institutions were subsequently undermined and awarded a lower status in New Zealand public life (King, 1989; O’Sullivan, 2007; see Wai 2336).33
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33 Wai 2336 is a claim lodged with the Waitangi Tribunal over Māori funding inequities for whare wananga (universities and places of higher learning) and kohanga reo (language nest) institutions.
Major shifts in population demographics added further complexity to the issue. Within two short decades, Māori demographics had shifted from being 75% rural in the 1950s to 60% urban by the 1970s (Ministry of Cultural Heritage, *History of the Māori language - Te Wiki o Te Reo Māori*). Māori language had become almost extinct and pressure by Māori Elders and educators to address Māori educational concerns increased. Successful groups such as Nga Tamatoa (The Young Warriors), Te Reo Māori and later other Māori activist groups such as Te Roopu O Te Matakite, (later Te Matakite O Aotearoa) petitioned Parliament to take urgent action on Māori issues (King, 1989; Smith, 1999b). The main aims of Nga Tamatoa were to seek recognition of the *Treaty of Waitangi 1840* (the Treaty) and to implement the compulsory teaching of Māori language in schools (Smith, 1999b). By 1975, Māori Language Day became Māori Language Week and both language and culture resurfaced in many aspects of New Zealand society. To allay Māori concerns over grievances pertaining to the Treaty, some dating back to pre-1840, the *Treaty of Waitangi Act* was established in 1975. This event created the formation of a permanent commission of inquiry where Māori could air their grievances, including those concerns relating to education. Providing a legal process by which Māori Treaty claims can be investigated, the Tribunal was given the ‘exclusive authority to determine the meaning and effect of the Treaty, as it is embodied in both Māori and English texts’ (Waitangi Tribunal, NZ Government, 2013). The *Treaty of Waitangi Act 1975* has become the second most significant piece of legislation in New Zealand’s history.

After years of the Pākehā thinking they knew what was best for Māori people, the New Zealand government reluctantly acknowledged the desire of Māori to
maintain their own unique identity (Tomlins-Jahnke, 2012). An example is as follows:

We have kept quiet for too long about how we truly feel about what is written about us by people from another culture. For years we have provided academic ethnic fodder for research and researchers. Perhaps it is time we set things straight by getting down to the enormous task of writing about ourselves (Kaa cited in Mahuika, 2011; Smith, 1999b).

In 1978, the first official bilingual school opened in Ruatoki in the Urewera district, followed closely by Māori immersion early childhood centres, Te Kohanga Reo, and kura kaupapa.34 In accordance with Māori pedagogy, these schools allow for greater autonomy and participation of Māori parents and extended whanau members in their children’s education (Ministry of Cultural Heritage, History of the Māori language - Te Wiki o Te Reo Māori). With the support of the Māori Language Commission, and the Māori Language Act 1987, Māori language recovery programs were implemented across the nation. In the 2006 census, 23.75% or 131,613 of Māori could hold a basic conversation in te reo Māori, although, only half, 48%, of all Māori aged 65 years considered themselves fluent. With the inevitable decline of Māori Elders fluent in te reo, it is imperative that more children have access to quality Māori education. The 2006 census showed that as few as one in six Māori under the age of 15 could hold a fluent conversation in their own language. The significance of Te Kohanga Reo Movement, the Waitangi Tribunal 1975 and the increase in Māori activist activities throughout the 1970–80s was largely responsible for the legitimisation of Māori Knowledge and education practices (Smith, 1999b), although not all of these changes occurred without resistance, for example:

34 Kura Kaupapa – Māori cultural and language immersion primary schools
In 1984 national telephone tolls operator Naida Glavish (of Ngati Whatua) began greeting callers with kia ora. Her supervisor insisted that she use only formal English greetings, and when Glavish refused, she was demoted.

The issue sparked widespread public debate. Not everyone was keen to hear kia ora used commonly, but many people came out in support of using Māori greetings. People called the tolls exchange to speak to ‘the kia ora lady,’ and airline pilots began to say kia ora when greeting passengers. After the prime minister intervened in the issue, Glavish returned to her old job. Eventually, she was promoted to the international tolls exchange where she greeted New Zealand and overseas callers alike with kia ora (Ministry of Cultural Heritage, History of the Māori language - Te Wiki o Te Reo Māori).

At the same time as Indigenous Australians were calling for the right to be ‘…given the responsibility for planning and implementing policies on Aboriginal education …’ (Lippmann, 1994, pp. 139–40), Māori began to articulate the right to address their own educational concerns.

**4.6 Current education issues**

In recent years, state-based education policy has shifted from one of ‘deficits’ and ‘closing gaps’ to one of ‘realising potential.’ However, predicated on the notion that including an ethnic orientation in policy frameworks will improve Māori student achievement is problematic because non-Māori teachers, who make up approximately 91% of teachers, are defining what Māori potential is on a day-to-day basis. A recent Māori Education Report Card showed a slight improvement in Māori educational achievements to 2007 (Nichols, 2007); results also indicated that a significant gap still existed between overall Māori academic achievements compared
to that of the Pākehā (Rata, 2011). The statistics in the Māori Report Card are also reflective of Māori students assessed against national standards and ‘mainstream ideologies,’ rather than from within their own worldview. Māori educator Professor Russell Bishop (2010) writes that the deficit view of Māori has now transpired from a debt that is not only evident in education, where Māori people have been ‘short-changed’ by the system for centuries, but has accumulated as a social debt across the entire spectrum of New Zealand society:

The long-term intergenerational legacy of an education system oriented to the interests of the dominant group has created this education debt and moving policy foci to ‘realising potential’ will severely exacerbate this pattern (Bishop, 2010).

This situation indicates that the majority group maintains control over Māori education and deflects the focus from educators addressing the part they themselves play in perpetuating achievement disparities. African American scholar and pedagogical theorist Gloria Ladson-Billings suggests rather than focusing on realising potential or closing the achievement gap, long-term, system-level policy attention needs to be focused on what identifies as ‘the “accumulation” of achievement disparities (cited by Bishop, 2010).

Even though more Māori communities are applying their own educational methodologies to combat the inconsistencies that drive mainstream ideologies, the dominance and control from a largely non-Māori government authority remains. In 2011, the New Zealand Education Review Office, an independent government department that reviews the performance of New Zealand’s schools and early childhood services, required Māori-medium kura (school) and settings to give effect
to Te Marautanga o Aotearoa\textsuperscript{35} and work with Ngā Whanaketanga Rukaki Māori.\textsuperscript{36} Essentially, this central system of governance was to set the direction for student learning in accordance with national standards.\textsuperscript{37} One school, Te Aho Matua Kura, stated at its annual meeting in 2010 that it should be exempt from these requirements because it was already legislated, providing the tenets and framework for teaching and learning in accordance with its own pedagogy.\textsuperscript{38}

To ensure specific Māori needs are met at the local level, based on a well-documented educational case study of the Ngati Kahungunu, Tomlins Jahnke (2012) argues for specific tribal place-based pedagogy, Ka Hikitia. This strategy essentially involves a partnership agreement between the iwi and the Ministry of Education to improve the educational achievement of Māori by developing curriculum that is culturally grounded, strives for excellence, and is based on a Māori-centred approach. Such an approach must include the stakeholders and a team of qualified experts at all levels of the education spectrum; educators must speak Māori, to varying degrees, and have a proven vested interest in the community they serve (Tomlins Jahnke, 2012). Māori-centred approaches are also being used in other aspects of education. Based on a Kaupapa Māori methodology, which is a Māori ethical approach to research (Smith, 1999b), Ngati Tuwharetoa ki Kawerau iwi in the Bay of Plenty are utilising Māori traditional environmental knowledge, when dealing with the New Zealand court system. Implementing Māori Indigenous Knowledge into a scientific paradigm in order to better translate and interpret the language of the

\textsuperscript{35} Te Marautanga o Aotearoa - The New Zealand Curriculum (see NZ Government, ERO, 2012)
\textsuperscript{36} Ngā Whanaketanga Rukaki Māori - The national progressions for literacy and numeracy
\textsuperscript{37} New Zealand Government, ERO, Readiness to implement Te Marautanga o Aotearoa and Ngā Whanaketanga Rukaki Māori, 2011
\textsuperscript{38} New Zealand Government, ERO, Readiness to implement Te Marautanga o Aotearoa and Ngā Whanaketanga Rukaki Māori, 2011
courts, this system provides a framework and an alternative approach that is better understood by the Māori trustees (Hikuroa et al. 2011).

Research is also emerging from the Māori immersion schools (Tocker, 2007). Kimai Tocker from the University of Auckland recently contributed to the field of Māori educational research by providing a qualitative research paper on students who have graduated from Kura Kaupapa (Tocker, 2007). In short, the findings concluded that the students’ experience of Kura Kaupapa Māori education prepared them to ‘actively participate in the Māori world, in New Zealand society and in the wider world.’ The research provided evidence that Kura Kaupapa Māori education has the ‘potential to remedy the crisis facing Māori in mainstream education’ and has contributed to the ‘survival and maintenance of the Māori language’ (Tocker, 2007). Others warn that ‘it is not yet possible to say that Māori medium education offers greater success to Māori students’ (Rata, 2011). According to the UNESCO Report entitled Education For All 2010, and a 2003–04 report compiled by S. Murray on behalf of the Ministry of Education, there was ‘a higher rate of attainment for Year 11 Māori-medium students’ doing National Certificate of Education Achievement levels 1 and 2 compared with Māori in mainstream schools (Rata, 2011). While these statistics may look promising, Māori parents demand for Māori medium schools has dropped at the post-Year 8 level as they transfer their children to mainstream schools to attain English literacy skills commensurate with the mainstream (Rata, 2011).

Notwithstanding the issues, Māori medium schools provide an attractive alternative to the Māori mainstream dilemma. Interestingly, the latest Census statistics in 2006 show that the Māori population has increased by 30% in the 15 year period from 434,847 in 1991 to 565,329, where approximately one in seven people, or 14.6%, identify as Māori (New Zealand Government, 2006). Comparatively, the
total number of Māori serving in the NZDF, at the same time was higher than the national average at 1673, or over 18% (Scoppio, 2007). Māori serving in the RNZN numbered even higher. In order to gain a better understanding of Māori participation, educational achievements and the aspirations of Māori people serving within the NZDF, the impacts that past and present educational policies and practices have on recruitment and retention of Māori personnel must be given priority consideration.

4.7 Current initiatives in the NZDF

The final section of this chapter briefly outlines the ways in which Māori Indigenous Knowledge is embedded in the New Zealand Defence Force (NZDF). Through formal and informal measures, aspects of Māori Indigenous knowledge are being successfully included in various NZDF contexts, and are contributing positively to members’ overall learning experience. The concept of a shared identity vis-à-vis a bicultural co-equal partnership between Māori, the tangata whenua, original inhabitants, and non-Māori, the kaiwhakanoho whenua or settler population of New Zealand is embraced by the NZDF (Scoppio, 2007). At the start of their military careers, all members are welcomed into the NZDF in the traditional Māori way and will spend some time on the Marae (Māori meeting place) learning Māori military history, local protocols and customs. As explained by the CDF, Lieutenant General Rhys Jones who spoke at a Whakarite ceremony at the National Army Marae - Rongomaraeroa o Nga Hau e Wha Marae - in Waiouru on the 22 June 2009: ‘It is a place where we bring new people into the Army to understand what is like to be part of Ngāti Tūmātauenga.’ Figure 4.1 shows the NZ Army Marae, Waiouru.
After decades of planning, preparation and interpretation of the Treaty, equity and diversity and equal employment opportunity policies and related acts including the *Defence Act 1990*, and the *Human Rights Act 2003*, the NZDF has established a Bicultural framework that sets out the organisation’s commitment to achieving biculturalism (Neill 2004; Scoppio, 2007). Adopting a one tribe philosophy and understanding the principles of the Treaty is a key aspect of this process. The first principle of the Treaty: ‘partnership,’ awards equal status to both Māori and non-Māori, and requires a reciprocated sharing of knowledge and resources within the organisation. Adapting a co-equal partnership also works to reduce any disparities and power imbalances that exist. The second principle: ‘participation’ implies that Māori people must be consulted regarding all matters affecting Māori military participation. The third principle: ‘protection’ refers to all matters to do with Taonga (Māori treasures) including but not limited to education, language, customs and culture within the organisation. This aspect also helps the organisation meet its
commitments as a good equal opportunity employer. One NZDF member claimed: ‘The pendulum is gradually starting to rebalance itself’ (informal discussions with staff on board HMNZS Otago, 03 March 2013). Embedding Māori Treaty concerns into daily practice ensures that Māori interests and aspirations are being addressed within the organisation.

While each service has its own bicultural policy, the overarching goal is to provide ongoing access to Māori education and development for all personnel. The general intent is that Māori cultural training is conducted progressively on promotion courses, beginning with the initial service powhiri (welcome) onto the Marae. Each service has its own haka (traditional dance), and all members are encouraged to join their unit, service or tri-service kapa haka group. Māori protocols and language feature prominently in military ceremonies, whereby senior leaders are required to comply with cultural leadership competencies under the New Zealand Competency Framework. Competencies are not only based on command and management techniques but also cover aspects of leadership, and language acquisition that help to protect Māori interests within the institution. Showing commitment to Māori professional development is considered a key leadership skill. When leaders lead by example, such as learning and speaking te reo, they show respect for Māori interests. Figure 4:2 shows the Chief of Navy addressing a parade wearing a Korowai cloak, which is worn predominantly by chiefs on important ceremonial occasions.\(^{39}\)

\(^{39}\) Claire Freeman, collection manager from the Nelson Provincial Museum in 2006 wrote an interesting article regarding a piupiu (Māori garment made from flax, similar to the garment worn in plate 4:2), that was gifted to Captain Lionel Halsey RN Commanding Officer of the battleship HMS New Zealand during the ship’s visit to New Zealand in 1913. According to the research gathered from a number of sources, ‘the Māori chief presenting the piupiu made three prophecies. The first was that the ship would be involved in three sea battles; the second was that the ship would be hit only once; and the third was that no one on board would be killed. They all came true (Freeman, 2006,
Figure 4.2: CN Addressing the RNZN clothed in the traditional Korowai cloak on the 18 January 2013 at the Ngataringa Sports Complex, Auckland


The wearing of the Korowai dates back to when the captain of the Flagship Battle cruiser HMS New Zealand was presented with a similar Māori battledress during WW I, and is considered unlucky if it is not worn when going into battle (Hore, 2010). Today, when commanders are speaking at important military events, they will often carry either a special patu or mere (war implement) to honour this tradition. Figure 4.3: shows members of the RNZN performing their haka.

Nelson Provincial Museum). The chief, Mita Taupopoki (c.1845–1935), Tuhourangi (Te Arawa) and a Ngati Wahiao leader who presented the piupiu, requested that Captain Halsey wear it into battle to protect the ship and its crew (Freeman, 2006).
4.8 Conclusion

This chapter has provided a broad overview of Māori military participation in the NZDF. It has also provided an overview into Māori educational matters that have paved the way for significant change in community and military educational praxis in recent years. While it has outlined some of the difficulties, such as resistance and government attempts to maintain control over Māori educational matters, it has set the context for the rest of this thesis. By outlining what is possible through Makere Stewart-Harawira’s (2005, see 1.3) spiral of understanding, a different approach to military education has emerged. Based on collaboration and respect, this thesis creates the potential for alternative paradigms that fall outside of a neo-liberal agenda. The following chapter explains the research approach, design, and methodology that is consistent with such an approach.
Chapter 5

Research approach, design, and methodology
Chapter 5 Research approach, design, and methodology

If research doesn’t change you as a person, then you haven’t done it right (Wilson, 2008, p. 135).

5.1 Introduction

The central aim of this chapter is to briefly outline the research approach, design and methodology that was used in order to answer the research questions, and objectives (see Chapter 1). In other words, this chapter describes the method how I went about doing what I did, and why I did it, in order to search for the research answers. Qualitative research was best suited to this study because as Aggie Wegner (2007) explains, research is a social act and cannot be viewed as an objective process. Unlike scientific researchers who try to position themselves as objective to their work, qualitative researchers understand that in the social sciences, the subjective perspectives and belief systems of the researcher influences how they seek and work with data (Corbin, cited by Hesse-Biber, 2007). As field observations and experiences are not easily reduced to numbers, it was socially appropriate to explore the values, experiences and attitudes of participants contextually, so that they were best understood within their natural settings (Babbie, 2007; Denzin & Lincoln, 2000; Fitzgerald, 2005; Smith, 1987, 1999a & 2006).

Contextualisation enabled the phenomena to be interpreted more thoroughly, in terms of the meanings people bring to them in their different locations (Smith, 1999a), and using the researcher’s ‘positive subjectivity’ (Siegesmund, 2008). This approach involved a more rigorous type of thinking and analytical approach than the dispassionate interpretation of data commonly found in quantitative research.
methods, and allowed the multiple experiences and perspectives of the participants to be interpreted using my own epistemology.

5.2 Approach

To begin a research project, it is important that the researcher has an understanding of his or her own values and beliefs surrounding knowledge. A researcher must understand their own philosophy about knowledge, and how this affects and influences their work. The first step in justifying a strategy of inquiry is to situate the researcher and the research project. This needs to be done in terms of the epistemology (nature of thinking or thought) of the researcher and the study; the ontology (nature of reality) of the project; the methodology (how knowledge is gained); and the axiology, the worth of knowledge that will be used (Wilson, 2008). Particularly relevant to this research was that the researcher acknowledged the legitimacy of Indigenous Knowledge systems and Indigenous paradigms, such as Kaupapa Māori research, Indigenous Standpoint Theory, and a myriad of other paradigms, emerging paradigms and theories (Cooper, 2012; Denzin & Lincoln, 2008; Fabish, n.d; Foley, 2002; Hall, 2014; Heshusius, 1994 & 1995; Kovach, 2012; Rangahau, 2014; Rigney, 1997 & 1999; Smith, 1999b; Smith, 1987, 1999a & 2006; West, 1998).

Kaupapa Māori, for example, is research that is grounded in Māori worldview and is based on the assumption that research that involves Māori people, whether individually or collectively should somehow make a positive impact on their lives (Bishop, 2008; Rangahau, 2014; Smith, 1990, 1997 & 2002). Indigenous Standpoint Theory (Foley, 2002), the Japanangka Paradigm (West, 1998), and the increasingly popular participatory, and Indigenous paradigms (Hall, 2014; Denzin & Lincoln,
Rigney, 1999; Wegner, 2007; Wilson, 2001; Wilson, 2008) have similar aims. Although research can have multi-paradigms, with no clear distinction between boundaries, difficulties may arise in identifying a prevailing or predominant paradigm (Wegner, 2007). Drawing on the work of Guba and Lincoln (1994), Wilson (2008) writes that there are four main paradigms most commonly found in qualitative research. The four main paradigms are: positivism, postpositivism, critical theory, and constructivism. An overview of these paradigms is provided on the following page in Table 5.1.
Table 5.1: Overview of the dominant research paradigms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Positivism</th>
<th>Postpositivism</th>
<th>Critical Theory</th>
<th>Constructivism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ontology</strong></td>
<td>One true reality (can be broken down into overriding laws)</td>
<td>Imperfect reality (can be never be fully seen)</td>
<td>Fluid reality, (no one fixed truth)</td>
<td>Fluid reality, (many reality, specific to people and locations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(What is the form and nature of reality?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Epistemology</strong></td>
<td>Through objective thought comes one reality</td>
<td>Ideal is to be perfectly objective, understanding this cannot be achieved</td>
<td>Reality shaped by cultural, gender, social and other values</td>
<td>Reality is what it is made to be (socially constructed, between investigator and subjects)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(What is the nature of thinking, or knowing?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Methodology</strong></td>
<td>One way to examine this reality-experimental controls over reality</td>
<td>Same as positivism, but can account for different settings</td>
<td>Transactional relations between researcher and participants to change/improve reality</td>
<td>Dialogue between researcher and participants to refine reality, by comparing and contrasting each other’s reality constructs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(What is reality, and how do you know this reality?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Axiology</strong></td>
<td>The pursuit of knowledge in itself was the ideal goal of research</td>
<td>The pursuit of knowledge in itself was the ideal goal of research</td>
<td>Promoting change to improve society, new knowledge not the ultimate goal</td>
<td>(Same as critical theory) research not ethical if it does not improve participants’ realities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(What are the ethics or morals that guide the search for knowledge and what knowledge is worthy of searching for?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Wilson (2008)

There are also a number of paradigms closely associated, or embedded within each of these categories (Wilson, 2008) that are used across a variety of social phenomena.
5.3 The main paradigm

The best approach that would reflect the interrelationship between my personal views about knowledge and the purpose and design of this research was the critical theory paradigm. My personal beliefs about knowledge are that there are multiple versions of a fluid reality, which aligned most with a critical theorist’s standpoint. A critical perspective of social reality shares a similar axiology40 with a constructivist paradigm in that research is not ‘worthy or ethical’ if it does not in some way help to improve the realities of the research participants (Wilson, 2008). The critical theory paradigm was best suited to this study because the work was not primarily concerned with creating new knowledge, which is a guiding tenet of positivism and postpositivism research (see Kincheloe & Tobin, 2009), but was more anti-positivist and anti-postpositivist in nature, by seeking to create change to a social reality. Epistemologically, this meant that both the researcher’s beliefs about knowledge and the research project were aligned. Rather than searching for the one true reality, this study took on a dialectic view by ‘using participants’ experiences as data’ (Campbell, 2006), and by ‘keeping the institution in view’ (McCoy, 2006). Analysing participants’ experiences in accordance with institutional norms and the discourse of Reconciliation meant that the focus of the study shifted from the members’ experience to focus on the institutional systems and social processes responsible for shaping, or not shaping, members’ learning experiences, as the case may be, in accordance with societal goals. Using subjective value-orientated analysis, the findings were determined through abstraction and interpretation based on the premise that the investigator ‘influences the subject and inquiry through their interaction …’

Another research student has best illustrated this approach:

After closely examining the various paradigms and perspectives of research methodology, my epistemology seemed to be most closely aligned with the critical perspective on social reality. By applying this framework, I truly think that my epistemological beliefs about research in the social science area can shine through … I think it is almost impossible for a researcher to not have a point of view or have no biases related to a social issue. Most research should have a hint of the value-orientation of the researchers. I do not think a researcher can ever completely detach themselves from their research and close their opinion off from that subject (student, cited by Hesse-Biber, 2007).

5.4 Design

The research approach and design are inextricably linked. Defining and articulating the research purpose is central to adapting a suitable paradigm. There are three main types of research purposes: exploratory, descriptive or explanatory (Babbie, 2007). Table 5.2 describes the three main characteristics of research purposes.
Table 5.2: Main characteristics of research purposes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exploratory</th>
<th>Descriptive</th>
<th>Explanatory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Become familiar with the facts, settings, concerns</td>
<td>- Provide a detailed, highly accurate picture</td>
<td>- Test a theory’s predictions or principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Create a general mental picture of conditions</td>
<td>- Locate new data that contradicts past data</td>
<td>- Extend a theory to new issues or topics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Generate new ideas, conjectures, or hypotheses</td>
<td>- Document a causal process or mechanism</td>
<td>- Support or refute an explanation or Prediction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Focus on ‘what’ questions</td>
<td>- Focus on ‘how’ and ‘who’ questions</td>
<td>- Focus on ‘why’ questions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Exploratory research is broad-ranging research designed with the intent to maximize the discovery of participants’ experience (Stebbins, 2008). Because this thesis was designed around gathering data to support, or not support, an argument (Babbie, 2007), and moved into an area not previously studied (Ma Rhea, 2004; Wegner, 2007), the exploratory design was best suited to the purpose. The exploratory design is particularly useful for ‘concatenation’ research, which is described as research that is useful for gaining familiarity with the basic facts, differing contexts, and issues of participants central to the project; concatenation research proceeds with the intent of further research (Neuman, 2006).

5.5 Methodology

All problems must be solved within the context of the culture – otherwise you are just creating another form of assimilation (Squires, in Bruyere, 1999).

41 Concatenation research involves a ‘set of open-ended field studies linked together in, as it were, a chain leading to cumulative, often formal, grounded theory’ (Stebbins, 2008).
Methodology is perhaps best described as the science of finding things out, or the theory of how knowledge is gained.

It was imperative in order to find things out that I take into account the three different contexts in which the participants of this study were located. Based on similar work conducted in cross-cultural and international military settings by Dr Grazia Scoppio (2007) and Mr Mason Tolerton (2011), the following list provides some of the considerations that were necessary in order to place the research in context:

- National context
- Historical context, including military involvement
- Policy and ethical frameworks
- Demographics
- Educational context
- Social and cultural contexts (Indigenous and non-Indigenous)
- Institutional

It was also important that I had an understanding of alternative worldviews so that my own worldviews complemented, rather than competed with those of others (Arbon, 2008; Bishop, 2005; Foley, 2002). Some of the skills and knowledge sets that I was able to draw on from my own background in relation to the methodological context of this research were:
• life experience being educated through Indigenous philosophies and place-based pedagogy as a young child
• a basic understanding of the Māori language and a broader familiarity with the cultural knowledge practices of other cultures, including Samoan, and Rarotongan, and a basic understanding of some of the educational issues facing Indigenous Australians
• teaching experience in bilingual and mainstream schools in Aotearoa
• work experience teaching in Western institutions, including the military

Enrolling in a research program has enabled me to learn just how important the research approach and methodology are. Despite ethical protocols and procedures being introduced into universities and research institutions in recent years, research continues to intrude into people’s lives, particularly where Western approaches do not align with Indigenous philosophies (Bishop, 1997; Bruyere, 1999; Hall, 2014; Kovach, 2012; Lincoln & González, 2008; Smith, 1999b; Wilson, 2008). Russell Bishop (2005) illustrates this point clearly when he states:

> Despite the Treaty of Waitangi, the colonization of Aotearoa/New Zealand and the subsequent neo-colonial dominance of majority interests in social and educational research have continued. The result has been the development of a tradition of research into Māori people’s lives that addresses concerns and interests of the predominantly non-Māori researchers’ own cultural worldview(s).

The section below describes the main methodology of this project and provides an overview of how the different philosophies and protocols of participants were addressed.
5.6 Institutional ethnography

Institutional ethnography is a qualitative research method that began around the 1970s, that is:

Committed to exploring the society from within people’s experience of it, rather than objectifying them or explaining their behaviour, it would investigate how that society organizes and shapes the everyday world of experience. Its project is to explicate the actual social relations in which people’s lives are embedded and to make these visible to them/ourselves (Smith, 1999a, p. 74).

Dorothy E. Smith (2008) terms institutional ethnography as a sociology for people that begins within, and works from, peoples’ embodied experience situated in their everyday lives. By exploring the daily realities of participants’ experience, Smith (2006) and other sociologists believe they can discover how institutional practices work that transcend the local, to coordinate with the activities of others, and how people participate in them without their knowing.

Marie L. Campbell’s study conducted in a long-term care hospital in Victoria, Canada is one illustration of how institutional ethnography was used to explore institutional ruling relations (Campbell, 2006). As part of a larger Total Quality Management Technique underpinned by tightening fiscal restraints, nursing staff were introduced to a Service Quality Initiative that changed the way they were to think about, and administer care for patients. In the new system, management were teaching nurses to base their clinical decisions on a cost and efficiency model, and by treating patients as ‘customers’ and themselves as ‘service providers.’ The reality of the situation was that the new model impacted on nurse and patient relationships to the detriment of both. The study began from the nurses’ experiences but shifted focus
to how the institution was shaping their experience by enforcing the nurses to base their clinical practices on a business model, rather than the ethics of patient care. Campbell found that the nurses were not only being taught to see the good sense of the new rules, and to bring their thinking in line with them, but they were expected to take up the ruling actions of the institution and perpetuate them, even when this undermined patient integrity and professional codes of practice (Campbell, 2006).

A second example of institutional ethnography, which shows how the study moves focus from participants’ experience to the ruling relations of institutions, was Didi Khayatt’s (1995) study of The institutionalization of compulsory heterosexuality, and the effects this was having on lesbian students in a mainstream school in Canada. The inquiry began from within the young women’s experiences, but then expanded into the ruling relations of those experiences through discussions, observations, and interviews with others in the schooling system, for example, other students, teachers, counsellors, and administrators. In summary, it was found that the cultural practices and administrative processes of the school normalised and reinforced ‘compulsory heterosexuality’ by excluding education about homosexuality in school curricula, lest it provide an alternative to heterosexuality. By failing to investigate and punish harassment and name-calling of homosexual students, compulsory heterosexuality was subsequently protected as the institutional and societal norm (Babbie, 2007; Khayatt, 1995 & 2002).

Figure 5:1: is based on Dorothy E. Smith’s first explication of institutional ethnography in 1987, but is adapted to the particular focus of this study.
Figure 5.1: A military educator’s standpoint: military education and the discourse of Reconciliation

(Adapted from Dorothy E. Smith's, 1987, 'A Woman's Standpoint: Single Parenthood and Educational Institutions')

The small figure in the diagram is representative of myself, active in the work of a military educator implicated by the complex relations beyond my view. The research takes up the inquiry from this position. As I look up through the complex bureaucratic organisation of education to the political discourse of Reconciliation, I want to discover just how things work, and how I am engaged and implicated as I am. I wonder how Reconciliation can be achieved where Indigenous Knowledge systems, integral to what it means to be Indigenous, are located peripherally to work organisation and military curricula. Through the course of this inquiry, I explored the possibility of centralising Indigenous Knowledge systems in military curricula.

In order to obtain a broader view of Reconciliation in Australia, and Biculturalism in New Zealand, the research methodology extended the analysis of
the experiences of the NZDF participants’ to the experiences of members from the ADF, and from a remote Indigenous community in the Northern Territory. While bearing in mind the subjective, and ideological positioning of the researcher (Smith, 1987; Stebbins, 2008; Wilson, 2008), three theoretical positions emerged: the need for alignment of values placed on Indigenous Knowledge systems by individuals, instructors, the ADF and society (Chapter 6); the importance of respect for Indigenous Knowledge systems and the link these have in strengthening relationships with Indigenous communities (Chapter 7 and 8); and the alignment of expectations and opportunities for implementing Indigenous Knowledge systems into daily practice (Chapter 8). These ideological concepts are aligned with the socio-political goals of Reconciliation and the aspirations of Indigenous people and their supporters to have access to multiple perspective inclusive education. The challenge, however, resides in questioning the current hegemonic approach to education, which epitomises Eurocentric norms to achieve mainstream economic goals.

To gather the data that would best answer the research question and achieve the set objectives, this study design was made up of three separate but related phases. Through discussion, analysis and connecting military, historical, social, and educational experiences with the political discourse of Reconciliation, this study highlighted some of the realities that closing the gap, and current military education and training practices are having on personnel. As shown, these spaces can either be sites of continued assimilation and oppression for Indigenous Australians (Altman, 2007 & 2010; Dodson, 2007; Hinkson, 2007 McConaghy, 2000; Nakata, 1991 &

---

42 Eric Babbie (2007) draws on Robert Bella’s Christianity and symbolic Realism (1970) and Comment on the Limits of Symbolic Reasoning (1974) that specify the need for researchers to treat the beliefs they study as worthy of respect rather than objects of ridicule. Professor Linda Tuhiwai Smith comments that the lack of respect and ridicule often displayed to Indigenous communities by imperial and colonial powers has never been forgotten (1999b, p. 113).
2007; Welch, 1996), or opportunities for emancipation and empowerment for all Australians.

5.7 Obtaining the data

Ethical clearance for this project was provided, prior to the project’s commencement, by the Australian Defence Human Research Ethics Committee, the New Zealand Defence Organisation Research and Development Branch and the Charles Darwin Human Research Ethics Committee. To reach as many participants as possible, this research was conducted using a mixed-method approach, which included the use of surveys, focus groups, open-ended interviewing, participant observation, and a distinctive approach to analysing text (Smith, 2006 & 2008). A generic copy of the cover letter and information sheet, used for each phase of the study, is attached as Appendix 1 to this Chapter. Using a variety of methods enabled a richness of data that allowed maximum representation of the participants’ views and experiences, and contributed to the robustness of findings (Barbour, 2008; Neuman, 2006). Similar questions that were linked to the research question were used in each phase of the project, which allowed the data to be analysed in an inductive and discursive manner. Allowing the data to speak on its own terms enabled the analysis to move from the ‘particular to the general’ (Babbie, 2007). Findings were then reanalysed connecting with institutional texts, Indigenous Knowledge literature, and societal goals. The majority of the fieldwork was completed from November 2012 to December 2013, with Phase 1 beginning with a study-tour conducted at various New Zealand Defence Force (NZDF) establishments.

---

43 Altman & Fogarty (2010); Apple (1987); Arbon (2008); Dei & Kempf (2006); Dewey (2008); Du Bois (1990); Fanon (1967 & 1971); Foucault (1977); Freire (2014); Osborne (2001); Rigney (1997); Youngblood & Henderson (2002); and Yu (1994) amongst many others, provide a controversial insight into the role education plays in matters of democracy, liberation and freedom from oppression.
early in March 2013. The decision was made to complete the New Zealand phase first because: a) the NZDF had an established Indigenous Knowledge program in place; b) there were a range of experienced staff members available to discuss the topic; and c) the NZDF had a history of accommodating researchers, and delegates wishing to learn and share best-practices.

The phases, location and numbers of those who participated are illustrated below in Table 5.3.

**Table 5.3: Phase, location, and participant number**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase of Project</th>
<th>Participant Location and Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>NZDF members 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Australian Defence Force (ADF) members 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Remote Indigenous community members 14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Phase 1 involved gathering information from 34 NZDF members, and kaumatua(s) (ex-members and Elders) through:

1. voluntary individual discussions and surveys
2. focus group discussion with the Commander New Zealand Defence College and staff
3. telephone conversations and emails with NZDF staff and Subject Matter Experts (SMEs)
4. analysis of unclassified internal reports, policy documents, and publically available information
5. observations of lessons
6. attendance at NZDF ceremonial activities
As the research was particularly concerned with the inclusion of Māori Indigenous Knowledge, it was appropriate to address the principles of kaupapa Māori (Māori research theory) to ensure that Māori methodologies and principles were incorporated into the research process where possible. Graham Smith (Smith, 1990), an expert in the field, who has written extensively on the topic, states kaupapa Māori research:

- is related to ‘being Māori’
- is connected to Māori philosophy and principles
- takes for granted the validity and legitimacy of Māori language and culture
- is concerned with ‘the struggle for autonomy over Māori cultural well-being’

While there has been much debate on the topic of who can, and who cannot, conduct Kaupapa Māori research, drawing on the works of other researchers, including Russell Bishop, Linda Tuhiwai Smith, Hirini Mead, Fiona Cram, Barton Pipi, Rangimarie Pere, and others, the guiding principles of Kaupapa research are:

**Aroha**

Usually interpreted as ‘love,’ in the context of research it relates to the notion of ‘respect’ for participants, culture, gender, class groups and subgroups including their values, beliefs, aspirations and the diversity of knowledge systems.
Kānohi Kitea

Is about meeting people face-to-face, where potential candidates can use all their senses to ascertain the credibility of the research project, and whether or not they would like to be involved.

 Manaaki Tangata

Taking a collaborative approach to research, research training, and reciprocity of information and findings, that may extend beyond the research itself.

 Mana

Refers to power, dignity and pride. Researchers have a responsibility to enhance the mana of participants, rather than diminish it.

 Māhaki

Finding ways to share knowledge without ‘showing off,’ for example, collaborative ways that enhance individual and community self-empowerment and emancipation.

 Tīkanga

To do things in a manner that is considered ‘right’ appropriate and respectful in accordance with local protocols and observances (Adapted from source, Rangahau, 2014).

After satisfying the NZDF ethics committee late 2012 that the methodology of this project was appropriate to the task, contact with the MCAs was made via email and telephone conversations, late 2012. A copy of the generic participants’ invitation letter (see Appendix 1 to Chapter 5) including an outline of questions for discussion (see Appendix 1 and 2, Chapter 7) was disseminated to contacts, prior to the researcher’s arrival. Interviews, particularly with kaumatu(s), were usually conducted after a traditional formal ‘powhiri’ (welcome ceremony) had taken place. Although
an official welcome was not always possible, the researcher made every attempt to adhere to the principles of kaupapa Māori. The preferred method of interview for both Māori and non-Māori personnel was Kānohi Kitea (face-to-face), which was often followed by a short prayer and the sharing of refreshments. Meeting people in person also allowed for the use of the ‘snowball sampling’ technique, whereby the researcher was referred to other members of the target population group whom it was thought might be willing to participate (Babbie, 2007).

Phase 2 involved gathering information from 84 ADF members, through:

1. voluntary individual discussions and surveys
2. observations and conversations with instructors from ADF establishments in the Northern Territory
3. analysis of unclassified reports, policy documents, and publically available information.

Similar to working with Indigenous personnel in Phase 1, as a sign of respect, it was appropriate to understand and apply the principles of Indigenous Australian research methodologies, where possible (Arbon, 2008; Denzin & Lincoln, 2008; Foley, 2002; Greenwood & Levin, 2007; Grenier, 1998; Kovach, 2012; Martin, 2008; Rigney, 1997 & 1999; West, 1997; Wilson, 2008).

In Professor Aileen Moreton-Robinson’s work *Towards an Australian Indigenous Women’s Standpoint Theory* (2013, p. 338) and drawing from many other Indigenous scholars in the field such as Martin Nakata, Lester Rigney, Denis Foley, Linda Tuhiwai-Smith, Professor Moreton-Robinson claims that ‘…an Indigenous standpoint is informed by family and collective consciousness, knowledges, politics, and history.’ Citing Professor Martin Nakata’s work (2007, p. 216), Professor
Moreton-Robinson summarises the three main principles of an Indigenous Australian Standpoint Theory, and provides an overview as follows:

Indigenous people are entangled in a very contested knowledge space at the Cultural Interface … [and one’s] social position is discursively constituted within and constitutive of complex sets of social relations as expressed through the social organization of my everyday … Indigenous standpoint theory would recognise the limits and possibilities of what I can know from this constituted position—to recognise that at the interface we are constantly being asked to be both continuous with one position at the same time as being discontinuous with another … Physical experience and memory of such encounters are to be included as part of the constellation of a priori elements that inform and limit not just the range but the diversity of responses from us (Nakata, cited by Moreton-Robinson, 2013, p. 338).

However, exploring the strengths and weaknesses of working from within an Indigenous Standpoint Theory, particularly when trying to generalise such an approach, Professor Moreton-Robinson problematizes the absences of gender claiming that the relationship between Australian Indigenous women’s knowledges and experiences will be different to that of Indigenous men because of ‘… our embodiment, our relations to different country, people and ancestral creator beings and our social location’ (2013, p. 339). Similar to the understanding that the researcher must be cognisant of the multitude of Indigenous experiences and bodies of knowledge, Moreton-Robinson states:

I am not arguing that Indigenous men and women do not share a body of cultural knowledge. What I am arguing is that our experiences will differ because as Indigenous women our social location within hierarchical relations of ruling within our communities and Australian society also
factors into our standpoint as researchers within the academy as does our different disciplinary training (2013, p. 339).

What this meant for me as the researcher was that I should avoid essentialsing and universalising the research findings and methodologies. This was problematic when working within the context of a Western hierarchical system that relies on generalised scientific evidenced based findings, and as the researcher, I did not meet the criteria of an Indigenous Standpoint Theory, in accordance with Professor Dennis Foley’s definition that the researcher is an Indigenous Australian, or is supervised by someone who identifies as such. Even though one of my supervisors identifies as Indigenous Australian, it was imperative that I chose an approach to my work that acknowledged the underlying principles of Indigenous ways of being, knowing and doing (ontological, epistemological, and axiological) in the world (Arbon, 2008; Moreton-Robinson, 2013; Wilson, 2008), and that Indigenous languages are central to this understanding. It was also important that the research benefited community members in some way, and that the researcher had an empathetic understanding of the detrimental effects Western research and Western research approaches continue to have for Indigenous peoples.

Phase 3 involved gathering information from 14 Galiwinku community members through:

1. open-ended discussion and interviews
2. participant observations, two focus groups
3. surveys.

Galiwinku community was chosen as an ideal site to focus the study because:
1. it has a rich military history and many current serving members,

2. the community is rich in Indigenous Knowledge systems and practices,

3. the researcher had family contacts and networks in the community,

4. the community was willing to participate.

The community was also accessible by plane from Darwin. Expressed permission was sought from community Elders prior to beginning the research (see Chapter 8). Ongoing communication with the main point of contact was fundamental to the research process and the success of this phase. The majority of participants were multi-lingual and spoke English comfortably as a second or subsequent language, and were agreeable to conducting the research in English, on account of the researcher’s lack of language ability. One exception was during one of the focus groups, where a respondent participated with the assistance of his work peers as translators. The community cultural advisor was able to assist the researcher, at times.

**Administration of instruments**

Two separate surveys were used to gather data during Phase 1 (see Appendix 1 and 2 of Chapter 7). The first survey was used to gather responses from NZDF members to learn how the inclusion of Māori Indigenous Knowledge has influenced their military learning experience. The second survey was similar but sought additional information regarding the history of the inclusion of Māori Indigenous Knowledge in NZDF curricula, and was designed more for those who had been influential in the administrative or instructional roles. Those who participated using
the second survey included six MCAs, three kaumatua(s), Māori Education Officers and Marae (Māori meeting place) staff, command staff, and members from various Māori cultural groups. After brief introductions and explanations about the study were provided to prospective participants at each NZDF establishment, surveys were distributed to members who expressed an interest to complete a survey in their own time. In this case, a self-addressed stamped envelope was provided with the researcher’s return address. Participant observations and field notes formed a part of this phase.

In Phase 2, potential participants from six different military establishments in the Northern Territory were invited to participate. Permission was sought in advance from the appropriate workplace commanders via letter, email, or in person. Similar to the first survey used with NZDF participants, questions in the ADF survey (see Appendix 1, Chapter 6) sought to gain insight into current military learning experiences and practices to establish a base line regarding Indigenous Knowledge experiences in the ADF. While participation was invited either by interview or survey, all those who participated in this phase chose to do so using the survey. Where further information was required, a follow up phone call or email was used, to help clarify concepts (Sbaraini et al. 2011). Collecting the data for Phase 2 was ongoing and took place over a period of 12 months, finishing December 2013. The most successful method of recruitment was to meet prospective participants in person. All prospective participants were given a copy of the necessary information (see Appendix 1 to Chapter 5), including the ethical considerations, and the option of returning the survey by email, or a return envelope. Participant observations, and field notes also assisted in this phase.
Phase 3 took place over an eight-month period that involved three separate visits to a Northern Territory remote Aboriginal community. Interviews were usually conducted at the participants’ workplace, or a place of their choice (see Appendix 1 of Chapter 8). Allowing participants to choose the interview place not only helped the researcher to establish rapport and interpret nuanced meaning including body language, and connectedness to place (Fogarty, 2010; Rangahau, 2014), but it enabled participants to express themselves freely (Wegner, 2007), using all their senses (Rangahau, 2014). For example, one particular focus group was conducted ‘on country’ at a site where particular landmarks that were pertinent to participants stories were more easily discussed through place-based pedagogy and story-telling. Story-telling has long been used in Indigenous societies to teach and pass on information and is recognised as a valid methodological approach to qualitative research (Barker, 2008; Bird et al. 2009; Christensen, 2012; Magowan, 2001). Moreover, because participants had a number of different roles and responsibilities in the community, flexibility remained critical to gathering the data in this phase. For example, it was not always appropriate or respectful to interview someone at the first or second meeting, at a particular place or time, even though this might have been previously arranged. Participants were extremely generous with their time and information, which helped to provide a rich perspective on the topic. The questions followed the open-ended format used in previous phases, but gained insight into ‘what’ and ‘how’ particular aspects of Indigenous community knowledge might benefit the ADF and community members the most.

Samples

Drawing on the work of Spradley (1979), Morse (2007) claims there are three principles necessary for the ability to gather good qualitative data. These are:
excellent research skills; the ability to locate excellent participants to obtain excellent data; and targeted and efficient sampling techniques. The criteria of excellent means that the data and its analysis is more likely to be richer and more reflective of the social reality under study. The use of the snowball sampling method, as an example, aided the ability to locate participants with in-depth experience and/or knowledge related to the topic (Babbie, 2007; Morse, 2007). One of the difficulties in qualitative research, however, is that researchers often hold quantitative assumptions in relation to sampling rules that are inappropriately enforced (Morse, 1995). Demographic quantitative criteria, such as ethnicity, gender, age, economic status, and so forth, are not necessarily the characteristics required for a good qualitative inquiry. Instead qualitative researchers seek participants who are most likely to be representative of the experience or phenomena under study (Morse, 2007).

Concerns related to sampling size were pertinent to this project. Ethics approval criteria for both the NZDF and the ADF were based primarily on the need for participant recruitment size to be representative of the demographics, rather than the experience (Morse, 2007; Smith, 2006). Another difficulty in a non-numerical qualitative study is that voluntary participation does not lend well to enforced demographic and numerical criteria, where generalised results are not the objective. For example, much time can be wasted trying to fulfil criteria with participants who have no knowledge, or interest, of the phenomena: ‘More bad data does not make good data … To keep sampling and hoping that the data will improve with quantity is nonsense’ (Morse, 2007). However, the demographics were still needed to be reasonably representative of the population groups, without compromising the overall research design and sampling methods best suited to the study. An overlap of phases meant that more time was spent gathering data in Phase 2 than what might
have been otherwise expected; this allowed more time for the data to be analysed progressively, as it accumulated (Sbaraini et al. 2011), rather than waiting for a predetermined number, or a given time.

The rate of participation in Phase 1 (the NZDF) was 68%, or 34 from a total of 50 surveys. Thirteen of this total were conducted as interviews. Due to the limited time available to distribute and collect surveys, the overall number returned is comparatively smaller than the ADF sample 84. Surveys were used as a primary tool because they were convenient to leave with members who were mostly on courses at the time. Data gathered by surveys was restricted to the questions in the survey, whereas the less-structured discussions with SMEs in the NZDF resulted in greater flexibility, thus providing additional information (Morse, 2007; Menjivar 2000, cited in Babbie, 2007). Participant observations and discussions over a longer period of time, however, added to the data in Phase 2. The combination of the less-structured interview technique and the added ability of getting to know the participants over a period of time, which were applied in Phase 3, was valuable (Barbour, 2008; Sbaraini et al. 2011).

Obtaining command support to access prospective participants was supportive in both the NZDF and the ADF. The rate of participation in Phase 2 was difficult to calculate because participants were recruited in a number of ways. For example, while the invitation to participate using the base wide email system generated very few returns, two over a fortnight period, visits to units hand delivering surveys fared much better: for example, 14 from 15 surveys; and 11 from 34. The majority of printed surveys returned in Phase 2 were by mail, or in person. The approximate participation rate in Phase 2 (the ADF) was 41% or 82 from 198 distributed. After the initial eight-month research period generated fewer returns than expected and
new information was slowing down, the decision was made to seek ethics approval to try to generate more data through opening-up the questions by asking for further comments. Although approval was granted, attempts to increase participation did not generate any new information. Based on the work of Barney Glaser, one of the founders of the Grounded Theory Method, Holton (2007) refers to this as reaching saturation point, as one generally knows when to no longer collect data. The process of constant comparison with existing data, and the realization that no new properties or dimensions were emerging, helped to reinforce the decision to cease gathering data.

**Demographics**

Perhaps the most important observations made from a demographic point of view was that the NZDF average age range was an older demographic than the ADF sample with 50% NZDF members being between the ages of 44 and 56. The majority of the sample identified as Māori: 18 of 34, or 52% and 16 or 48% identified as non-Māori. This finding was particularly relevant where some of the earlier experiences amongst the longer-serving NZDF members (over 20 years), provided insight into the journey, and benefits of the inclusion of Indigenous Knowledge in military curricula (see Chapter 7).

The average age of ADF participants was below the age of 43, with 45% identifying as being in the 18 to 30 age group, and 35%, in the 41 to 43 age group. Sixteen of 84, or 19%, of members identified as Indigenous Australian, however, only one of these members indicated serving over 15 years. Apart from where referenced in the findings chapters (see Chapter 6–8), demographics of gender and age were largely irrelevant. Participant response rates by Service and ethnicity, for Phases 1 & 2 have been included in Figure 5.2 and 5.3.
The following Figure 5.3 shows the ADF response rate by Service and Ethnicity.

**Figure 5.2**: NZDF response rate by service and ethnicity

**Figure 5.3**: ADF response rate by service and ethnicity
5.8 Data analysis

The purpose of an exploratory investigation is to move toward a clearer understanding of how one's problem is to be posed, to learn what are the appropriate data, to develop ideas of what are significant lines of relation and to evolve one's conceptual tools in the light of what one is learning about the area of life (Blumer, 1969, in Corbin & Strauss, 2008).

Qualitative data analysis refers to the non-numerical assessment of observations used to discover underlying meanings and patterns of relationships (Babbie, 2007). Qualitative data analysis should be executed using a rigorous scientific and creative approach that can involve a number of different and complementary methods (Babbie, 2007; Corbin & Strauss, 2008; Wegner, 2007). Babbie (2007) believes qualitative data analysis has its own logic and techniques, in which understanding must precede practice, and where the analytical process can be enhanced by the use of computer programs, such as N-Vivo and ATLAS-ti (Barbour, 2008).

There are, however, both benefits and difficulties in using computer programs for data analysis (Barbour, 2008; Morse, 2007). For example, while computer programs can be invaluable by placing data in the best position to aid the researcher’s cognitive work, they cannot ‘do’ the analysis, for the researcher (Morse, 2007). Other considerations also need to be taken into account. Excessive and/or irrelevant data could impede the analytic process, by swamping the researchers’ cognitive capacity to analyse large amounts of data. Some of the problems that occur for novice researchers are that they can become bogged down by learning the process of ‘doing’ good qualitative research, while simultaneously learning how to use the computer package (Barbour, 2008). Another difficulty that can arise is where the
analysis is being limited to or driven by the properties of the computer package, rather than the conceptual and interpretive work of the researcher.

Regardless of the chosen approach, the actual sorting, and coding, process is an inherently biased activity because data is deliberately ‘sought and selected’ at this point (Morse, 2007). Thus, it is during the analysis phase that the worst or best cases of the characteristics of the phenomena under study are determined (Morse, 2007), and where the subjective and ideological positioning of the researcher is implicated in the findings. Furthermore, despite emerging methodologies that are intended to create conditions of equality and objectivity, the power differentials between the researcher and the researched remain unchanged and significant.

Bearing in mind the benefits and difficulties of computer and manual analysis, the size of this project, and the researcher’s positioning, it was decided that manual analysis would best suit the scope of this project. Data analysis occurred concurrently, beginning immediately after the first phase and in an ongoing process during and after each phase of data collection (Barbour, 2008; Corbin & Strauss, 2008; Sbaraini et al. 2011; Wegner, 2007). Adding to the process was the constant revision of field and diary notes, memos, participant observations, and follow up notes from participant phone calls. Important during the initial stage of analysis was the ‘discovery of patterns’ which were systematically sorted into ‘codes’ (Babbie, 2007; Sbaraini et al. 2011). Through working intimately with the data in Phase 1 (by copying and placing pieces of data into codes) as in an open filing system, the data could be manipulated into categories, due to the smaller sample size. Coding and memoing allowed the researcher to fracture the data from an empirical level to a condensed, and abstracted view (Holton, 2007): code with code, data with data (Sbaraini et al. 2011) and phase with phase. Coding began with ‘open coding,’ or
codes that were suggested by the questions the researcher asked of the data (Babbie, 2007). New codes appeared fairly quickly (Sbaraini et al. 2011) in Phase 1, where the open code of ‘historical context’ generated a mass of data as participants stories clearly related to experiences, in a past context. As more data was analysed, and more open codes emerged, ‘axial coding’ was used to ‘reanalyse’ the data in order to generate underlying concepts (Babbie, 2007). Within the open code of ‘historical context,’ for example, axial codes such as ‘positive experiences, negative experiences, and cultural issues’ appeared; these then led to the use of ‘selective coding,’ particularly after the second and third phases were completed.

Memo writing is an important part of the coding and categorising process (Babbie, 2007, Barbour, 2008; Lembert, 2007). Memo writing raises the data to a conceptual level and helps develop properties within each category (Holton, 2007). Memos, mapping charts, and highlighting pieces of text in different colours that related to particular code or concept proved useful from the outset. However, some of the difficulties that can occur during memo writing are when a researcher cannot make sense of all the seemingly unrelated memos that are accumulating (Holton, 2007), or alternatively, does not write enough memos to draw upon later (Wilson, 2008). Memo writing, with colour codes and storing information in identifiable places, directly after interviews proved helpful. Rewriting notes soon as time permitted also allowed time for reflexive analysis.

Once categories were created and ordered in a hierarchical manner, selective coding occurred. Selective coding is a grounded theory analysis method that builds on ‘open and axial’ coding by identifying the central concept of a larger body of textual data that organises or overarches other data (Babbie, 2007). Three ‘selective codes’ that inductively appeared, during the initial analysis and confirmed during the
reanalysis, aligned with the Reconciliation objectives. In accordance with, institutional ethnography, this was an important theoretical development because it was here that the focus and analysis of the study shifted from peoples’ experience, to the institutional texts, and societal agendas.

The ongoing comprehensive process of coding, taking memos, and mapping is ‘inductive content analysis,’ which can lead to the development of substantive theory (Neuman, 2006; Wegner 2007). Although the grounded theory methods of qualitative data such as ‘content and constant comparative analysis’ were used in this study, the study itself was not considered a grounded theory example. The use of questioning the data at the end and beginning of each phase, helped to enrich the analysis by keeping sight of the research question. As concepts developed, and codes either collapsed or were replaced with new codes, themes emerged that were categorised, into main and subcategories that took on their own form. The main categories and subcategories helped form the conceptual framework: the ‘benefits and difficulties’ of Indigenous Knowledge inclusion. Under each of these appeared the subcategories: including improved cultural understanding, increased pride, operational effectiveness, lack of instructor understanding, cultural dominance to name a few. Dialectic differences were noted and included as these helped to show a range within the responses provided. Participants’ experiences were often presented verbatim in order to present a rich narrative, while illustrating the analysis and discussion that linked multiple experiences, to the bigger picture. During the ‘tightening up’ phase, or presentation stage, the words of wisdom from Harry Wolcott (2009), ‘Do less, more thoroughly’ proved helpful advice.
Appendix 1 to Chapter 5 – copy of generic cover letter and information sheet to participants

Debbie Hohaia
10 Unknown St
Suburb
DARWIN NT 0820

2014-03-04

Dear (community, ADF or NZDF) member,

My name is Debbie Hohaia and I am enrolled as a doctoral student at the Australian Centre for Indigenous Knowledge and Education, Charles Darwin University. I am at present on personal leave from my normal role, as an education officer in the Australian Army. For the past six years, my position has involved instructing on promotional courses and working with soldiers from the Regional Force Surveillance Unit, Norforce. I am a Māori woman from Taranaki, New Zealand.

I am writing my thesis on *The Potential Benefits to the Australian Defence Force Education Curricula of the Inclusion of Indigenous Knowledge Systems*. This letter is to invite you to participate, by way of a survey or discussion. The study aims to support the Defence Reconciliation Action Plan, the Australian Defence Force Indigenous Employment Strategy and strengthen relationships with a Northern Territory community.

The survey is completely voluntary and you are under no obligation to participate. However, if you choose to participate, the survey can be conducted during a face-to-face interview, in which case I request your permission to come and meet with you at a time and place of your convenience, or alternatively, it can be completed as a questionnaire.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for your consideration and look forward to your reply.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Debbie Fiona Hohaia
Phone & contact details
INFORMATION SHEET

The Potential Benefits to the Australian Defence Force Educational Curricula of the Inclusion of Indigenous Knowledge Systems

Brief description of the study. The aim of this research is to gain and analyse information that will either support or not support the argument to include Indigenous Knowledge systems in ADF education and training. This is an exploratory study that will showcase the training experiences of ADF and NZDF members, in particular, where Māori Indigenous Knowledge is included in the training of all members; it is also an opportunity to discuss meaningful ways in which local Indigenous Knowledge systems might benefit the learning experiences of all ADF members.

Your part in the study. This is not a Defence initiated study and your participation in the study is entirely voluntary. If you choose not to participate, there will be no detriment to your career or your community.

- You may withdraw at any time.
- You will be asked to either respond to a questionnaire or a short interview, no longer than half an hour.
- The results and recommendations of this research will represent the findings and views gathered by the researcher, thus will not be expressed as the official opinion of the ADF.

Risks of participating. There are minimal risks to your participation; however, you may choose not to answer some of the questions if you feel uncomfortable. You may also choose to have a support person with you if you desire, or a translator of your choice during an interview. If you would like to contact me after your initial survey is completed, you may contact me via the contact details provided below.

For the purpose of this study, if you are an ADF member, you will not be considered ‘on duty’ during participation. If Indigenous Knowledge is disclosed, it will be acknowledged appropriately for the use of this study, and not released without the owner's consent.

Statement of Privacy. All data is to be stored and handled under lock and key and only the investigator and the supervisors will have access. All data will be treated confidentially, and no names or identifiable details will be published in reports or articles. Any personal data collected will be used for the purpose of this study and no other, without the express permission of the participant.

The investigator's name is Debbie Hohaia. You may contact me by the following methods: by telephone on (0439 --- --- (mob) or email, dhohaia@cdu.edu.au. Should you have any complaints or concerns about the manner in which this project is conducted, please do not hesitate to contact the researcher in person, or you may prefer to contact the

Executive Officer, Ethics Committee (contact details)
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Indigenous Knowledge in military curricula: Australian Defence Force participant perspectives (Analysis I)
Chapter 6 Indigenous Knowledge in military curricula: Australian Defence Force participant perspectives (Analysis I)

Recently, the Australian Defence Force (ADF) embarked on a journey focusing on Reconciliation between Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australians. Not only does this situation provide an excellent opportunity to explore the attitudes and learning experiences of ADF members with regard to the inclusion of Indigenous Knowledge systems in the military learning environment, but it also provides an important opportunity to analyse these experiences in accordance with the principles and objectives of Reconciliation. This chapter showcases the learning experiences of 84 members within the context of a military education and training environment, and the broader context of a society working towards Reconciliation. Moreover, it contributes to the gap in literature regarding the potential benefits of Indigenous Knowledge systems in the Australian military, by seeking answers to the following questions:

- What is the current situation of Indigenous Knowledge use in the ADF?
- What Indigenous Knowledge systems would benefit the ADF the most?
- How would the inclusion of Indigenous Knowledge systems support current Reconciliation initiatives?
- What difficulties need to be overcome?
- What are the benefits?

Firstly, however, a brief overview of the military system is required. Glyn Harper (1994, p. 191) describes the Australian military as a unique organisation in that it spends most of its time preparing to meet serious social challenges which may never
eventuate. The military is also recognised as Australia’s most bureaucratically hierarchical institution, where individuals ‘… are allocated a rank which immediately indicates to them, and to other members of the institution, exactly where they are located within it’ (Harper, 1994, p. 192). Today, Western military establishments face significant challenges (Catanzano, n.d). Issues include recruitment and retention, keeping pace with technology, advances in training and education, operating in complex environments, budget and resource constraints, and maintaining public support (to mention a few). Challenges are also shaped by specific agendas which include the defence of the nation, and reforms underpinned by current socio-political goals (Department of Defence, 2009, 2012 & 2013). As mentioned in Chapter 1 and 3, however, government reforms have often failed to take into account the multiple lived realities and concerns of Indigenous people. This situation is particularly problematic within a hierarchical institution, where there is no critical mass of Indigenous Australians, and where similar to the Australian Public Service system, there are likely to be few Indigenous Australians in executive positions, or in charge of Indigenous specific programs (Larkin, 2013).

Other issues that emerge within the analysis of this chapter are the questions of how, to what extent, and by whom might Indigenous Knowledge be taught within the context of military curricula. The question of whether or not Reconciliation without a formal or legal framework such as a treaty arrangement or constitutional recognition is an appropriate mechanism for improving the quality of the military learning experience also arises, and has some relevance for other learning institutions. Even though more learner focused approaches to military education are being explored in the 21st-century (Catanzano, n.d, p. 2), they do not appear to cater for the multiplicity of Indigenous perspectives. This is also evident in the
Department of Defence Diversity Inclusion Strategy 2012–17 (2013), which highlights the institutional objective to attract more people from international culturally and linguistically diverse population groups but has yet to formally include the language diversities of Indigenous Australians. The omission of Indigenous Australian languages has many flow on effects. First, it could be perceived disrespectful by some Australians, resulting in the organisation not being considered an employer of choice, and second, it could result in a reduction of opportunity to improve the military learning experience in accordance with Reconciliation goals. It also highlights the principles of the Interest Convergence Theory (see Chapter 1), the presence of colour-blind ideologies embedded within the institutional literature and is an example of contemporary colonialism (Bell, 1980 & 1992; Bonilla-Silva, 2006 & 2015; Cooper, 2012; Delgado, & Stefancic, 2012; Larkin, 2013; McConaghy, 2000). This chapter expands on Chapters 2 and 3, and explores some of the ways in which Indigenous Knowledge systems are, or are not being included within the military per se. In doing so, it highlights aspects that are potentially inhibiting, or enhancing Reconciliation objectives, and more importantly Indigenous cultural identity.

6.1 Background: the journey begins

In September 2009, the Deputy Secretary of the People Strategies and Policy Group of the Australian Government Department of Defence released the first of its reconciliation reports, Reconciliation Action Plan 2007–09. The overarching mission was to ‘Encourage and support Indigenous participation and contribution in Defence,’ and ‘Ensure Defence recognises the diversity of Indigenous cultures and contributions they make to Defence as part of everyday life’ (p. 6). To support the
Implementation of a number of initiatives and provide a single point of contact for Indigenous matters within Defence, the Directorate of Indigenous Affairs (DIA) was established in July 2008 and was given the responsibility of implementing and managing a range of programs focusing on three specific themes or goals. The targeted areas were ‘cultural awareness, recruitment and retention, and land and environmental management’ (pp. 11–12). These areas were aligned to support and enhance the Defence’s mission to defend Australia and its national interests, and were underpinned by the themes of respect, opportunities and relationships. To be successful, the principles of Reconciliation must underpin all education initiatives.

Following the first report, the DRAP was released in 2009. Outlining the Reconciliation journey thus far and providing an overview of the principles and strategies for the four years ending 2014, the DRAP noted that its focus was to build on the solid start made under the initial report, and further Reconciliation efforts under the Coalition of Australian Governments (COAG), Closing the Gap initiatives (p. 2). To recognise the importance of Defence as being an organisation that ‘truly reflects the richness and diversity of today’s Australia,’ the DRAP 2010–14 outlined its updated themes:

- Changing perceptions on Indigenous cultural issues
- Creating specialised recruitment pathways
- Establishing strong support networks and systems to retain existing Indigenous ADF and APS members (pp. 2–9)

The organisation was committed to achieving its goals through ‘better communication and improved and appropriate cultural recognition across all activities and at all levels’ (p. 10). Moreover, the DIA reported that it was working
hard to ‘enhance Defence’s understanding of Indigenous cultural issues by
developing targeted education programs and embedded ceremonial
acknowledgements’ (DRAP 2010–14, p. 4). The analytical process of this chapter
begins with enquiring into the everyday educational experiences of the participants
involved and brings into view some of the texts and complex practices that are
responsible for shaping and governing those experiences (Smith, 2006). The aim is to
discover to what extent Reconciliation and ‘recognising Indigenous diversity’ and
‘cultural identity’ is happening on a day-to-day basis, and to identify any disparities
between the discourses outlined in the DRAP with the everyday realities of the
participants concerned. The chapter highlights areas that have the potential to exceed
the DRAP objectives, and improve the learning experiences of personnel, however, it
also raises issues that are potentially undermining the principles of Reconciliation,
and the integrity of members themselves (see Human Rights Commission of
Australia, 2014).

The participants who volunteered for this phase of the study came from various
military worksites and training establishments in the Northern Territory (NT). As
highlighted by the literature, Indigenous people are much more likely to commit to
an organisation, and reach their full potential, where their language and cultural
identity is valued and developed in partnership with organisational goals, and where
opportunities exist for their knowledge to be shared respectfully with others
(Scoppio, 2007; see also Chapter 7). Extensive research amongst many of the
world’s First Nation’s peoples and ethnic minority groups, shows that loss of cultural
identity, which is compounded by Eurocentric education practices, is directly linked
to the erosion of one’s cultural identity and spiritual well-being (Arbon, 2008;
Collins & Lea, 1999; Grimes, 2009; Ki-zerbo et al, 1997; Lewis, 2001; Lippmann,
Cultural awareness training, as one of the DRAP initiatives, was due to be integrated as a ‘three tier program’ across Defence by the end of 2014 (p. 17). While some of the participants in this section of the study may have received cultural awareness training, or have been involved in some of the DRAP initiatives, the majority of participants in this study had not. This chapter is not a report on any of the DRAP programs, but will contribute to base line data that may form the basis of further research. Data was obtained through informal discussions, personal experience, observations, and completed surveys. The journey begins by exploring the current situation of Indigenous Knowledge use within the ADF.

6.2 What is the current situation of Indigenous Knowledge use in the ADF?

In order to establish a baseline for understanding the current situation of Indigenous Knowledge use in ADF, this section highlights some of the participants’ experiences as they navigate organisational processes that either support or inhibit the inclusion of Indigenous Australian Knowledge systems within military curricula. Themes are grouped under areas related to recruitment, Indigenous language use, cultural issues, instructor experience and professional development.

6.2.1 Recruitment

The process of enlistment into the military is a distressing experience for many candidates, and can be even more stressful for an Indigenous person. For example, in the majority of higher learning institutions, ‘… what remains least acknowledged are the ways in which epistemology as ideology and practice …
routinely ‘settle’ or colonize academic spaces, thereby imposing spiritual injury…” for Indigenous populations (Nabavi, 2006; Ruck-Simmons, 2006). Acknowledging this difficulty within the context of the military, the 1993 report *The Ethnic Composition of the Australian Defence Force: Measurement Attitudes and Strategies* Volume 1 stated that English literacy standards can act as a ‘barrier’ to Indigenous Australians (Bergin et al. p. 170). The report’s review team were not convinced that the psychometric tests, or specific questions on the tests administered to potential candidates for the full-time services, which have changed little since WW II, were not biased against persons of non-English speaking backgrounds or Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander background (Bergin et al. 1993, p. 173). Notwithstanding, the fact that the ADF has stated that it has ‘a legitimate need for reasonable levels of English language literacy,’ and that a certain degree of flexibility can be applied when recruiting Indigenous members for the Regional Force Surveillance Units (RFSUs), the report noted that:

- English is the language of instruction in the ADF
- English language is a requirement of the job
- ADF should liaise with relevant bodies to ensure that it is kept abreast of changes in national language and literacy policy … (Bergin et al. 1993)

The ADF must also abide by the principles of multiculturalism and equity and diversity guidelines. Silk et al. 2000, claim ‘Equity and diversity encompass the concept of fair treatment and that everyone should be given the opportunity to make the most of their talents and abilities.’ Drawing on a wide range of literature where First Nations peoples are concerned, the educational experiences of many
Indigenous Australians, however, particularly those who speak their Indigenous language as their first language, shows that anything but fair treatment is the norm in Australian classrooms (Coram, 2008; Grimes, 2009; Hughes and More, 1997; Lewis, 2001; Lippmann, 1994; McConaghy, 2000; Osborne, 2001; Parbury, 1999; Rigney, 1997; Welch 1996).

What the literature actually shows is that constant failure in education systems not set up to support an Indigenous worldview, means that it is ‘rare’ to find an Indigenous person whose Indigenous Knowledge ‘talents and abilities’ are recognised at all. This situation usually results in low self-esteem, long-term psychological damage, and intellectual alienation (Drew, et al. 2010; Davidson, 1988; Grimes, 2009; Hughes & More, 1997), and is likely to be little different in the military learning context. African anti-colonial scholar Arlo Kempf finds ‘…when students see neither themselves nor their histories reflected within their education, disengagement understandably follows;’ failure to contest Euro-centric dominance supports neo-colonialism (Kempf, 2006), and reinforces cultural imperialism:

Every people in whose soul an inferiority complex has been created by the death and burial of its cultural originality – finds itself face to face … with the culture of the [dominant] mother country. The colonised is evaluated above his jungle status in proportion to his adoption of the mother country’s cultural standards (Fanon, 1967).

The above statement is evident in the Australian context whereby Indigenous Australians are measured only in terms of their Western academic achievements. The absence of Indigenous Knowledges and languages in national curricula reinforces Western cultural superiority (McConaghy, 2000) and highlights a blatant disregard and disrespect for Indigenous Knowledge systems (Ma Rhea, 2004;
Martin, 2008). It also highlights the contradictory nature and rhetoric of Reconciliation principles (see Chapter 3), multicultural policies, and equity and diversity statements. As Torres Strait Islander educator and scholar Professor Martin Nakata asks:

Why not raise success rates to levels of individual requirements? For the community-orientated, why not raise levels to self-management requirements? For the politically orientated, why not to levels of emancipation from white control? For the cultural diversity orientated, why not to levels required by the Islander future in a changing technocratic state? For the culturally difference orientated, why then, pursue levels of sameness based on difference? (Nakata, 1991, p. 54).

One of the recommendations of *The Ethnic Composition of the Australian Defence Force: Measurement Attitudes and Strategies* was that a review of the ADF language policy be considered. Amongst items for consideration were that non-English speakers and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander candidates should be advised that ‘the ADF values foreign language skills’ whereby potential candidates with the ability to speak ‘selected foreign languages,’ not including Indigenous Australian languages, were to be advised that they might be entitled to a language proficiency bonus.

How is it possible for Indigenous people to reach their full-potential, where injustice is allowed to reign under the pretence and illusion of equity? (Ruck-Simmons, 2006). Furthermore, how does spiritual and intellectual violence, that robs Indigenous people of their humanity and sense of self-worth, remain tenable in today’s institutions? Drawing from the work of Calliste (2000), Ruck-Simmons (2006) claims not only are enacted forms of intellectual injustice and inequity inherent in higher education practices, and Western institutions, but they are
supported by masked ‘social closure processes’ including gatekeeping; sponsorship mechanisms; the application of rules, including seniority rules; and the construction and maintenance of institutional barriers. Institutional barriers, such as English only policies which contradict human rights, combined with unaddressed social justice concerns make it extremely difficult for Indigenous people to maximize their full potential in contemporary practice.

While the DRAP has acknowledged the difficulties ‘some’ Indigenous people may have with the military recruitment process, participants in this study make little reference to suggest that the formal recognition of Indigenous Australian Knowledges, or languages has taken place. Participants were asked whether or not they thought their recruitment process was satisfactory and were invited to comment (see Question 18, Appendix 1 to Chapter 6). Recruitment experiences have been listed under Indigenous or non-Indigenous experiences to ascertain the level of recognition awarded for Indigenous Australian Knowledge systems and languages during the recruitment process. If members identified as Indigenous Australian, and spoke an Indigenous language as their first language, they were further questioned whether or not they had someone from the same language group to support them during recruitment.

**Indigenous Australian recruitment experience**

Of the 17 members who completed a survey and identified as Indigenous Australian, 16 indicated being ‘satisfied’ with the recruitment process. However, only three of these members had been through the full-time enlistment process, which meant that 14 members had enlisted through the RFSU process, where criteria is more flexible (Bergin et al. 1993). The member who indicated being ‘not satisfied’ with the recruitment process declined to comment. Twelve members
claimed they were granted ‘no’ recognition for any previous Indigenous Knowledge experience during the enlistment process, either formal or informal; four stated they were granted ‘a little’ recognition and one stated ‘a lot’ but did not comment.

Two Indigenous members who were ‘satisfied’ with the recruitment process stated that the enlistment process helped them to learn about the military, and that the process ‘was good’; however, only 1 out of 11 members, or .09%, who indicated speaking an Indigenous Australian language as their first language indicated having a support person there during the enlistment process.

**Non-Indigenous Australian recruitment experience**

Fifty-four non-Indigenous members indicated being ‘satisfied’ with their recruitment process, nine indicated they were not, and three declined to comment. Of the members who were dissatisfied, seven came from the RAN and three from the Army. The comments made by members of the RAN who were dissatisfied included the process being not comprehensive enough, lack of information regarding the job, career progression, and the process itself being ‘too long.’

Two Army members also referred to ‘excessive time spent in administrative hindrances,’ lack of time to gather effects before enlistment and/or being posted to posting location × 1, and that recruiting personnel seemed ‘removed from the products they were selling’ × 1. One member referred to his experience while engaged in the Indigenous community recruitment activities as ‘mutually beneficial’.

As stated by one participant, the military recruiting process can be ‘a life changing experience.’ While the results of this section are generally positive, only one Indigenous Australian member who spoke an Indigenous Australian language as a first language indicated having a support person at the time of recruitment. The
indication that ‘no’ recognition is awarded to Indigenous Australian languages within the ADF, but where bonuses are potentially awarded to members with selected foreign language skills is inconsistent with the principles of Reconciliation, institutional literature, and the United Nations Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous People. Participants’ recruitment experiences suggest that it is generally expected that Indigenous Australians will have to sacrifice this aspect of their cultural identity to join the military; not only is this situation out of step with Indigenous people but it is an expression of contemporary colonialism and the colour-blind ideologies referred to in the literature (Bonnilla-silva, 2015; Cooper, 2012; Larkin, 2013; McConaghy, 2000). It is also a daunting prospect not faced by the majority of non-Indigenous Australians. In accordance with the United Nations Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous People and the DRAP goal to ‘recognise the diversity of Indigenous cultures and the contributions they make to Defence as part of everyday life,’ the ADF should consider developing a policy that recognises, supports and develops the specific languages and knowledge skill sets that Indigenous Australians bring to the organisation. Such a policy would serve as a framework from which Indigenous Knowledge systems could be valued, and respectfully shared within the organisation.

6.2.2 Indigenous language use within the ADF

Indigenous language use is fundamental to cultural identity. However, with little support from the Australian governments, Indigenous Australians are struggling to maintain their languages within Australian society and its institutions (Ma Rhea, 2004). World expert on linguistics and endangered languages Professor Gil’ad Zuckermann claims that Australia is evidently leading the world in the act of linguicide (Living Black, 2013). Even though the DIA has provided a framework for
acknowledging items of cultural significance and future direction for Indigenous cultural issues within the ADF, this trend is continued where no reference is made with regard to the development and protection of Indigenous languages.44

The ADF may wish to consider the positive implications of supporting the centralisation of Indigenous Knowledge in military curricula. The ADF operates in areas rich in cultural heritage and diversity, and employs a number of Indigenous members in the RFSU reserve capacities, who speak one or more Indigenous Australian languages. The following list shows the Indigenous languages spoken by the participants in this study; Table 6:1 then follows depicting how much ADF work time was spent speaking in an Indigenous language:

- Wik × 1
- Wik Mungkan × 1
- Kaja × 1
- Kriol × 4
- Torres Strait Creole × 1
- Yupunguthy × 1
- Pitjantjatjara × 1
- Yolngu × 1
- Kugu Mungkan × 1
- Kuuk Thayorre × 1

44 See Australian Institute Aboriginal Torres Strait Islander Studies, AIATSIS, (2014); Ma Rhea (2004); McConvell, & Thieberger (2001); Waller (2012); Walsh (2004) for statistics and discussion regarding the critical state of Indigenous languages in Australia.
Table 6.1: Indigenous Australian language use during ADF work hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Indigenous Australian</th>
<th>non-Indigenous Australian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>never</td>
<td>a little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In support of the organisation’s mission to build stronger relationships with Indigenous members and their communities, learning and appreciating the different local language and cultural skills by embedding these into daily practice would undoubtedly enhance the goals of the DRAP. Educating military personnel about the benefits of appreciating an alternative worldview, and creating a positive environment so that Indigenous language speakers are encouraged to speak their language in the work place, rather than discouraged, as is often the case (Walsh, 2004, p. 2), is another way to prevent further local and world heritage language loss. Some of the benefits of tapping into Indigenous languages are explained by Professor Zuckermann (cited in Dean, 2013) who notes that ‘Personal identity, community empowerment, cultural autonomy, spiritual, intellectual sovereignty, and improved wellbeing are just some of the added benefits that come from a people being proficient in and reconnected to their language.’ Indigenous scholar Marie Battiste summarises the benefits in the following way:

Indigenous languages offer not just a communication tool for unlocking knowledge; they also offer a theory for understanding that knowledge and an unfolding paradigmatic process for restoration and healing. Indigenous languages reflect a reality of transformation in their holistic representations of processes that stress interaction, reciprocity, respect and non-interference (Battiste, 2008, p. 504).
Despite the identified benefits in the literature, the results of this study pose some complex issues. Of the 11 Indigenous ADF members who speak an Indigenous Australian language as their first language, apart from one Indigenous instructor who noted that he spoke Kriol ‘often,’ the majority spoke their languages either ‘never’ or only ‘a little’ of the time during work hours. One member noted his ability to speak three different Indigenous languages, but conversed in any one of these only ‘a little’ of the time. This situation is likely to be disempowering for these members, and needs urgent investigation for a number of reasons. Firstly and most importantly, it highlights the breadth of untapped Indigenous Knowledge that has yet to be explored within the ADF. Secondly, it is inconsistent with the increase in movement of Indigenous people to reclaim and revive their languages and cultures and have these formally valued in contemporary institutions (see Chapter 1); and thirdly, it is inconsistent with the principles of Reconciliation. However, colonised peoples are well familiar with the inconsistent nature of Western ideals, as illustrated by the Grand Council of American Indians in 1927:

The whiteman says there is freedom and justice for all. We have had “freedom and justice,” and that is why we have been almost exterminated (Begaye, 2008, p. 462).

Indigenous scholar, Professor Karen Martin claims the use of Aboriginal languages is necessary to assert Aboriginal agency and is integral for Indigenous empowerment; not only do Indigenous languages rename and enliven Indigenous ontologies and knowledges, but they restore agency in Indigenous relatedness45 (Martin, 2008).

45 For a discussion on the importance of Indigenous languages for the maintenance and development of Indigenous identity see the works of Battiste (2008); Dean (2013); Duran & Duran (2002); Grimes
Providing a case in point in the NZDF, in a complete turnaround of events since the 1980s, Māori Indigenous language proficiency and cultural knowledge is now sought after within the organisation (see Chapter 4 and 7). This development is in line with what is happening in the wider context of education across multiple settings in New Zealand classrooms (see Bishop, 2008 & 2010; Denzin & Lincoln, 2008; Fleras & Spoonley, 1999; Smith, 1999b), and is consistent with the anti-colonial movement of Indigenous peoples throughout the world. The recognition of Indigenous language in everyday practice shows ‘respect’ towards Indigenous people, and creates a pathway for valuing difference, and alternative knowledge systems in the military learning environment (see Chapter 4 and 7). Not only is it practical to learn from fellow classmates and workmates, as the literature suggests, but as one ADF member pointed out ‘… how can we [as an organisation] seek to increase numbers of people we don’t understand,’ brackets added for clarification (male, non-Indigenous RFSU member # 10). This statement indicates that perhaps there are too few Indigenous learning opportunities in the ADF. The following section reiterates these findings.

6.2.3 Cultural issues

While the previous section indicates that the use of Indigenous language use in the ADF workplace is ‘low,’ this section discloses some of the ‘unreported’ reasons that could be contributing to this situation, thus impeding transformational change. Being cognisant of the ethical responsibilities within all research projects, Clarke and Friese state that ‘we need to attempt to articulate what we see as the “sites of silence”’ in our data. What seems present but unarticulated? What thousand-pound gorillas do we think are sitting around in our situations of concern that nobody has

(2009); Smith (2002); Smith (1999b); Weber-Pilwax (2001); Wilson (2001); Youngblood Henderson (2002).
bothered to mention yet?’ (cited in Bryant and Charmaz, 2012, p. 372). Thousand-
pound gorillas frequently appear but are not well understood within predominantly
non-Indigenous educational and institutional learning environments where instructors
and educators, without an in-depth understanding of the historical and continuing
implications of colonialism, either explicitly or implicitly assert their own biases
about what is best for Indigenous students (Grimes, 2009; Hughes and More,
1997).46 This is a systemic issue. Without a political and legal framework, such as a
treaty, that protects the language and cultural aspirations of Indigenous Australians,
negative patronising attitudes are not uncommon in Australian classrooms, unless
there is a clear philosophy and understanding that Indigenous languages are integral
to cultural identity and wellbeing.47

In 2009, the then Chief of the Defence Force, Air Chief Marshal Angus
Houston stated the DRAP ‘was developed in an inclusive way because its objective
is inclusion’ (DRAP, Foreword, p. 3). Therefore it is a contravention of the plan’s
intent to expect Indigenous Australians to ‘exclude’ or ‘suppress’ aspects of their
cultural identity in the military, simply because they might not be widely understood
by others. For example, being told to ‘speak English; you are in the military now,
you must speak English or else how else will the commanders understand you?’ is
unlikely to instil personal confidence and pride in the ADF (Personal observations of
the writer in an RFSU learning environment, May, 2013).48 Asserting the Western
worldview as superior to the Indigenous worldview is a contemporary expression of
colonialism, and positions the learner in a culturally subordinate relationship. In such

46 See also Eviatar Zerubavel (2006) The elephant in the room: silence and denial in everyday life,
Oxford University Press.
47 See Key Findings and Recommendations in Community, identity wellbeing, the report of Second
48 Observations of this nature were made during separate incidents involving non-Indigenous
instructors and educators instructing Indigenous RFSU trainees during problem solving activities.
scenarios, the instructors’ responsibility to question their own motivations and the ruling relations they represent is ignored, thus constituting a fundamental breach of the DRAP’s principle of respect.

Indigenous Australian educator Professor Veronica Arbon (2008) claims that negative statements of this nature are born out of outdated racist ideologies, institutional discrimination, and biases that result in psychological trauma and ‘violence’ to the Indigenous perspective (Rigney, 2003; Ruck-Simmons, 2006; Stewart-Harawira, 2005; Smith, 1999b). As highlighted in Chapter 1, lack of teacher/instructor understanding about the importance of Indigenous life ways and denial of the right to express oneself in one’s own language are major contributing factors to the high rates of failure, and lack of Indigenous engagement in Western institutions (Grimes, 2009; Hughes and More, 1997; Lewis, 2001; Lippmann, 1994; Osborne, 2001; Perez, 2000). 49 Dr Bronwyn Campbell, a Māori scholar from New Zealand, writes that such attitudes are the primary reason for the systemic marginalisation of Māori people in New Zealand classrooms (cited in Tomlins-Jahnke and Mulholland, 2011, p. 54), and are becoming even more complex with the advent of globalisation (see also Carnoy & Lingard, 2000; McGinn 1997; Stewart-Harawira, 2005; Stromquist & Monkman 2000). The following comment highlights the issue of epistemological dominance in the ADF learning environment, and supports the argument for a partnership approach in education (this will be discussed in the following chapter):

I have observed non-Indigenous ORs (other ranks) teaching navigation to Indigenous soldiers. This did not strike me as very productive. Such encounters could involve a sharing of knowledge,

49 See Chapter 7 regarding similar issues of cultural dominance displayed in the NZDF learning environment, prior to the implementation of the NZDF Bicultural Policies.
with each group teaching the other practical warrior skills. They might then come away from the encounter saying: “You think they’re dumb at first, but they have a lot of knowledge from their own culture” (male non-Indigenous RFSU member # 8).

The above statement draws attention to the hegemonic style of instruction that often occurs in a predominantly Eurocentric male dominated training environment. Drawing on Dorothy Smith’s (2006) definition of the ‘ruling relations’ that apply to the administration and governance of large Western institutions, Devault and McCoy describe this phenomena as a complex field of coordination and control that is located in textual forms and the local settings of everyday life (cited in Smith, 2006, p. 15). It is in this manner that power is generated and held in Western societies. Providing evidence of Professor Derek Bell’s (1980) Interest Convergence Theory, where the dominant group will not support the interests of minorities unless it advances their own interests further, and the reluctance on the part of organisations to change (see Section 1.2; Evans, 2013; Whitely, 1995) such power imbalances are reinforced by epistemological and ontological dominance that privilege the voices of the dominant group (see also Cooper 2012; Frankenburg, 1993; Hage, 1998; Goodman, 2001; Lewis, 2001; Spivak, 1994; Willis, 2012).

How can military educators teach in ways that are non-dominating and complementary to Indigenous students’ perspectives? How can dignity be instilled in all learners, if instructors are unaware of the consequences of their actions and lack the ability to appreciate an alternative worldview? Is teaching in a non-dominating way even possible in a military context? This is an important question in relation to this study, and is perhaps the paradigm change that is required, and referred to within the DRAP literature. Understanding the differences between Indigenous and Western pedagogical approaches to knowledge and knowledge production is essential when
working across cultural groups and is discussed by academics such as Garrick Cooper, Veronica Arbon, and Aileen Moreton Robertson. Unpacking the instructors’ demands to *speak English*, implies that those responsible for these statements assume that a person who speaks an Indigenous Australian language, as their first language, is unlikely to be in a position of command in the ADF. The statements also suggest that the instructors concerned feel they have no responsibility for learning an Indigenous language, despite the DRAP objectives to ‘change perceptions on Indigenous cultural issues.’ Silencing Indigenous people in this manner is a primary example of epistemological dominance and is how colonialism sustains and supports itself in the twenty-first century (Cooper, 2012). Any challenges to the status quo are likely to be met with significant resistance, as highlighted by the following participant’s comment:

> From my experience, members of the defence that I have worked with have no interest in Indigenous knowledge, culture, traditions (especially local Indigenous people) (female, non-Indigenous Army member, # 18).

Issues of epistemological dominance can lead to other forms of discrimination. In the United States, Rosaldo claims that Chicanos on a daily basis are forced to confront the ideology that everyone must be the same, that is, like white people (Ortiz & Timmerman, cited in Harris, 1995). Similarly, national programs in Australia, and New Zealand, designed to reduce the disparities caused by centuries of racism and exclusion have come under similar criticism (Mahuika, 2011; McConaghy, 2000). Others find that, ‘Historically privileged groups now complain that measures to redress disadvantages facing minority groups are themselves unfair and “reverse racism”’ (Hollinsworth, 2006, p. 63). For example, negative attitudes shrouded in statements such as ‘I’m not racist, I think everyone should be treated
the same’ deny Indigenous people self-autonomy and the right to retain their own identities, which is evident in the following example:

I personally choose to consider Aboriginal as AUSTRALIANS. I do not support preferential treatment for ADF members based on colour or culture. I would regard Indigenous as I would any other Australian (male, non-Indigenous RAAF member, # 7).

Statements such as this are classic examples of colour-blindness: a contemporary expression of racism, and the proposition that race does not matter in contemporary society, when clearly it does (see Bonilla-Silva, 2006; Delgado & Stefancic, 2002; Larkin, 2013). The denial that racism does not exist within Western hierarchical institutions ensures that issues of cultural dominance and colour-blindness remain. This is similar to one of Professor Steve Larkin’s recent findings where the lack of knowledge and cultural interaction between Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australians in the Australian Public Service (APS) masks the continuance of institutional positioning that sees the majority of non-Indigenous Australians in executive Indigenous specific APS positions. In the participant’s comment above, not only is this type of colour-blind ideology likely to be undermining and traducing Indigenous potential within the ADF, and the integrity of members and instructors themselves, but it is clearly inconsistent with the objectives of the DRAP. Perhaps the only real answer to the instructor’s rhetorical question … *Speak English … how else will the commanders understand you?* can be found in Charles Perkins’s’ statement at the very beginning of this thesis:

> My expectation of a good Australia is when white people would be proud to speak an Aboriginal language … (cited in *Songman: the Story of an Aboriginal Elder*, Randall, 2003).
The following section gains further information from an instructional perspective.

6.2.4 Instructor experience

The ADF IES will not be sustained unless the culture of the ADF is conducive to, and committed to, change. Defence needs to ensure that all workplaces embrace cultural diversity on a daily basis (IES p. 6).

Questions 16 and 17 of the survey (see Appendix 1) were for ‘instructors only’ and were provided to gain evidence to understand how much Indigenous Knowledge content, perspectives or education methods, were being ‘included’ or taught on a ‘daily basis’. Again both questions were aligned with the mission statement of the Reconciliation Report 2007–09 to ‘Ensure Defence recognises the diversity of Indigenous cultures and contributions they make to Defence as part of everyday life’ (p. 6) and the previous Chief of Defence Force’s intent to create an inclusive environment ‘at all levels and at every Australian Defence Force location throughout Australia’ (DRAP, p. 3). The answers provide a base line of ‘how’ these ideals are, or are not, being taken up in practical terms, within the various education and training establishments of the instructors involved.

Fifteen members in this study identified as instructors: 10 from the Army, 9 non-Indigenous and 1 Indigenous; 1 non-Indigenous member from the RAN, and 4 from the RFSUs, 3 non-Indigenous, and 1 Indigenous. There were 3 female and 12 male instructors. Instructors were asked two questions to gain a base line understanding of how much Indigenous Knowledge content had been taught in the last two years. Table 6.2 provides the number of courses in which participants’ had instructed in the last two years.
Table 6.2: Number of courses instructed in the last two years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indigenous instructors (N=2)</th>
<th>non-Indigenous instructors (N=13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0–2</td>
<td>0–2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2–4</td>
<td>2–4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5–10</td>
<td>5–10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;10</td>
<td>&gt;10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=15

Table 6.3 shows how much Indigenous Knowledge content participants said they had delivered in the last two years.

Table 6.3: Indigenous Knowledge content delivered in the last two years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indigenous instructors (N=2)</th>
<th>non-Indigenous (N=13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little</td>
<td>A little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>Some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lot</td>
<td>A lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, 6 out of the 15, or 40%, of instructors indicated that they had delivered approximately 2–4 courses in the last two years. The majority of instructors, 10 out of 15, answered that they had not delivered any Indigenous knowledge content during that period, suggesting that the curriculum they are responsible for does not contain any formal content that involves Indigenous Knowledge systems, or the use of Indigenous methodologies. Instructors who identified having included ‘a little’ or ‘a lot’ of Indigenous Knowledge content at some point were either currently instructing in a RFSU environment, for example, at Norforce, or had instructed there previously. Reiterating concerns about cultural and epistemological dominance, two non-Indigenous instructors commented that they would ‘not’ like to learn any Indigenous Knowledge content during their military career. One male non-Indigenous Army member, however, who had previously taught within an RFSU
learning environment, found it useful to include ‘storytelling’ as a method or tool for assisting Indigenous personnel who speak their Indigenous languages as their primary language, to recall information and confirm learning objectives, and mentioned that this was particularly useful during practical lessons such as weapons training. Two male non-Indigenous instructors, 1 from the Army and 1 from an RFSU, made the following comments providing further evidence of the Eurocentric nature of the ADF learning environment:

In comparison with the NZDF, I don’t think there is enough involvement with the aboriginal culture (male non-Indigenous Army instructor # 4).

Most instructors in defence seem much more interested in pushing mainstream culture and in particular replicating whatever experiences they had as students (male non-Indigenous RFSU member # 11).

As organisations are under pressure to increase the diversity of the population they train, instructors and educators must also be aware of the need to address the diversity that exists in the population at large. Marie Battiste argues that ‘… the challenge is not so much about finding receptivity to inclusion but the challenge of ensuring that receptivity to diverse education is appropriately and ethically achieved and that educators become aware of the systemic challenges for overcoming Eurocentrism, racism and intolerance’ (Battiste, 2008; Davidson, 1988; Grimes, 2009; Gaykamangu with Taylor, 2014 Smith, 1999b). Evelyn Steinhauer challenges the hegemony found in education institutions, which leads people to believe that Indigenous languages and ways of knowing are only important to Indigenous people (cited in Wilson, 2008). One instructor highlighted how this myth is perpetuated in the following comment:
… some indigenous methods/strategies may not be effective for the type of training that Defence undertakes nor would it meet the learning needs of many Defence trainees. The primary reason for this is that indigenous education strategies are designed for a set target audience which is inherently different to the current training environment within Defence. However, if there were a larger demographic of indigenous trainees then indigenous education methods would need to be implemented to cater for their needs (male, non-Indigenous Army instructor #1).

Issues of cultural dominance and lack of Indigenous worldview in military curricula were reinforced by another member who claimed the ‘ADF has a set training and education curriculum designed by non-Indigenous personnel’ (non-Indigenous RFSU member # 3). However, aware of the risks of ‘indigenising curriculum,’ Indigenous educator Professor Russell Bishop calls for education that is delivered through ‘a culturally responsive pedagogy of relations, wherein self-determining individuals interact with one another within non-dominating relations of interdependence’ (Bishop, 2008, p. 456). The comment made by the male non-Indigenous RFSU member (# 8) about the possibility of reciprocated learning relationships and the ‘sharing of knowledge’ in the military learning environment is a prime example of such a ‘culturally responsive pedagogy of relations.’ The findings in this section suggest there is a large disparity between instructional experiences and the statements made in the DRAP and IES documents to ‘recognise the diversity of Indigenous cultures,’ at every level of the institution. While the RFSUs presented more informal ‘opportunities’ for an appreciation of different worldviews, overall there were insufficient formal opportunities to acknowledge and embrace Indigenous Australian cultural diversity on a day-to-day basis.
6.3 What Indigenous Knowledge systems might benefit the ADF the most?

This section examines some of the current perceptions regarding whether or not Indigenous Knowledge and education methods are valued in the ADF, and identifies what aspects of Indigenous Knowledge might benefit the ADF the most. Knowledge and awareness regarding the DRAP and the IES are also explored.

6.3.1 Professional development and Indigenous Knowledge content

Eighty-four members answered the question regarding the number of professional development courses they had been on in the last two years. The majority, 43 members indicated that they had been on fewer than two courses, and 27 members indicated they had attended between 2–4 courses. Eleven members said they had been on between 5–10 courses, and 3 members said over 10. Table 6.4 represents how much Indigenous Knowledge content members stated they had received while on course in the last two years.
Table 6.4: Indigenous Knowledge content received in the last two years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indigenous Knowledge content</th>
<th>Under 2 courses</th>
<th>2-4 courses</th>
<th>5-10 courses</th>
<th>Over 10 courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of the time</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=84

The majority, 71 members or 84% of respondents, stated they had received ‘no’ Indigenous Knowledge content on courses during the last two years. Seven or 29% of the RFSU members stated they had received ‘a little,’ which was significantly more than the other three full-time services who averaged 1 or 2 members receiving ‘a little’ Indigenous Knowledge content in that time. One RAN member claimed receiving Indigenous Knowledge content during courses in the last two years ‘often’ but did not provide further comment. Overall, the findings suggest that there are currently few ‘organisational processes’ that support Indigenous Knowledge systems in the ADF. The following section explores participants’ perceptions regarding the current value awarded to Indigenous Knowledge within the ADF and explores what knowledge systems might benefit the ADF the most.

6.3.2 Current perceptions

All members were asked whether or not they thought Indigenous Knowledge systems and education methods are valued in the ADF, and provided the opportunity to comment (see Question 14, Appendix 1). The results from this question are as follows:
• Army: yes, 9 out of 17 = 53%, no, 8 out of 17 = 47%
• RFSU: yes, 9 out of 23 = 39%, no, 13 out of 23 = 56%\textsuperscript{50}
• RAN: yes, 10 out of 28 = 36%, no, 18 out of 28 = 64%
• RAAF: yes, 2 out of 14 = 14%, no, 12 out of 14 = 86%

Overall 50 out of 82 members, or 61%, felt that Indigenous Knowledge systems and education methods were ‘not’ valued in the ADF, while 31 out of 82, or 37%, of members felt that they were. The Army and RFSU members thought they were valued more so in these services, 52% and 39% respectively, while the RAAF at 35% and the RAN at 14% showed that fewer members perceive Indigenous Knowledge systems and education methods to be valued within their services. Nine out of the 16 Indigenous Australian members, or 56%, just over half, thought that they were valued, while seven out of 16 members, or 44%, felt that they were not.

Six members felt that while Indigenous Knowledge systems and education methods were valued in the RFSUs, ‘little was known outside the RFSU’ environment, in the wider ADF. However, one member mentioned the value of Indigenous Knowledge while on deployments, which was found to be extremely valuable amongst NZDF members, and another proposed a valuable means of implementing Indigenous Knowledge systems into the curriculum by suggesting that Indigenous military history topics could be used as a topic of choice for presentations on promotion courses, thus reinforcing members’ selection of Indigenous military history as being an area of high interest. Comments from participants who thought

\textsuperscript{50} One RFSU participant did not answer the question.
that Indigenous Knowledge systems were currently valued by the ADF are provided below:

**Current perceptions regarding Indigenous Knowledge in the ADF – (valued)**

(Italics have been inserted where clarification is required.)

- I wouldn’t say they were not valued, as I am sure Defence values any contribution towards training and development of personnel. However I would say Indigenous Knowledge is not being utilised effectively (male, non-Indigenous Army instructor #1).

- More so in RFSU and SF (*Special Forces*) than other ARA units. Exposure is an issue for these units, as they have little to none (*referring to Indigenous members*) (male, non-Indigenous Army instructor #2).

- Yes, if it is explained what the benefit is for the individual and the Defence (male, non-Indigenous Army instructor #5).

- Yes, but only in a very limited capacity, not in the wider Army (female, non-Indigenous Army instructor #7).

- Yes, but only in very specific roles (male non-Indigenous Army member #8).

- Yes, Local Knowledge and understanding is valued in some areas especially if working in the bush (male, non-Indigenous RAAF member # 10).
• If a particular culture or people learn in a particular way then why change a method of learning? (male, non-Indigenous RAN member # 10)

• Yes, by higher ups at least (male, non-Indigenous RAN member # 16).

• However, only in units such as RFSU, wider Army has little or no interest (male, non-Indigenous RFSU instructor #4).

• Little is known outside of the RFSU. However, these knowledges are useful in overseas deployments (male, non-Indigenous RFSU instructor # 6).

• I am posted to Norforce. I go out of my way to engage with Indigenous soldiers, learn from them and about them … (male, non-Indigenous RFSU member # 8).

Current perceptions regarding Indigenous Knowledge in the ADF – (not valued)

Members provided various reasons why they felt Indigenous Knowledge systems and education methods were not valued in the ADF. These included as follows.

1. lack of interest, not seen as a priority, or of no value (8 comments)

2. a reflection of society’s values

3. negative stereotyping

4. resistance to changing traditions

5. unwillingness to disrupt white Australia’s history

6. discrimination
Below are some of the comments from participants who thought Indigenous Knowledge systems were not currently valued in the ADF:

- Due to lack of Indigenous soldiers in regular Army (male, non-Indigenous Army instructor # 4).
- Reflection of Society values (female, non-Indigenous Army instructor # 17).
- Unfortunately in the Northern Army [Northern Territory] we are too often exposed to the negative aspects of the plight of the indigenous people. This degrades any empathy that otherwise might exist (male, non-Indigenous Army member # 12).
- How are they applicable to the ADF, and in particular to being a CLK Admin? (Clerk Administrator) (female, non-Indigenous Army member # 13).
- Capability wise, there is little to offer (male, non-Indigenous RAAF member #2).
- Not relevant (male, non-Indigenous RAAF member # 3).
- It’s just not a high priority. Does not add value into how we get the job done (male, non-Indigenous RAAF member # 7).
- The military has its own traditions/education methods to uphold, which have been proven to be effective (female, non-Indigenous RAAF member # 8).
- Very limited need across the wider ADF (male, non-Indigenous RAAF member # 14).
- We are a military force not a school (male, non-Indigenous RAN member # 21).
- Only if positively engaged with communities (male, non-Indigenous RAN member #26).
- I believe non-Indigenous people are hesitant to acknowledge the value and history/culture of Australian Indigenous people and therefore (it is) not pursued (female non-Indigenous RFSU member # 1).
- They are recognised but not valued (male, non-Indigenous RFSU instructor # 2).

### 6.3.3 What members would like to learn about?

Members were asked what Indigenous Knowledge content they would like to learn about during their military career. A range of generic Indigenous Knowledge categories applicable to the military was provided including an additional space for comment. This question was useful for establishing a baseline understanding about members’ attitudes towards Indigenous Knowledge systems and what they perceived might be most useful within their military career. Eighty-four members answered this question with 63 out of 84, or 75%, answering in the affirmative, selecting between zero to all six areas. Twenty-one out of 84 members, or 25%, selected the choice ‘none’. The choices are ranked numerically in Table 6.5 from the most to the least frequently selected:
Table 6.5: Indigenous Knowledge content members would like to learn about

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indigenous survival techniques</th>
<th>38</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>local Indigenous Knowledge, culture and traditions</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous military involvement</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous environmental knowledge</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous medicinal knowledge</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous war fighting strategies</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>language</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dreamtime stories</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Four non-Indigenous members provided further comments. Two male Army instructors believed ‘survival techniques, medicinal knowledge and environmental knowledge’ would be ‘well received if approached in an appropriate way’ and suggested that these topics would ‘benefit all soldiers by broadening their knowledge.’ One female RFSU member who ticked all subject areas commented ‘…have lived and worked with Indigenous people in semi-remote areas and find the above [referring to the available list] valuable knowledge.’ The remaining comment came from a male RAN member who selected the choice of ‘None’ and stated ‘Doesn’t make sense to teach to ADF members.’ The majority of members who indicated that they would ‘not’ like to learn any Indigenous Knowledge content during their military career came from the RAN 15 out of 28 members, or 54%, compared to 2 out of 18 members, or 11%, for the Army; 3 out of 14 members, or 21%, for the RAAF, and 1 RFSU instructor. All of these members were non-Indigenous. Given the history of lack of Indigenous perspectives in mainstream education institutions, the above result is not altogether surprising. However, the
following information supports the literature that much can be learned from Indigenous Knowledge systems (see Chapter 1, and 7–9).

For example, the largest number of choices came from members in the RFSU, both Indigenous and non-Indigenous, who are likely to be more familiar with using Indigenous Knowledge on operations in the Northern Territory (see Chapter 3). These members indicated that they would like to learn more in all of the specified areas, almost double the number chosen by the next service, for example, RFSU, 93, followed by the Army with 47 choices. On average RFSU members selected four areas of interest showing that they feel this knowledge is of direct benefit to their military career. The second largest choice on average was the Army members who chose an average of three choices, also demonstrating the potential benefits they perceive Indigenous Knowledge to have throughout their military careers. Members of the RAN who selected topics chose on average two choices, followed by the RAAF at 1.5. The most frequently selected choice for non-Indigenous Australians overall was ‘Indigenous survival techniques’ followed by ‘Local Indigenous Knowledge, culture and traditions.’ The most popular choice for Indigenous members overall was ‘Indigenous military history,’ followed by ‘Indigenous war fighting techniques’. One instructor suggested ‘Maybe during promotion courses, essays or presentations could be researched and presented as part of assessments, therefore, educating soldiers on Indigenous involvement within the ADF history’ (male, Indigenous Army instructor #10). Three non-Indigenous members commented specifically that they would like to learn ‘language’ (× 2) and more about the Dreamtime stories (× 1). The most frequently selected choices by service are shown:
• **Army:** Indigenous survival techniques, followed by Indigenous medicinal knowledge

• **RAAF:** Indigenous survival techniques, followed by Local Indigenous Knowledge, culture and traditions

• **RAN:** Indigenous survival techniques followed by Local Indigenous Knowledge, culture and traditions, Indigenous military involvement, war fighting strategies and environmental knowledge equally

• **RFSU:** Indigenous military involvement, followed by Local Indigenous knowledge, culture and traditions

Overall, the three full-time services chose ‘Indigenous survival techniques’ to be the area that would interest them most, followed by ‘Local Indigenous Knowledge, culture and traditions.’ However, the choices from the RFSU members are slightly different where members selected the area of ‘Indigenous military involvement’ to be an area that would interest them the most followed by ‘Local Indigenous Knowledge, culture and traditions,’ similar to the three full-time services second most frequently selected choice.

### 6.4 How would the inclusion of Indigenous Knowledge systems support current initiatives?

#### 6.4.1 DRAP and IES awareness and support for Reconciliation

To establish a baseline regarding the current level of awareness surrounding Reconciliation initiatives in the ADF, members were questioned about their familiarity with the DRAP and the IES; members were also asked how they perceived the centralisation of Indigenous Knowledge systems in military curricula would
support Reconciliation goals. Table 6.6 shows the overall rate of awareness of the DRAP and the IES.

Table 6.6: Awareness of Defence Reconciliation Action Plan and Indigenous Recruitment/Employment Strategy by service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Defence Reconciliation Action Plan</th>
<th>Indigenous Recruitment/Employment Strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Army</td>
<td>RAAF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/18= 55%</td>
<td>3/14= 21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=84

Overall 21 members, or 25% of participants indicated they were aware of the DRAP while slightly more 25 members, or 30%, indicated they were aware of the IES. Twelve members provided further comments about their roles or experiences. The majority of these comments, seven in total, were provided by RFSU members who had been involved in some of the initiatives in various roles. These included Program and Recruitment Officers for the DRAP initiatives, working as Liaison Officers for RFSU recruiting purposes, and in advisory roles with recruitment staff and personnel in Canberra. One RAAF commander commented that he had been called upon to ‘ascertain ways that Air Force could benefit from these programs.’ Other members indicated attending conferences, or assisting with training and community engagement activities including providing ‘… transportation for Norforce members to liaise with remote communities for recruitment purposes.’ Members who indicated their involvement in the initiatives, in particular, the community engagement or the Indigenous Recruitment pathways, were both Indigenous and non-Indigenous and came from all three services and the RFSUs. Although there was a mix of age, rank and length of service time, there were no females amongst the
members who indicated being involved in these initiatives. There were no negative comments regarding any of the roles or experiences. One member summarised his experience in one of the recruitment programs as follows:

I was involved in an Indigenous program called the Defence Indigenous Development Program (DIDP) that was held at Batchelor for five months. In that program I got the chance to learn about the ADF and got some tickets\(^{51}\) such as community services. I learnt a lot of skills in this course such as life skills and made good friends and met a lot of good people (male Indigenous RFSU member # 20).

Other comments were from personnel who had not been involved with the programs in any way but linked to Reconciliation initiatives in the wider context. Statements included one from a member who was aware of the ADF initiatives, stating that they were ‘linked to the closing the gap campaign,’ and another member reflected on the lack of progress made by Australian governments to address Indigenous concerns: ‘Government makes up policies that sound good but actually do nothing.’ According to the *National Indigenous Times* reporter Gerry Georgatos, government initiatives are largely ineffective, and can often make matters worse when dealing with the complex issues affecting Indigenous Australians, particularly in regional and remote communities:

… research has found the data used to report on Close the Gap is dubious and many indicators have deteriorated, some of these deteriorating to epidemic proportions, figures that rate the treatment of Australia’s Indigenous people among the world’s worst … (Georgatos, 2013, pp. 1 & 22–23).

\(^{51}\) Tickets – trade certifications, or units of competency, in the Vocational and Educational Training Framework.
The general population reflects these sentiments. Based on the Reconciliation Barometer, the Co-Chairs of Reconciliation Australia, Professor Mick Dodson and Mark Leibler note that only 35% of Australians believe that programs to address Indigenous disadvantage have been successful: ‘… imposed solutions don’t work because the people whose lives are affected don’t own them…’ (Reconciliation Australia, March, 2013). This comment was highlighted in a discussion about the DRAP and IES with an Indigenous ADF member, who has since left the organisation. The comment was made that although the DRAP and IEP initiatives were a positive move, they are largely perceived as ‘tokenistic’ because they lacked majority support. The ex-member believed that the principles espoused in the DRAP of ‘respect for Indigenous cultural difference’ were not being reflected in day-to-day life in the wider ADF, and that the cultural awareness training, was mostly ineffective in dealing with the discrimination that Indigenous ADF members still faced. The ex-member recounted a disturbing racial incident that occurred during a formal ceremonial occasion while on an overseas deployment (pers.comm with male Indigenous ex-Army member October, 2013). During the Indigenous flag raising ceremony as part of the NAIDOC celebrations, the member witnessed racist jokes and unacceptable comments made about Indigenous Australians by non-Indigenous ADF members. Another male non-Indigenous ex-RFSU member, who also believed the cultural awareness training was ineffective, stated that it was a ‘complete waste of time’ because it was being run by ‘so called subject matter experts from Canberra who had no idea what life was really like in the NT’ (pers.comm with male non-Indigenous ex-RFSU December, 2013). While government support is certainly necessary for national goals, policy direction, and economic reform, social justice initiatives that meet the educational goals of all
Australians, across a broad range of settings, need to be driven from the ground up, and not the other way around:

This then is the great humanistic and historical task of the oppressed: to liberate themselves and their oppressors as well. The oppressors, who oppress, exploit and rape by virtue of power, cannot find in this power the strength to liberate either the oppressed or themselves. Only power that springs from the weakness of the oppressed will be sufficiently strong to free both (Freire, 2014, p. 21).

The DRAP and IES awareness results show that 79% of respondents overall claimed they were not aware of the DRAP, and 70% of participants had not heard of the IES. The general lack of awareness was spread across all of the services, including the RFSU.

The largest number of members who identified having no knowledge of either the DRAP or the IES came from the RAN, where 90% and 79% of members respectively indicated their lack of knowledge of the programs. The majority of these members were young, for example, indicating their age range to be 18–30, and had been serving on average under two years. By contrast, the Army’s level of awareness was the highest showing that 55% of participants were aware of the DRAP, i.e. 10/18 members, and 38%, were aware of the IES. The majority of these members identified being in the higher age range of 31–43, and had served on average 2–4 years. Considering that Reconciliation is everyone’s responsibility, and the goals as stated in the Reconciliation Plan Report 2007–09, (p. 10) are to ‘raise awareness,’ the findings in this question are cause for concern.
Indigenous Knowledge systems in support of the DRAP and the IES

Members were asked if they perceived the inclusion of Indigenous Knowledge systems in the ADF curriculum to be supportive of the DRAP and the IES, and were asked to provide any comments (see Question 21, Appendix 1). Once again, answers have been itemised by service to establish any similarities or differences amongst the services.

Indigenous Knowledge systems in support of the DRAP and the IES – Army

The Army members were very positive. Seventeen out of the 18 participants, or 94%, of Army members thought that the inclusion of Indigenous Knowledge systems would indeed support the DRAP and the IES. However, there were some concerns raised about content needing to be carefully planned and pitched at the right level so that it does not have the adverse effect or is seen as ‘tokenistic’:

If information presented, is not over the top, it may be of assistance. Too much information/education for the wider ADF may also have a negative impact (male Army, Indigenous instructor # 10).

A female member expressing her desire to learn more about Indigenous culture and the potential benefits that new knowledge brings stated:

I have an open attitude to learning more about Indigenous culture as I have been a foster carer for Indigenous children for over 7 years and I don’t have a wide insight or knowledge of their culture. And I find it important to recognise the contribution that Indigenous Australians have made to our Defence Forces (female, non-Indigenous Army member # 18).
Indigenous Knowledge systems in support of the DRAP and the IES - RAAF

Seven out of 14 members, or 50%, also felt that the inclusion of Indigenous Knowledges would support the DRAP and the IES. Four out of 14 or 28% thought that they would not, and three members, or 21%, were unsure, and declined to comment. Members who thought that Indigenous Knowledge would enhance current initiatives stated:

Any increase in awareness of Indigenous Knowledge will bring greater awareness of the relevance of these programs (male, non-Indigenous RAAF member # 12).

Obviously a little training would make it easier to integrate Indigenous people into the ADF, but there are bigger social issues outside the ADF’s control that will also need to be addressed...The DRAP is a good strategy and I support the effort to create more job opportunities for Aborigines, if they can adapt to the ADF lifestyle (male, non-Indigenous RAAF member # 7).

I spent a year in NZ on the staff command course and learnt about NZ’s history, Māori people and their connection to land. I also observed many non-Māori speaking and learning the Māori language and protocols… Cultural awareness and military history is important and not fully appreciated in the NT…we could do more in this aspect (male, non-Indigenous RAAF member, # 6).

One member perceived that the inclusion of Indigenous Knowledge in the ADF curriculum might have a negative recruiting impact on potential Indigenous candidates.

Indigenous recruits would not sign up because of the aspect that they would be taught Indigenous Knowledge. There will always be basic reasons why people join the Defence. 1.) adventure 2.) pay
3.) escape from home 4.) job stability. If people want an education they would do it in the education system (male, non-Indigenous RAAF member # 2).

However, this statement was refuted in the NZDF example, where evidence indicates that the inclusion of Indigenous Māori Knowledge has resulted in many tangible benefits, including recruiting and retention, and improved organisational morale (see Chapter 7).

**Indigenous Knowledge systems in support of the DRAP and the IES - RAN**

Similar to the RAAF, 14 out of 28 members, or 50%, of RAN members felt that the inclusion of Indigenous Knowledge systems would support the DRAP and the IES. Ten members, or 36%, thought that they would ‘not,’ and two members ‘declined to comment.’ A further two felt that they were ‘unsure.’ After a follow up conversation with one member, the member stated that he had previously worked in the mining industry and was aware and supportive of issues to do with Reconciliation. He perceived the benefits that would likely accrue from the inclusion of Indigenous Knowledge systems in military curricula would be in line with what was happening in the broader community, and would ‘increase community engagement, cultural awareness, create wider acceptance of Indigenous people within the ADF, and be a positive pathway for learning from local Indigenous communities.

**Indigenous Knowledge systems in support of the DRAP and the IES - RFSU**

Nineteen out of 24, or 79%, of RFSU members felt that the inclusion of Indigenous Knowledge systems would support the DRAP and the IES. No members answered in the negative, and five did not complete the question. The comments provided were both from Indigenous and non-Indigenous members alike, and
similar to the Army members’ comments were very positive. Eight comments were provided which ranged from: ‘Yes, I believe it would be a big help for Indigenous soldiers and non-Indigenous’ (male, Indigenous RFSU member # 24) and three similar comments:

Maybe if well planned and configured properly involving indigenous members with rank to conduct it (male, Indigenous RFSU member # 9).

Learning is a lifelong experience and accepting new ways of viewing knowledge other than the norm should be encompassed and valued, “think outside the square” (female, non-Indigenous RFSU # 1).

Despite the lack of DRAP and IES awareness, 58 out of 84, or 69%, of participants’ perceived that Indigenous Knowledge systems in military curricula would add positively to the military learning experience. The comments supplied provide further evidence to suggest that such endeavours would support the DRAP and the IES. However, while the overall findings in this section are positive, the majority of participants had some concerns that would need to be addressed. These concerns are discussed in more detail in the following section.

6.5 The difficulties

This section looks at some of the difficulties members perceived would occur as a result of the inclusion of Indigenous Knowledge systems in the military curricula. The responses have been itemised numerically by service to identify any similarities or differences across the services. Table 6.7 shows the perceived potential difficulties by Army members.
Table 6.7: Perceived potential difficulties – Army

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Racism and overcoming negative stereotyping and preconceived ideas</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and assumptions about Indigenous people, discrimination or prejudice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resistance and having to justify importance to majority members</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language barriers and communication difficulties</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certain Aboriginal customs and traditions or cultural barriers</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional difficulties and finding best people to teach it</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance to work place and ensuring it is not tokenistic</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of appropriate training management packages</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties obtaining guest trainers from local communities</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties embedding Indigenous methodologies within current training</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>model</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addressing the individual needs of all trainees</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time constraints</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Army members, 17 out of 18, or 94%, provided a comprehensive list of what they ‘perceived’ to be areas of difficulty that could be encountered as a result of the inclusion of Indigenous Knowledge systems in ADF curricula. Each of the 17 members perceived there to be an average of 2–4 areas that would need careful consideration. The area that the majority of members thought would be most difficult to overcome was ‘racism’ (9 members) followed by the related issues of ‘resistance and having to justify the significance of Indigenous Knowledge systems to majority group members,’ including the higher ranks (4 members). The difficulty of having to
justify relevance to higher ranks, in the majority of cases being at the middle management level, was found to be an issue experienced by some NZDF members, for example, when seeking permission to attend legitimate NZDF cultural representational duties, or professional development opportunities (see Chapter 7).

While all but one of the comments were constructive, indicating a certain level of goodwill and thoughtful consideration of the topic amongst Army members, many comments referred to logistical issues such as time constraints, curriculum development, instructor and cultural difficulties, and issues that are not uncommon when developing any new curriculum content (see for example, Arbon, 2008, Wilson, 2008, Mertens, Cram and Chilisa, 2013, Larkin, 2012, Denzin, Lincoln and Smith, 2008, Kovach, 2012, and within the NZDF, see Chapter 7). One member declined to comment and another perceived there to be ‘no issues’ if the value of Indigenous Knowledge systems can be seen, for example:

It may be too much too soon or too little too late depending on your perspective … there will be resistance to change, there maybe people that will discharge because of their opposition to this change (male non-Indigenous Army Instructor # 4)

May not be embraced by the wider ADF society at all levels of rank (male Indigenous Army Instructor # 10).

I’ve been to Indigenous briefs, where the lecturers turned it into a talk about how ‘white’ people are to blame for all the problems the indigenous have. Wasn’t good. But I’ve also completed orientation at Royal Darwin Hospital that was so professional it actually made me look forward to and caring for and learning more about Indigenous culture (male non-Indigenous member # 14).

Relevance – the training needs to bring something relevant to the ADF (male non-Indigenous Army member # 12)
Ensuring it isn’t viewed as tokenism (female non-Indigenous Army Instructor # 17).

People’s inability to accept differences (female non-Indigenous Army Instructor # 6).

Racism or preconceived ideas of Indigenous people (male non-Indigenous Army member # 8).

Overcoming ingrained attitudes would be problematic (male non-Indigenous Army Instructor # 5).

Pre-conceived stereotyping of Aboriginals as no good (male non-Indigenous Army Instructor # 2).

The greatest difficulty would be trying to overcome the members’ visible exposure to bad examples …how do we overcome these? (male non-Indigenous Army Instructor # 3).

The comments made about the potential difficulties finding instructors (three comments) and ‘Having the right people teach us … would they hang around long enough to teach us and not go off on “walkabout”’ (female non-Indigenous Army member # 13) were made by non-Indigenous members and highlight the entrenched nature of racism and negative stereotypical attitudes that are still held by some non-Indigenous Australians, towards Indigenous Australians. The above comments provide further evidence that ‘race’ and notions of racial superiority still play a major role in shaping peoples’ perceptions.

While no evidence was found to suggest that organisational processes encouraged Indigenous members to formally recognise their instructional leadership capabilities, the point was made that ‘… Indigenous Knowledge is not being utilised effectively’ (male non-Indigenous Army Instructor # 1) within the organisation arose
during a conversation with an Indigenous RFSU member. Recently awarded a commendation for his ‘outstanding’ accomplishments and dedication to service, this long-serving member commented that he was ‘passed over’ as a suitable mentor for the Defence Indigenous Development Program, which was subsequently awarded to a non-Indigenous member of a higher rank (Personal conversation with male Indigenous RFSU member # 9, September 2013). Not only does this situation provide a good example of the hierarchical ‘ruling relations’ that control the daily lives (Campbell, 2006, p. 105) of military personnel, but it conflicts with the Chief of Defence Force’s intent ‘… to give Indigenous Australians the opportunity to realise their potential …’ (DRAP, p. 3). Similarly, Māori NZDF members noted that difficulties can arise regarding competing knowledge systems, particularly the ways in which knowledge is held and disseminated differently in Indigenous and non-Indigenous societies. In accordance with Māori worldview, NZDF participants pointed out that some organisational processes actually inhibit Indigenous members from reaching their full potential because it is not necessarily a person of ‘rank’ who is always the best person for the job.

These issues raise a number of concerns from an instructional perspective. How are ADF members’ educational experiences being shaped, or are not being shaped, in accordance with the principles of ‘inclusivity’ and ‘recognition of Indigenous diversity?’ As discussed by Silk et al. 2000, increasing Indigenous participation is not confined to merely recruiting more people into the organisation, but it is about tapping into the potential that already exists: for example, ‘Australian organisations cannot afford to overlook the reservoir of talent held by marginalised groups, who together with other groups, hold the key to improved product innovation, quality and employee commitment’ (Silk, et al. 2000, pp. 11–14).
Creating Indigenous Knowledge learning opportunities by valuing the knowledge and skills that Indigenous people bring to the ADF will contribute markedly to ‘Changing perceptions on Indigenous cultural issues’ (IES, p. 6). The perceived potential difficulties highlighted by RAAF members are shown in Table 6.8.

**Table 6.8: Perceived potential difficulties – RAAF**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resistance and having to justify importance to majority members</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance to work place, lack of interest</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time constraints</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eight out of 14 RAAF members, or 57%, perceived there to be some difficulties that would result as a consequence of including Indigenous Knowledge systems into ADF education and training curriculum; five declined to comment and one member stated they were ‘unsure’. Rather than ‘racism’ being cited as the most difficult area to overcome, as was clearly indicated amongst Army members, the RAAF personnel felt that ‘resistance to change’ and ‘lack of relevance to the majority of occupations in the RAAF’ (male, non-Indigenous RAAF member # 7) would be most problematic. These perceptions are summarised in the following statements:

Making sure you target the correct audience. There are enough distractions to ADF members core responsibilities as it is without adding extra training they will never use…Making sure the information is relevant and useful. If the members cannot use it, then the training will be resented as just another waste of time (male non-Indigenous RAAF member # 14).

If such inclusions are additional (i.e. don’t replace existing content) course lengths will be increased…Delivery by instructional staff
who are not familiar with, or biased against, the subject matter may result in poor or inappropriate delivery (male, non-Indigenous RAAF member # 12).

Overcoming attitudes that the training has little relevance to a modern-day defence force, especially RAAF and Navy who do little field work … time constraints of courses would see difficulty in including such curriculum (male non-Indigenous RAAF member # 2).

The perceived potential difficulties highlighted by RAN members are shown in Table 6.9.

**Table 6.9: Perceived potential difficulties – RAN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Racism and overcoming negative stereotyping and preconceived ideas and assumptions about Indigenous people, discrimination or prejudice</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resistance and having to justify importance to majority members</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of understanding, tolerance and disrespect</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional difficulties and finding best people to teach it</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural issues including different locations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language barriers and communication difficulties</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time constraints</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenging personal beliefs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Twelve out of 28, or 42%, of RAN members provided comments relating to perceived areas of difficulty that may result from the inclusion of Indigenous Knowledge systems in the ADF. Similar to the Army, the most common response was made with reference to ‘racism and discrimination’ (4 comments), followed closely by issues of ‘resistance and having to justify relevance to majority group members’ (3 comments). Bearing in mind the RAN had the largest percentage of
younger members and service time; comments provided were not as comprehensive as the Army or the RAAF comments. One member simply stated ‘a lot’ of issues could be encountered but failed to provide further comment. However, the comments clearly identify that racism and resistance were perceived as significant issues:

People being resistant to the training as they may disagree with it (male non-Indigenous RAN member # 7).

Racist attitudes … scope deemed inapplicable (male non-Indigenous RAN member # 12).

Conflicting personal beliefs … (male non-Indigenous RAN member # 13)

People asking ‘Why are we learning this?’ (male non-Indigenous RAN member # 18).

No interest (male non-Indigenous RAN member # 17).

Irrelevance to our job, may cause disinterest to defence members (male non-Indigenous RAN member # 20).

Backlash because we don’t really learn much about our own military history (male non-Indigenous RAN member # 22).

They are small minority (male non-Indigenous RAN member # 23).
Table 6.10: Perceived potential difficulties – RFSU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Racism and overcoming negative stereotyping and preconceived ideas</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and assumptions about Indigenous people, discrimination or prejudice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of understanding, tolerance and disrespect</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional difficulties and finding best people to teach it</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignorance and lack of acceptance to new knowledge (resistance)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying curriculum content, resources eg what is worthy and</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>valuable to ADF and who decides this</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resistance and having to justify importance to majority members</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural issues including different locations</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>language barriers and communication difficulties</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevance to work place, lack of interest</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selecting appropriate audience</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Considered more work</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time constraints (for example, ceremonies including ‘Sorry Business’)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ten out of 24, or 42% of RFSU members provided comments about the perceived difficulties of including Indigenous Knowledge content in ADF curriculum, while one member stated there would be ‘nil’ difficulty, and 13 members, or 58%, of members declined to comment. Many of those who declined to comment were Indigenous members whose first language is not English, 12 out of 14, or 85%. The reason this question was left largely unanswered is unknown, while the majority of participants had answered the previous question regarding the ‘benefits’ of the inclusion in Indigenous Knowledges in ADF curriculum. It could be an example of what Clark and Friese (cited in Bryant and Charmaz, 2012, p. 372) refer to as a ‘site
of silence’ within the data. An Indigenous Knowledge researcher and writer Louise Grenier claims that ‘a question and answer format is not always appropriate’ when discussing issues with, or relevant to, Indigenous people (1998, p. 33). As the questions were ‘written’ and are not in the member’s preferred language, particularly as the questions concerned a topic that might be difficult, or never before been verbalised, the lack of answers might be considered understandable. For example, drawing on the work of Kater (1993) who completed a study on the art of learning Indigenous crafts, Grenier (1998, p. 33) quotes that the participants in Kater’s study:

… never discussed learning processes among themselves and hence found it difficult to be interviewed on a topic they never verbalized. Interviewees failed to understand the researcher’s questions. Kater concluded that under those circumstances (where the research topic touches on matters not normally verbalized), interviews could not yield satisfactory results and observation was more important …

In the context of this study, the question of ‘what difficulties might be encountered by including Indigenous Knowledge systems into ADF education and training’ could also lead to memories regarding past negative learning experiences for Indigenous participants. Such experiences have been well documented, and were not pursued in this case; however, even without further clarification, the results from this section are disconcerting. Comments below either expand or illustrate the main themes identified by RFSU members:

Disrespect for cultural knowledge or undervaluing by some non-Indigenous people, ignorance, lack of acceptance to new knowledge, and gaining senior Indigenous assistance to compile

---
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appropriate information and education (female, non-Indigenous RFSU member # 1).

Language – all ADF text is English … learning how to understand culture and customs of Indigenous society (female, non-Indigenous RFSU member # 2).

Peoples’ opinion of its worth … preconceived ideas need to be overcome…selecting an appropriate audience … identifying what is worthy and valuable to ADF (male, non-Indigenous RFSU member # 3).

Racist attitudes of many pers (personnel), Very limited understanding of other cultures by most pers … very limited Indigenous instructors available (male, non-Indigenous RFSU member # 6).

Disrespectful students/teachers … European teachers instead of black (male, Indigenous RFSU member # 22).

Not required to do the job – so why do it? … overburdening RFSUs to conduct training in lieu of experts – SME should be RFSUs (male, non-Indigenous RFSU member # 4).

I suspect soldiers would resent being lectured about a single group within the ADF (male, non-Indigenous RFSU member # 8).

Racism … limited knowledge of Indigenous Knowledge amongst most people … limited resources … limited Indigenous NCOs (non-commissioned officers) and officers … lack of interest in this amongst senior staff and average members (male, non-Indigenous RFSU member # 11).

Similar to the Army and the RAN, the RFSU members who answered this question perceive the area of ‘racism and overcoming negative stereotyping and preconceived
ideas and assumptions about Indigenous people, discrimination or prejudice’ and ‘lack of understanding, tolerance and disrespect’ to be areas that would cause the most concern resulting from the inclusion of Indigenous Knowledge systems in the ADF.

Overall, the perceived difficulties that would result from the inclusion of Indigenous Knowledge systems in ADF curriculum are concerning. While the IES identified that there was ‘a perceived lack of cultural awareness in the ADF’ (2007, p. 2), 47 or 56% of members who responded to this question have highlighted a number of issues that are of a much more serious nature. Members identified areas of ‘racism, discrimination, negative stereotyping, preconceived ideas and assumptions about Indigenous people’ as being areas that would be the most difficult to overcome (17 comments), which are consistent with the literature (see sections 1.4 and 1.6). The second and subsequent areas of concern are ‘resistance’ (10 comments), lack of understanding, tolerance and disrespect (6 comments), and instructional issues.

However, adding to the positive response regarding the question ‘what Indigenous Knowledge systems participants’ thought would benefit the ADF the most,’ the final section of this study itemises particular individual and organisational benefits that members thought would result from the inclusion of Indigenous Knowledge in military curricula.

6.6 The benefits

Members were asked to identify the benefits they perceive would accrue from ‘including Indigenous Knowledge systems in ADF education and training.’ The answers expand on the interest shown by 75% of members to include Indigenous Knowledge content in the ADF, particularly in the areas of ‘survival techniques,
bushcraft, and cultural diversity.’ The answers have again been itemised by Service and begin with Table 6.11 which highlights responses from Army members who perceived there to be significant benefits:

**Table 6.11: Perceived Indigenous Knowledge benefits - Army**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural diversity, understanding and respect for cultural differences</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broader range of survival techniques including bush/field craft</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Indigenous knowledge, including customs and traditions</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of native plants for medicinal and food purposes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broader tracking strategies</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental knowledge</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved race relations/understanding and building of relationships</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased awareness of Indigenous Military history and existing contributions Indigenous people make to the ADF</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A better reputation for Defence in this area, including an increased awareness of the vital role Norforce and the other RFSUs play in Australia’s strategic Defence</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navigating by natural features, for example, without maps</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciation of alternative methods, ideas, values</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased Indigenous participation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, the Army personnel perceive there to be many benefits that would accrue from introducing Indigenous Knowledge content into ADF curriculum. For example 17 out of 18, or 94%, of members selected, on average, two to four areas of where Indigenous Knowledge content would add potential benefits to both individual skill sets and organisational benefits. Adding to the results of regarding ‘what
Indigenous Knowledge systems would benefit the ADF the most?’ where members selected ‘survival skills, local Indigenous Knowledge customs and traditions, and Indigenous military history to be the most popular areas likely to increase individual skill levels, there is also evidence of the benefits that would result at the macro organisational level. These include a greater understanding of cultural difference, respect, and improved race relations, which are embedded in and complementary to the DRAP and Reconciliation initiatives. As has also been shown in the results of the NZDF participants (see Chapter 7), these benefits, in turn, can lead to increased organisational morale and operational effectiveness. Other areas mentioned were Indigenous participation (recruitment and potential instructional/curriculum advisory opportunities within the ADF), improved Defence image in the public domain, and improved awareness about Indigenous contributions, both past and present.

A female non-Indigenous Army member (# 13) who perceived there to be ‘no’ benefits to including Indigenous Knowledge in ADF education and training stated ‘we have done alright so far,’ and provides yet another example of the significant ‘unexplored’ reasons and ‘sites of silence’ that could be contributing to the lack of Indigenous participation in the ADF. The overall benefits identified by RAAF members can be seen in Table 6.12.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6.12: Perceived Indigenous Knowledge benefits - RAAF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved cultural understanding and appreciation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bush survival knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field craft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity and different points of view</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better understanding of how to use the environment for tactical advantage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Eight out of 14, or 57%, of RAAF members provided comments in the above areas, while two felt that they were unsure, and four did not comment. Similar to the Army, members who provided a comment perceived there to be the most benefits in areas of improved cultural understanding, followed by bush survival skills, and field craft. Similar answers were also provided by members of the RAN and are highlighted in Table 6.13.

Table 6.13: Perceived Indigenous Knowledge benefits - RAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural awareness and understanding of different ways of life</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved tolerance and acceptance, sensitivity and respect</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survival skills</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved knowledge of local Indigenous history</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in recruitment and participation by Indigenous personnel in ADF (positive role models)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bush medicine</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navigation skills</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative perspectives and ways to deal with life in the military</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language skills</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved community engagement and relationships</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental knowledge</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Twelve out of 28, or 43%, of RAN members answered in the affirmative perceiving there to be the most benefits within the areas of improved cultural awareness, understanding, tolerance and respect. This was then followed by survival skills, which is consistent with both the Army and the RAAF. Sixteen out of 28, or 57%, either declined to comment, thought that there would be no benefits, or stated they
‘had no idea’ or were unsure. Perceived benefits outlined by RFSU members are shown in Table 6.14.

**Table 6.14: Perceived Indigenous Knowledge benefits - RFSUs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Better knowledge of bush tucker, medicines and bush health and well-being</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased cultural knowledge (basic local language skills, customs and traditions)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survival skills, (including Desert warfare)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved communication skills</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broader view on environment, weather knowledge, and Aboriginal land issues</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved public image within the Australian society</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased role capabilities and opportunities for Indigenous members within ADF, eg instructors, mentors, cultural advisors</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possibilities for reciprocated learning partnerships, strategies/teaching and learning using Indigenous methodologies</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased community engagement</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhanced effectiveness on overseas deployments (for example, assistance with non-English speakers interpreting body language and other non-verbal cues that are useful amongst other populations)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved tracking skills</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Indigenous participation/recruitment and retention benefits</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better local knowledge of sacred sites and their importance to Indigenous people</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sixteen out of 24, or 66%, of RFSU members provided a range of areas where they perceived there to be potential benefits for the ADF, as a result of the inclusion of Indigenous Knowledge systems. The answers provided came from both Indigenous and non-Indigenous members alike and were perhaps the most comprehensive of all
the services. Eight members, or 33%, declined to comment. The first preferred choice was slightly different to the other services in that Bush tucker was selected as the most preferred choice over either improved cultural knowledge or survival skills, although these were still considered the essential skills for ADF personnel. In particular, areas of potential that were not mentioned by the three full-time services included: development of a uniquely Australian/service culture, being an example to mainstream Australia (male non-Indigenous RFSU member # 6); and promoting a better understanding between the two cultures, by recognising the importance of Indigenous values, unique skills, and experiences etc. (male Indigenous RFSU member # 9).

Other comments noted that the inclusion of Indigenous Knowledge systems would help Indigenous people feel more welcomed in the ADF, assisting in recruitment endeavours (male Indigenous RFSU member # 20); and that the organisation would then be recognised in a positive light by the wider Australian public, perhaps influencing others to do the same (male non-Indigenous RFSU member # 11). The following examples provide some of the benefits that would transform the learning environment:

Helping each other, learning from each other, and explaining easier ways to communicate [collaborative partnerships based on respect] (male Indigenous RFSU member # 21).

Better understanding of our own country (male non-Indigenous RFSU member # 11).

The ADF will learn from us that there are limits or boundaries that an outsider must understand regarding Indigenous culture (male Indigenous RFSU member # 12).
Members perceived there to be a number of potential benefits that would result from the inclusion of Indigenous Knowledge systems in the ADF. For example, ‘improved cultural understanding, diversity and respect for difference’ (31 selections) was perceived as having the greatest potential benefit amongst ADF members. This would have a significant positive impact on the organisational goal of Changing perceptions on Indigenous cultural issues. The combination of building stronger relationships with the local Indigenous communities and reinforcing existing members pride in Indigenous culture by conducting a ‘welcome to country’ ceremony at the time and place of recruitment would send a powerful message that the military is a place that respects the knowledge systems of Indigenous and non-Indigenous personnel, and that the organisation has a zero tolerance for racism.

The second most favoured choice overall was of a more practical nature involving skills of ‘survival knowledge’ (21 selections) including related areas such as ‘field craft, bushcraft, medicinal, food and water knowledge, tracking, navigating, interpreting the environment, and weather knowledge.’ These are skills that members would gain direct individual benefit from, particularly in preparation for deployments in certain terrains, which would inevitably increase the collective knowledge and skills of the organisation. For members who are already experts in these skills but have not yet had any opportunities to share their knowledge with others, this would be an opportune time to recognise ‘the diversity of Indigenous cultures and contributions they make to Defence as part of everyday life’ by encouraging and supporting these members into leadership and instructional roles (DRAP, p. 6), as illustrated above by Indigenous RFSU members # 9 and 21, and through embedding practical learning activities into the training continuum. The indirect potential benefits that would result from such a hands on approach are limitless. For example,
members from HMAS Warramunga have already experienced similar informal learning opportunities during a recent field trip in 2012:

Seeing just how much our visit has meant to the Warumungu community, and to my crew members, has been the reward. This visit has proven that there’s a very special bond between us, and it has reinforced the pride we feel to be part of the Warumungu story. Commander Turner said. … Lenny, a Warumungu Elder, said the connection to HMAS Warramunga was very important to his people. “Well, it makes me feel stronger. It makes the community feel stronger too. See, because you get HMAS Warramunga coming here, it gets the whole community speaking about it. So, it makes people here feel like we’ve got a warship behind us. It feels good,” he said.53

The third most favoured choice was ‘local Indigenous knowledge including traditions, customs, history etc.’ (17 selections). Creating opportunities for existing members to share their knowledge in the various activities mentioned in this chapter, would not only reinforce the DRAP initiatives of ‘respect, opportunities’ and improving ‘relationships’ but would provide a range of opportunities to unlock the Indigenous potential that exists within the ADF.

6.7 Conclusion

This chapter has explored the perspectives of a group of ADF members as they reflect on their military learning experience and discuss ‘the potential benefits to the ADF education curricula of the inclusion of Indigenous Knowledge systems.’

Participants perceived there to be a range of benefits that would result from the inclusion of Indigenous Knowledge systems in military curricula. These included ‘Indigenous survival knowledge,’ including hunting skills, bush and environmental knowledge, followed closely by ‘Local Indigenous Knowledge, culture, and traditions.’ Perceived to improve the level of cultural understanding, and institutional pride in the ADF, these areas were thought to enhance the learning experiences of all personnel. Participants thought these knowledge systems and skill sets would support Reconciliation goals, namely: ‘changing perceptions on Indigenous cultural issues’ and ‘building stronger relationships with Indigenous communities’ (DRAP, 2010-2014). Themes that emerged were conducive to ‘improved individual and organisational morale.’ For non-Indigenous personnel, in particular, it was noted that the ability to appreciate an alternative worldview would promote ‘respect’ and pave the way for the possibility of reciprocated learning partnerships in military education. This would create a range of ‘opportunities’ to tap into the wealth of knowledge that exists amongst Indigenous personnel, and local communities. Participants, particularly in the RFSUs, expressed a keen desire to learn more about Australia’s Indigenous military history, which is an important national Reconciliation objective.

While the findings in this chapter correspond with the goodwill expressed by community Elders to share aspects of their Indigenous Knowledge within the military learning environment (see Chapter 8), there were some significant ‘issues’ that need to be addressed. The difficulties the participants perceived would inhibit the journey to include aspects of Indigenous Knowledge in military curricula included lack of organisational support to ‘recognise Indigenous diversity on a day-to-day basis,’ and the absence of institutional policy framework for the recognition for Indigenous Knowledge systems and languages in educational praxis. Participants’
findings were therefore found to be disparate with the institutional literature about how the ADF positions itself as an ‘equitable and inclusive’ place for all Australians. Furthermore, lack of awareness about ADF Reconciliation initiatives, in general, are similar to the findings reported in the Reconciliation Barometer, and reflect the reluctance of the governments to provide a legal framework that respects Indigenous life ways, in Australian institutions.

Other difficulties related to cultural (epistemological) dominance, discrimination and lack of instructor understanding regarding the importance of Indigenous life ways. Despite the likelihood that these issues are potentially undermining the principles of the DRAP, majority support was evidenced regarding the inclusion of Indigenous Knowledge systems in military curricula. Furthermore, many of the issues that are perceived potentially ‘difficult’ by ADF participants have been markedly reduced through the implementation of appropriate Indigenous Knowledge education in the NZDF. Reinforcing this finding to a certain degree in ‘some’ ADF establishments, participants who identified having worked in the RFSUs, or who had been involved in visits to Indigenous communities for the DRAP and IES initiatives, indicated having increased levels of ‘cultural understanding,’ and spoke positively of their ‘informal’ Indigenous Knowledge learning experiences. These members also displayed ‘higher’ receptivity and open-mindedness to the inclusion of Indigenous Knowledge systems in the ADF, and supports the argument that Indigenous Knowledge systems in military curricula would improve the learning experience of all members.
Appendix 1 to Chapter 6 – Survey instrument for ADF members

1. In which ADF Service are you currently employed?
   Army full-time □  Air Force full-time □  Navy full-time □
   Army reserves □  Air Force reserves □  Navy reserves □

2. Are you employed in a Regional Force Surveillance Unit?
   Yes □  No □

3. Do you identify as an Indigenous Australian of Aboriginal or Torres Strait Island descent?
   Yes □  No □

4. Do you speak an Indigenous Australian language as your first language?
   Yes □  (If yes, what language or languages do you speak?)
   Comment
   (If no, go to Question 6.)

5. If you answered yes to Question 4, how often do you speak your first language during ADF work hours?
   □ never   □ a little  □ often  □ all the time

6. What sex are you?  male □  female □

7. Please tick the appropriate box to indicate your age.
   □ under 18  □ 18-30  □ 31-43  □ 44-56  □ over 57

8. How long have you been employed in the ADF?
   □ under 2 years □ 2-5 years □ 5-10 years □ 10-15 years
   □ 15-20 years □ over 20 years

9. As a student, how many ADF professional development courses have you been on in the last two years?
   □ under 2 □ 2-4 □ 5-10 □ over 10

10. On average, as a student, how much time was spent on your courses learning Indigenous Knowledge content in the last two years?
    □ none □ a little □ often □ most of the time

11. What Indigenous Knowledge content would you like to learn about during your ADF career? (tick as many as you like)
    □ none □ local Indigenous Knowledge  □ culture and traditions
    □ Indigenous survival techniques □ Indigenous military involvement
    □ Indigenous war fighting strategies □ Indigenous medicinal knowledge
    □ Indigenous environmental knowledge
    Other   comments
12. Are you aware of the Defence Reconciliation Action Plan (DRAP)?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

13. Are you aware of the Indigenous Recruitment Strategy (IRS)?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

14. If you have been involved in either the DRAP or the IRS, can you describe your role and/or your experiences?
   Comment

15. Are you currently employed as an instructor in an ADF training establishment?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]
   (If you are not employed as an ADF instructor, go to question 18.)

**Instructors only**

16. As an instructor, how many ADF courses have you instructed on in the last two years?
   [ ] under 2 [ ] 2-4 [ ] 5-10 [ ] over 10

17. On average, as an instructor, how much time have you spent in the last two years instructing Indigenous Knowledge or delivering content using Indigenous methodologies?
   [ ] none [ ] a little [ ] often [ ] most of the time

**Recruitment experience**

18. Overall, was your recruitment experience satisfactory?
   Yes [ ] No [ ] (please provide a comment if you wish)
   Comment

19. If you identified as an Indigenous Australian in Question 3, apart from identifying as such, were you granted any recognition, during the recruiting process, for any Indigenous Knowledge and experience you have, either formal or informal?
   [ ] none [ ] a little [ ] some [ ] a lot

20. If you answered yes to Question 4, were you able to have someone with you from the same language group to assist you during the interview process?
   Yes [ ] No [ ] (please provide a comment if you wish)
   Comment
**All participants**

21. Do you think Indigenous Knowledges and education methods are valued in the ADF? Yes ☐ No ☐

   Comment

22. What benefits do you think would result from including Indigenous Knowledges in ADF education and training?

23. What difficulties might be encountered by including Indigenous Knowledges in ADF education and training?

24. Do you think the inclusion of Indigenous Knowledges and learning through appropriate Indigenous education methods in the ADF will support the DRAP and the IRS?

   Comment:

25. If you wish to discuss further any aspect of this questionnaire, please use the space provided; alternatively, if you wish to be contacted for an interview, please fill in the details below.

   Comment

---

Thank you for your support. Your feedback is valued.

Name:

Best contact number and time:
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My culture is important (NMM#1, March, 2013).

7.1 Introduction

The opening of the New Zealand Army National Marae (Māori meeting place) in October 1995 was a significant event in both New Zealand Army and New Zealand Defence Force (NZDF) history. Providing recognition of the value and importance Māori Indigenous Knowledge has within the NZDF and the wider New Zealand society, the establishment of the military Marae marked the beginning of a partnership based on the fusion of Māori and European traditions. After years of planning and collaboration with Māori iwi (tribes) and military personnel throughout New Zealand, the NZDF has developed a complementary approach to military education and training by sharing the knowledge systems of two very different societies. Recognising the mutual obligations and responsibilities under the Treaty of Waitangi 1840, (from herein referred to as the Treaty), the military Marae have become the focal points for Māori cultural training, ceremonial activities, and places of learning for all members, ex-members and their families.

This chapter showcases the Māori cultural learning experiences of 34 members from the NZDF as they reflect on their experiences within the contemporary context of a military education and training environment, and the broader context of a decolonising society. The study is grounded in a multicultural military organisation,

54 Statement expressed by one of the Māori participants in this section of the study.
operating within a nation seeking to establish a bicultural co-equal partnership between Māori, the Tangata Whenua, original inhabitants, and non-Māori, the Kaiwhakanoho Whenua, or settler population of New Zealand. Through analysing data obtained during a two-week study tour to six NZDF establishments in 2013, this chapter argues that embedding Indigenous Knowledge systems in military curricula improves the learning experiences of all members; it also contributes to the gap in literature regarding the benefits of the inclusion of Indigenous Knowledge systems in military curricula, by exploring answers to the following questions:

- What is the current situation of Māori Indigenous Knowledge use in the NZDF?
- What were some of the difficulties that needed to be addressed during its implementation?
- How does Māori Indigenous Knowledge in military curricula support national efforts towards biculturalism?
- What are the benefits?

### 7.2 Background

Māori people contribute significantly to the NZDF. Māori Indigenous Knowledge, however, is a relatively new addition that has been formally acknowledged in military curricula, since the late 1970s. During this time, New Zealand society has undergone significant change. Change was largely due to Māori activism that escalated in the 1970s and disrupted the myth that Māori and Pākehā (non-Māori) existed in a ‘pavlova paradise’ and were treated as equals in every aspect of New Zealand public life (Fleras & Spoonley 1999; Hill & Bonisch-
Brednich, 2007). Unresolved disputes over the inequitable sharing of power and privilege, economic and educational marginalisation (Smith, 1999b), combined with the continued loss of Māori land culminated in 1982 when Donna Awatere’s work *Māori Sovereignty* challenged the core of New Zealand society and questioned the framework under which it was built (Awatere, 1984; Campbell, 2011; Fleras & Spoonley, 1999; Hill & Bonisch-Brednich, 2007). Awatere argued that the signing of the Treaty did not relinquish sovereignty of Aotearoa, instead Pākehā deception and Crown complicity suppressed it (Fleras & Spoonley, 1999). Increased involvement by Indigenous people and their supporters in international forums (Stewart-Harawira, 2005) has also led to contentious public debate about sovereignty, land rights, education, biculturalism, and other important societal issues, which has helped to charter new ways of doing business in the twenty-first century (Bishop, 2010; Culpitt, 1994; Havemann, 1999; Tomlins-Jahnke, 2011).

While much has been written about the value of increasing diversity within contemporary organisations (Dansby, Stewart & Webb, 2001; Silk et al. 2000), few have been successful in tapping into the rich labour resources offered by a multicultural workforce (Bertone, Esposto, and Turner, 1998; Ma Rhea, 2004; Silk et al. 2000). By contrast, the NZDF has created a unique way of embracing cultural diversity by acknowledging the rich resources offered by its Indigenous people. Obligating Crown responsibilities under the principles of the Treaty, and the *Treaty of Waitangi Act 1975*, the inclusion of Māori Indigenous Knowledge in military curricula has created a framework of respect, partnership and equality within the institution (Neill, 2004; Scoppio, 2007).

---

55 Māori name for New Zealand.
In 1996, the journey towards biculturalism officially began when the Chief of Staff released a directive providing a framework to enhance the Army’s culture. To increase service ethos, the directive outlined the development and coordination of Marae activities, and directed the teaching of tikanga Māori (Māori customs and traditions) across all training initiatives. The deliberate inclusion of Māori Indigenous Knowledge was underpinned by the organisation’s goal to inculcate ‘a commitment to service’ and to increase esprit de corps and morale amongst members. The directive outlined that progressive training for Army personnel, including close-quarter battle training using Māori weaponry, learning the Army haka (war chant), ethos training, and ceremonial activities, was to occur throughout a member’s career at every available opportunity. Almost two decades later, the NZDF has developed and implemented a bicultural policy. Māori Indigenous Knowledge is now firmly embedded within the NZDF educational and training curriculum and is coordinated through respective bicultural policies and training initiatives developed within each service.

Participants stated that the introduction of the service bicultural policies was critical to the Māori cultural training process. Not only were the policies required to support the initiatives, but were essential in characterising the bicultural identity (see NZDF, 2012), and for providing the necessary resources. One non-Māori member contended, ‘… without the bicultural policies in place, the NZDF would be just like the British Army’ (AMNM#7). This point of view was expressed by many members, both Māori and non-Māori, who said that the legitimisation of Māori Indigenous Knowledge in all aspects of New Zealand public life, including the military, was due to the political will of New Zealand society. While the bicultural policies were considered ‘… the right thing to do for all New Zealanders,’ the training initiatives
were considered imperative. This was portrayed in the comment of one Māori participant who stated:

… Without the correct tikanga\textsuperscript{56} Māori, none of these things would happen. They have to be taught (MM#9).

To understand the institutional and societal reasons behind the change, personal accounts of many long-serving members were analysed to gain a historical perspective. Even though all participants spoke positively about their military careers, the following section provides a ‘glimpse’ of what life was like during the twentieth century.

7.2.1 Reasons for change: before the bicultural policies

Before the late 1970s, mainstream education practices were largely responsible for the widespread denigration of Māori identity (Bishop, 1999; Bishop & Glynn, 1999; Drurie, 1998; Edwards, McCleanor, & Moewaka-Barnes, 2007; O’Sullivan, 2007; Smith, 1999b; Spivak, 1994; see also Chapter 4). Assimilationist education policies and practices greatly disrupted Māori ways of viewing and existing in the world (Simon & Smith et al. 2001), resulting in widespread psychological and spiritual trauma, which was not restricted to the schooling experience. Before the New Zealand military established its own chain of command, resident British officers were heavily influenced by their European culture and had their own ideas about how the New Zealand military should operate. Even though experiences in command relationships may have differed between the services (AMM#16), generally speaking, the British commanders had no desire to listen to New Zealand personnel, prior to the 1980s (NMM#7). However, as Professor Linda Tuhiwai Smith points out, individual

\textsuperscript{56} meaning/customs (Ryan, 2009, p. 136)
and institutional disregard for Māori culture did not deter Māori from maintaining their identity:

To resist is to retrench in the margins, retrieve what we were and remake ourselves. The past, our stories local and global, the present, our communities, cultures languages and social practices – all may be spaces of marginalization, but they have also become spaces of resistance and hope (Smith, 1999b, p. 4).

Resistance against European dominance often resulted in the strengthening of Māori resolve. Many non-Māori personnel were also keen to learn from their Māori peers. Long-serving members felt that the formal acknowledgement of Māori Knowledge in military curricula was simply a natural progression of what had been ‘quietly’ taking place since the beginning of the twentieth-century and was evident in the following statement made by one Māori member:

We never let it go really, just quietly carried on teaching our culture in our own way … Whoever wanted to learn, we were happy to teach (AMM#14 & NMM#7).

Others noticed the differences in attitudes as New Zealand commanders gradually replaced the British commanders during the 1960–80s. This was perceived to be the turning point towards formally validating Māori Indigenous Knowledge within the services. ‘We finally had the support of our own officers’ (NMM#7) noted one senior Māori member, who claimed by that time he was of the rank where he was able to exert some influence at the higher command level. Gaining support from command was noted by another senior Māori member, who proudly advised that his kaumātua\textsuperscript{57} status was awarded by Lieutenant General Jerry Mateparae, the former Chief of

\textsuperscript{57} Kaumatua are highly respected Māori Elders (in the context of this study, often ex-military personnel).
Defence (the current Governor General of New Zealand). Māori language and culture continues to play an important role in his, and his family’s military life, as it has done for the last 129 years (AMM#9).

To keep pace with the institutional changes, maintaining connections with Māori communities was considered vitally important. Under the Treaty’s three principles of partnership, participation, and protection, the New Zealand Government is bound to honour these principles in order to strengthen national identity (Campbell, 2011; Culpitt, 1994; Neill, 2004; Scoppio, 2007). While participants considered the formal acknowledgment of Māori perspectives to be a mark of ‘respect’ and equality in the learning environment, the length of time and effort it had taken to achieve this goal did not go unnoticed. The following comment made by a Māori member also highlights how discursive connections are made with respect to the advancement of Indigenous rights and social justice issues in other colonised countries:

Unlike Indigenous Australians, Māori has an advantage in that we have been able to get effect from te Tiriti o Waitangi, albeit late and limited, and provided of course on the back of continual protest (AMM#16).

Today, the Treaty’s relevance is included as a topic on promotion courses. Courses such as the RNZAF Flight Lieutenant’s Bicultural Course help to explain the Treaty’s implications to RNZAF managers and are designed to develop an understanding of how the Treaty affects personnel in the workplace. After attending one of these courses during the study-tour and discussing the outcomes with members, it was unanimously stated that it had helped to develop a better understanding of the relevant issues.
One of the issues that was particularly difficult before the bicultural policies was the entrenched assumption that Māori were culturally inferior, or were less intelligent than non-Māori were. Some long-serving Māori members stated that they were not encouraged to apply for the higher skilled positions at the start of their careers. This finding is consistent with one of Michelle Erai’s findings in her 1995 thesis *Māori Soldiers: Māori Experiences in the New Zealand Army* when she stated ‘What the literature has shown is that ethnicity and gender may restrict the corps an individual enters, the rank which they subsequently achieve, and therefore the path of their career within the army’\(^{58}\) (p. 45). In another of her findings, Erai (1995) claims that most of the participants felt their ‘ethnicity’ had not held them back with regard to promotion, although three of the women had a ‘nagging feeling’ that they had been held back in some way, but could not explain why (p. 45).

While Erai’s findings are related to promotional opportunities and training experiences, in general, the following comments from the participants in this study relate to perceptions about ‘Māori culture’ specifically, and display a notable difference from the afore-mentioned experiences. For example, one Māori member was told at the start of his career that ‘Māori culture had no place in military life’ and the sooner he forgot about it, the better off he would be (NMM#5). Another member recalled a particularly distressing incident where a British officer informed him: ‘Your culture and your language is inferior and always will be’ (NMM#7). Māori participants described the humiliation of being ordered to ‘speak English’ and commented that these were the times they drew on the strength from their own

---

\(^{58}\) See also Ball (1991); Bergin et al (1993); Cheatham (1988); Cowan (2008); Dansby, Stewart, & Webb (2001); Enloe (1980); Erai (1995); Hall (1981, 1995, 1997); Holm (1997); Krouse & Dixon (2007); LaDuke with Cruz (2013); Longa (1999) for an in-depth discussion on ethnical related issues and some of the effects social and political ideologies are having for Indigenous people and people of colour with reference to colonialism and Western military establishments.
culture. The British hierarchy were quick to remind Māori personnel that the service was a ‘professional organisation,’ thus, making it difficult for them to connect and respond in a meaningful way (NMM#7). These incidents highlight the racial superior attitudes held by many non-Māori personnel towards Māori, and reiterate Bell’s (1980 & 1992) theory regarding the entrenched nature of racism and discrimination in Western societies (Awatere, 1984; Bonilla-Silva, 2006; Gershon, 2008; Mortensen, 2013; Pryor, 2013; Rocha, 2012; Smith, 1999b; Sorrenson, 1988).

Cultural ‘put downs’ were deeply disrespectful for Māori members who had often dedicated their lives to the organisation. Before the bicultural policies were introduced, incidents of discrimination were ‘not uncommon,’ and included ‘not being treated with respect,’ being told ‘your culture was a waste of time,’ and being actively discouraged from maintaining, or developing identity (AFFM#1; NMM#5; NMN#11 AMM#14; NMM#7). The irony of the situation is that many Māori members have gained high status such as prominent leaders, advisors to ministers and service Chiefs, or advisors in the fields where they used to be discriminated against 20–40 years beforehand. Other Māori members described it an ‘honour’ to impart Indigenous Knowledge to those who have an open mind. The Marae is the ideal place for this to happen because it is a place of great significance and learning for Māori people. The education and training is not about ‘imposing Māori culture’ on others, but more to do with ‘respect’ and inviting members to learn in a supportive environment, which is one of the fundamental differences between how knowledge is held and disseminated in Indigenous societies (Arbon, 2008; Bishop, 1999; Grenier, 1998; Stewart-Harwira, 2005; Smith, 1999b & 2014; Worby, et al. 2010). All long-serving members, both Māori and non-Māori, were positive about the changes. However, despite significant progress, some believed:
New Zealand still has some way to go before we realise the partnership that te *Tiriti o Waitangi* was supposed to provide (AMM#16).

It is still a very NZ Pākehā (non-Māori) worldview when it comes to perspectives in military training … Māori perspectives however will never be reduced to a narrow field of military training. The “whole” concept needs to be understood … (NMM#3).

Ethical and equitable education that addressed Indigenous concerns was sadly lacking in the past. Indigenous Knowledge education in military curricula is helping to address some of these issues. As values are perceived as providing the basis for individuals’ and groups’ worldviews, including their social justice concerns (Wegner, 2007; Yosso, 2005), understanding how Indigenous Knowledge education can contribute to improved relationships, and the alignment of values, is extremely important in contemporary institutions (Kincheloe & Steinberg; 2008 Ruck-Simmons, 2006). Not only does Indigenous Knowledge serve the interests of Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples by providing alternative views from a diversity of cultural sites, essential for biculturalism and reconciliation, but it also helps to reinforce an appreciation of Indigenous epistemologies by contributing to ‘… a fundamental transformation of both outlook and identity’ (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 2008, p. 137). Such transformation can result in a much more reflective and progressive consciousness (Kincheloe & Steinberg, 2008, p. 137; Freire, 2014; Stewart-Harawira, 2005), which in turn can contribute to a shared identity. Increased understanding also helps clarify ethical standards and informs values in decision-making processes that lead to a shift (and or an alignment) of values (Wegner, 2007, p. 157; Wilson, 2008). The following section explores some of the methods in which this is being achieved in the NZDF learning environment.
7.3 What is the current situation of Indigenous Knowledge use in the NZDF?

This section looks at some of the information personnel provided about the current situation of Māori Indigenous Knowledge use in the NZDF. It discusses data under emergent themes and underpinning concepts to do with ‘organisational processes’ that support, or do not support, the inclusion of Māori perspectives in military curricula, including the areas of recruitment, language use, curricula content, and instructor and curricula development. The data in this section came from discussions with members, the Māori Cultural Advisors (MCAs), Subject Matter Experts (SMEs), the kaumātua, and surveys.

7.3.1 Recruitment

In order to gain an understanding of the level of institutional recognition for Indigenous Knowledge at the time of recruitment, participants were asked whether or not they thought their recruitment process was ‘satisfactory’ and were invited to comment (see Questions 26–28, Appendix 1). All 34 members found their recruitment experience satisfactory. One long-serving non-Māori member stated that he ‘felt at ease with the culture’ at the time of his recruitment; however, only one Māori member felt that ‘a little’ recognition was awarded for his Māori Indigenous Knowledge. Senior members noted that the lack of recognition of Māori Indigenous Knowledge during the recruitment process was an issue that was currently being addressed with regard to the ‘testing procedures’ particularly with more members enlisting from the Kura Kaupapa (Māori immersion schools). Conversely, ‘no’ recognition of Māori Indigenous Knowledge during the recruitment process could also be perceived as contravening the bicultural policies, the intent of the Treaty, and the Māori Language Act 1987. Senior Māori members
commented that Kura Kaupapa students are a lot more competent in Te Reo (the language) and have a lot more Māori Indigenous Knowledge than students who have come from the mainstream schools. It was considered important that their knowledge and skills be recognised as members felt it ‘inequitable’ for candidates to grapple with standardised recruitment tests that did not support the content of their learning. These students are not less intelligent, as one Māori participant stated, it is just that they approach the questions in a different way, and are likely being disadvantaged by the current recruitment process (AFMM#11). This finding illustrates how discrimination is ‘normalised’ in Western institutions.

Other comments made concerning the lack of recognition of Māori Indigenous Knowledge at the time of recruitment were noted in the areas of Marae protocol, and military related ceremonies. This included systems of knowledge surrounding parades, formal occasions, protocols, and language, for example, the oral proficiencies required to ‘whaikorero’ (formal speech), lead the haka, the wero (challenge) or karanga (female call onto the Marae).

Many of us brought these skills in with us, but they do not realise how substantial they are (AFMM#11).

This comment provides further evidence that Indigenous Knowledge needs to be valued and taught in military curricula, and can no longer be relied upon on a goodwill, or informal basis. Senior members and the kaumātua raised concerns regarding the gaps in training required to replace existing personnel who possess in-depth Māori Knowledge. Much of this knowledge can only be gained from practical experience, and time spent with Elders, and is generally not sold as a commodity in Western institutions (Bishop, 2008; Bishop & Glynn 1999; Egan, 2008; Giner, 2007; Rigney, 2003; Sarra, 2005, 2011 & 2012; Smith, 2002). The second concern related
to recruitment in Māori communities, similar to the importance of maintaining strong relationships with the Indigenous communities in the Northern Territory (see Chapter 6 and 8). The following comment highlights the significance of connections made during the recruitment process:

We also make a point of promoting the Defence in the Māori communities by sending Māori people there. It’s pretty hard recruiting where everyone around you is Māori and the people that have come to talk to you are white. That connection has to come right from the start (AFMM#11).

The importance of Indigenous language in education and the maintenance of relationships (Arbon, 2008; Battiste, 2008; Bishop, 2008; Graham, 2009; Grimes, 2009; Hēbert, 2000; Kanu, 2011; Kiernan, 2000; Martin, 2008; Rigney, 2003) is explored in the following section.

7.3.2 Te reo (the language)

Māori language fluency is one of the hardest skills to find in New Zealand society. According to Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori (The Māori Language Commission) Statement of Intent 2011–14, the Māori language is in a ‘critical state’ and efforts to revitalise its use need to be intensified so that it does not become obsolete. New Zealand Government organisations therefore have a statutory obligation to help promote and revitalise the Māori language so that it will be recognised as ‘a living language’ and used as an ‘ordinary means of communication’.

In accordance with the bicultural policies, and the Māori Language Act 1987, Māori language, customs and items of cultural significance are respected and honoured within the NZDF. Māori language is actively promoted through external language programs, the promotional education and training continuum, and through oral and
written measures applied in daily practice. While these initiatives have greatly improved the level of Māori language skills within the organisation, apart from the kaumātua, there were ‘no’ current members who indicated speaking Māori as their first language.

In answer to the question, i.e., ‘is the use of Māori language encouraged in the NZDF?’ all members answered ‘yes’ but one respondent commented that ‘only in certain contexts,’ and another said ‘not across all of the training’. This may support the view that Māori Indigenous Knowledge is not something that should not be taught in isolation but should be applied across all curriculum areas, in the same way that Western Knowledge has been taught. Highlighting Indigenous Peoples’ rights to have access to education in their own language and develop their identity in accordance with their own worldviews, one non-Māori member said that the bicultural policies and the equal employment opportunity legislation ‘provide(s) Māori the opportunity to use their language in the workplace’ (NMNM# 2). Table 7.1 records participants’ responses of ‘how often personnel speak Māori during NZDF work hours?’

**Table 7.1: Te reo in the workplace**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Māori</th>
<th>non-Māori</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>never</td>
<td>a little</td>
<td>often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=31

In support of biculturalism, to become an MCA one needs to be fluent in the Māori language or have attended the one-year intense program offered by each
service as a full-time course. The service programs sponsor two candidates, per year where any members can apply, but need to have the entry-level skills as a prerequisite. If members do not have the prerequisite skills, they can be achieved online, for free, in members’ own time. One issue that was mentioned related to a lack of information regarding the ‘full-time opportunity’ resulting in some members missing the opportunity to apply for these positions. Gaining Chain of Command support was also perceived as difficult (see sections 7.4.1 and 7.4.2).

Other points that were raised related to language use on the Marae. One member stated that he would like to see senior commanders taking more time to learn and pronounce Māori words correctly rather than learning passages by rote, or without understanding the meaning. Another member suggested that other languages could also be encouraged on the Marae (AMM#3). Te reo programs on the whole were found to be extremely valuable. Regardless of the level of language proficiency, all members observed, during the study-tour, speaking te reo were greatly encouraged for their efforts. This finding was evidenced by an Australian Defence Force (ADF) member in the wider context of this study:

I spent a year in NZ on the staff command course and learnt about NZ’s history, Māori people and their connection to land. I also observed many non-Māori speaking and learning the Māori language and protocols… Cultural awareness and military history is important and not fully appreciated in the NT…we could do more in this aspect (AFMNI, # 6).

While all Māori members surveyed who had taken advantage of Te Reo programs had greatly improved their Māori language skills to a level of fluency, and spoke Māori ‘often’ or ‘most’ of the time, there were no non-Māori members indicating the same level of proficiency. All members who had completed the programs, however,
stated that they had gained confidence in speaking and understanding Tikanga Māori and had definitely learnt more about the Māori culture. These findings suggest that respecting and learning Indigenous language through meaningful engagement, rather than learning ‘about’ Indigenous people (Hall, 2014) in the Western sense, contribute to greater cultural understanding.

### 7.3.3 Curricula experience

To establish a baseline for understanding members’ Māori Indigenous Knowledge learning experiences prior to joining the military, members were asked how much knowledge they thought they had prior to enlistment. Table 7.2 highlights how much Māori Indigenous Knowledge members perceived they had prior to joining the NZDF. This is followed by Table 7.3 which shows ‘how much Māori Indigenous Knowledge content was encountered on professional development courses during the last two years, and how this knowledge was reinforced, and experienced in the workplace.

**Table 7.2: Māori Indigenous Knowledge content prior to joining the NZDF**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Māori (N=15)</th>
<th>non-Māori (N=17)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>A little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=32

The most common response across both Māori and non-Māori respondents in answer to the question ‘how much Māori Indigenous Knowledge did you have prior to joining the NZDF? ’ was ‘a little’ or 59%. However, 8 out of 15, or over 50% of Māori indicated that they had either ‘some’ or ‘a lot’ of knowledge prior to joining
whereby, only 1 out of 17 of non-Māori members, or 0.06% felt that they had ‘some’ Māori Indigenous Knowledge prior to enlistment.

Nineteen members answered the question regarding the number of professional development courses they had been on in the last two years. Of these members, 10 indicated that they had been on between 2–4 courses, and 7 claimed they had been on fewer than two. One member said they had been on between 5–10, and 1 said over 10. Table 7.3 represents how much Māori Indigenous Knowledge content members said they had received during their courses in the last two years.

Table 7.3: Māori Indigenous Knowledge content received in the last two years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Māori content</th>
<th>Under 2 courses</th>
<th>2–4 courses</th>
<th>5–10 courses</th>
<th>Over 10 courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most of the time</td>
<td>3 (Te Reo)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=19

The majority, 12 members or 63%, of respondents stated that they had received ‘a little’ Māori Indigenous Knowledge content on the courses during the last two years. There were no significant differences between the services. Three members or 15% claimed they had received this training either ‘most of the time’ or ‘none’ at all, lastly followed by one member who stated he/she experienced Māori Indigenous Knowledge content on courses ‘often’. One non-Māori member commented that although he had received ‘a little’ Māori Indigenous Knowledge content during the
last two years, much is now forgotten; another member stated that he had not covered any Māori content on courses in the last two years.

7.3.4 Māori Indigenous Knowledge in the workplace

Members were asked to reflect on their military experiences to gain insight into how Māori Indigenous Knowledge was being experienced in the workplace. Responses were mixed with 3 members claiming they had experienced a ‘little – only on ceremonial occasions’ to many who conversed in Māori ‘some’ or ‘most of the time.’ Responses illustrated how Māori Knowledge was implemented in the workplace through language support, daily activities, in parades and ceremonies, deployment farewells, return parades, and overseas handovers. Members were mostly aware of the bicultural policies, and knew their service haka (war dance) with the exception of the lateral transfer members from overseas. The majority of members stated they had encountered Māori perspectives during training, attestation, and promotion courses, particularly during tangi (funeral) services, historical events, and command level courses. Information was available on intranet sites, in booklets for the workplace, in hymns, waiata (songs) and Marae history booklets and on the overnight bicultural awareness, ‘noho Marae,’ and Māori weaponry courses. Members also experienced Māori perspectives during external study courses, including Māori war history lessons, belonging to a Māori Cultural Group (MCG), or doing kapa haka (cultural activities).

Reinforcing Indigenous non-competitive approaches to learning, the cultural groups were found to be extremely popular. As well as a Tri-service representative group, each service generally has its own body of personnel that attend national or international functions. Every unit, ship, or flight also has a MCG that can be called upon to attend, speak and perform at various military occasions. A common
complaint, however, was that some managers, not familiar with the bicultural policies, often due to not receiving the training themselves, were reluctant to release personnel for official practices or events. These events are considered part of MCG members’ ceremonial duties. As a consequence, some members reported that they often practised for official activities in their own time. A number of Māori members reported approved cultural practises are seen as a ‘waste of time’ and are therefore not supported.

This finding highlights one of the ways in which ‘contemporary colonialism’ (Cooper, 2012) is experienced within the military learning environment. Failure to take seriously the knowledge and identities of Indigenous people, is an expression of contemporary colonialism and institutionalised racism, and is one of the greatest challenges in today’s classrooms (Cooper, 2012; Kempf, 2006). Furthermore, institutionalised practices that are non-racialised essentially maintain racial inequality and they are what Bonilla-Silva and many others describe as new-racism where ‘… a selected and vetted segment of the minority population participates fully in the political system, which legitimizes the order racially and otherwise’ (Bonilla-Silva, 2015, pp. 1368–9). While a selected few people might be allowed to get to the top, too often education ignores the worldviews of Indigenous students, thus constituting and/or facilitating removal and alienation of Indigenous students from their communities (Egan, 2008; Fogarty, 2010; Hall, 1991; Kempf, 2006; Ma Rhea, 2004). Failure of managers to address these concerns maintains the dominant status quo and reinforces an assimilationist agenda (Freire, 2014; Hollinsworth, 2006; McConaghy, 2000; Rocha, 2012; Rowse, 2005; Smith, 2006; Smith, 1999b). This was evident in the comments made by two Māori participants as follows:
The worse thing associated with negative attitudes is their (commanders’) unwillingness/reluctance to allow the soldiers to attend activities. Time may see a difference – it will take some years (AMM#16).

We are not always trusted to make the decisions…we have to continually seek approval from the chain of command even when we are better placed to make these decisions (NMM#1).

The purpose of the bicultural policies was to address some of these issues, and support the Māori Cultural Advisors (MCA) in their roles. An extensive Māori support network exists that consists of the Māori Education Officers (MEO), the Māori Liaison Officers (MLO) and the Kaumātua. Each Service has its own Rūnanga (council) which is made up of the aforementioned members, the Chief of service, and the Chief of Defence Force (CDF). The MCAs were considered vitally important to the success of the initiatives as they ensure that the training occurs in accordance with the intent of the policies and that managers and personnel are supported in the workplace (CDF).

Before the formalisation of the policies, people were already conducting the roles, as an extra responsibility, so it formalised the process and added recognition and acknowledgment regarding the importance of our work (AFMM#11).

Initially, there was only one MCA position for the entire NZDF, but due to increased demand this number has grown to one member for each service, and one for the Headquarters Group.

**Intellectual property**

There were no issues mentioned with regard to the ownership of knowledge as the Rūnanga and the MEOs are considered fully qualified for the role. Where gaps in
knowledge exist for some of the specialist skills courses, such as the Māori weaponry training, or policy development, expert advice is sought from Te Puni Kōkiri (Ministry of Māori Development, the Crown’s principal adviser on Crown-Māori relationships and public policy development). Members involved in the instruction in some way indicated that they receive a ‘good level of support’ from the organisation, for example: ‘I have very strong support networks around me’ (NMM#1), and commented that it is very helpful when there are others within the training institutions, who are training for the MCA positions. However, reiterating the high demands and responsibilities attached to the MCA roles, it was noted that, while there does not seem to be a shortage of people keen to take the training, the positions are extremely high profile, and often members do not feel confident or have the management or communication skills required. The sense of pride and accomplishment Māori personnel experienced from an instructional perspective was evidenced in the following comments:

Understanding Māori creation narratives provides a strong foundation to work off … I feel a sense of accomplishment teaching these ideologies with others within the military … I have noticed that a lot more people have started to support more events that have a cultural component (NMM#15).

I have benefitted greatly. I joined the Army knowing only one Haka, a couple of waiata [songs] and a couple of Māori words … now I know a few more waiata, and Haka and a level of Te Reo that isn’t too bad … I can’t complain at all (AMM#16).

Now proud to learn and share our culture with others (NMN#11).

These comments suggest personnel are mostly well supported to learn Māori Knowledge within the institution. Organisational processes set up to support the
training, including the policies, instructor support, and the Rūnanga network appear to be highly effective at tapping into the wealth of knowledge that exists amongst personnel, and the extended community. The current formal lack of recognition for Māori Knowledge at the time of recruitment, however, is an area of concern and could be considered incommensurate with institutional and societal intent. Gaps in the training and lack of command support, which can perpetuate ‘resistance,’ were also highlighted as needing attention. More difficult challenges are discussed in the following section.

7.4 The difficulties

This section analyses some of the difficulties that have occurred, and in some cases continue to occur, with respect to Māori Indigenous Knowledge in military curricula. This includes data relating to cultural issues, epistemological dominance, discrimination and resistance, and also highlights underpinning concepts related to conflicting knowledge systems, command relationships, and instructor difficulties.

7.4.1 Cultural issues, discrimination, and resistance

Despite the commitment to promote New Zealand’s shared military heritage, an overseas visitor from Denmark openly criticised her cultural experience on a Defence Marae in 2013 that resulted in a racial furore amongst the New Zealand and Danish public (Pryor, 2013). During her visit to New Zealand, Danish right-wing politician Marie Krarup wrote a scathing account of her official Māori welcome ceremony onto the RNZN Marae in Auckland. In her article, Ms Krarup referred to Māori people, their traditions and hospitality in a negative and demeaning manner and described aspects of the NZDF cultural awareness training as ‘cultural self-annihilation’ or ‘grotesque’ multi-culturalism. She also commented that Māori
protocols and traditions are the ‘opposite’ of civilised (Mortensen, 2013). Ms Krarup’s comments not only offended her hosts and many New Zealanders, but resulted in the resurfacing of negative memories and stereotypical racist comments made to and about Māori people and their culture in the past. Racism was not an uncommon experience throughout the twentieth-century, as outlined in a letter written by Sir Peter Buck, one of the four Māori members of Parliament, to his friend in 1934:

Western culture has accepted as an axiom that any member of their race or races is superior by that very fact to any member of a Native race no matter how gifted that Native may be in his own culture … The Native is a fine fellow so long as he accepts an inferior position … (Sorrenson, 1988, p. 163).

Even though comments of this nature are generally not heard today (pers. comms with NZDF personnel, March 2013), this is not always the case. Returning a survey with Marie Krarup’s article attached, one NZDF member claimed, ‘This is how we are sometimes affected by some Euro cultures even when we go out of our way to be good generous hosts’ (pers.comms one NZDF member, April 2013). Prior to the implementation of the bicultural initiatives, Māori personnel were sometimes subjected to individual bouts of racism that ranged from derogatory name-calling to being given extra duties for no valid reason. ‘While these incidents have declined in recent years’ (long-serving members), attitudes of ‘cultural superiority’ and ‘resistance to change’ can surface within the organisation now and then. Highlighting the need for change, with reference to equality in education, Māori educator Professor Russell Bishop claims:

… the answers to Māori educational achievement and disparities do not lie in the mainstream, for given the past 150 years, mainstream
practices and theories have kept Māori in a subordinate position while creating a discourse that pathologized and marginalized Māori people’s lived experiences. … The answers lie in the sense-making and knowledge-generating processes of the culture that the dominant system has sought to marginalize for so long (Bishop, 2008, p. 457).

Race relations scholar David Hollinsworth (2006) also suggests there needs to be more focus on institutions, including structural relationships, class locations and access to resources (Smith, 1999a; Owen, 2007; Battiste, 2008). As Michelle Fine asks:

For if we do not dare to analyse the very institutions in which we work and the ways in which we and our colleagues are implicated in the production of racism and the propping up of whiteness, then how can we move beyond theory at its most hollow? How can we move toward transformation (Hollinsworth, 2006, p. 64)?

While some participants talked openly about their discriminatory experiences, stating that they were not just isolated incidents, others preferred to ‘leave it all behind’. One member, however, described a particularly disturbing event. After trying to diffuse an altercation caused by members refusing to carry out a direct order from a senior rank, the member was called to a commander’s office where he was wrongfully accused of starting the argument himself. He was told: ‘If I have any more problems from you “f.....g” natives, you will all be gone from here’ (NMM#7). Conversely, there were no non-Māori members in this study who reported any incidents of racial discrimination. Another Māori member noticed a marked improvement in attitudes after getting out of the military and re-joining, as the policies and training initiatives were being introduced (mid to late 1990s).
Despite the obvious changes, Māori often struggle to find autonomy where current neo-liberal education practices distort, or disregard, their worldview, instead asserting the myth that Indigenous peoples are peoples without knowledge (Cooper, 2012; Crawford, 1988; Kendall, 2006; Yosso, 2005). Much of the debate that has taken place on this topic in recent years has centred on the questions of what knowledge is, how it is produced, and controlled in contemporary institutions (Bishop, 2010; Gershon, 2008; Graham, 2009; Hikuroa et al. 2011; Jones & Jenkins, 2008; Tangaere & Twiname, 2011; Mahuika, 2011; Smith, 1990; Smith, 1999b). Highlighting the limitations of Western Knowledge, Māori Marsden (2003) articulates an entirely different theoretical approach that centralises abstract rational thought and subjective empirical methods.

Reiterating Hollinsworth’s concerns, Māori researcher Garrick Cooper (2012) writes that more needs to be done to challenge the underlying issues of ‘epistemological dominance’ that preside in Western institutions. In his article *Kaupapa Māori research: Epistemic wilderness as freedom*, 2012, Cooper discusses a recent trend to address Indigenous social justice concerns, which he refers to as the ‘culture thesis.’ The culture thesis has many discursive manifestations and antecedents. Cultural practices alone, such as the powhiri and kapa haka, for example, which have been embraced by many New Zealand institutions, are too often, perhaps, taken up on their ‘weakest terms’ (Cooper, 2012). Evidence of this lack of understanding at the ‘epistemological’ level is clear in the following statement:

> Our perspectives are different. We have things that are considered ‘spectacle’ versus ‘substance’. From a Māori perspective,

---

59 Māori welcome ceremony
substance always comes first. Unfortunately a lot of people don’t understand or respect that; they see the spectacle and not the substance. They don’t understand for example the ‘wero’ (challenge). They see just the jumping around and poking out of tongues etc. There is a lot more to it than that. It takes many years of training to be able to perfect that. So when we say ‘sorry, we can’t do that (because there is an entire protocol attached to that and we do not perform it after dark or if the karanga (call), the female welcome, hasn’t been completed first, they say ‘oh, that takes too long, we only want to see the other (spectacle) part (AFMM#11).

This extract asserts that while aspects of the ‘Māori culture’ may have been embraced on an individual, and institutional level, understanding the ‘substance’ of Māori knowledge at the philosophical level is somewhat left to chance. This was reinforced by another member who claimed: ‘Māori perspectives … will never be reduced to a narrow field of military training. The “whole” concept needs to be understood …’ (NMM#3). Thus, cultural practices on their own do not adequately challenge or critique issues of ‘epistemological dominance,’ but may inadvertently reinforce the myth that Māori, and other Indigenous minorities, are cultural bearers and not knowledge holders, or producers, in their own right (Cooper, 2012).

Relying on the culture thesis approach alone is problematic. This is because it could be perceived as tokenistic, or at the worst, as a contemporary expression of essentialism. Essentialism dates back to early ethnographers and anthropologists assessments of Indigenous peoples, where they were viewed under the microscope as ‘objects’ of study, or the exotic ‘other,’ and not as ‘subjects’ with their own knowledge systems and multiple perspectives of the world (Smith, 1999b). Cooper (2012) believes that ‘Culture has effectively become a code for race.’
Highlighting issues of race, three long-serving Māori members commented that they were often ‘directed’ to perform kapa haka for officers’ cocktail parties, in the past, and were expected to rehearse in their own time. When one member requested time from work to prepare for such an event, he was told to “stop being a bloody trouble-maker” and get back to work where he belonged (NMM#11). The following example suggests that this practice may still occur:

People trying to use rank and status to coerce Māori people to express their cultural practices to impress visitors at cocktail parties and chain of command ceremonies (NMM#3).

Participants felt that while incidents of ‘overt’ discrimination are gradually declining in New Zealand society, resistance and negative attitudes persist (AMM#16). This finding reinforces Professor Bell’s (1980) findings on the entrenched nature of racism in Western societies, and highlights the continued need to critique issues of individual, institutional and societal resistance. One societal example was the public outcry at an All Blacks World Cup match against England in 1999 when the first verse of the New Zealand national anthem was sung in Māori only, for the first time (NMM#11). Today, it is the norm for both versions to be sung, consecutively. Another individual example was made during a discussion with a member of a senior rank who had not participated in the Māori cultural training, or visited a Marae before. The member stated: ‘I would not feel comfortable on the Marae because I do not want someone else’s culture imposed on me; and I do not want to let go of my British heritage.’ It was clear that this member had not been involved in any of the bicultural initiatives and was therefore unable to consider the impacts of colonialism on New Zealand society (pers.comms with NZDF member and observations of the writer, March 2013).
It is also evident how little self-reflection occurred without appropriate education, for example, drawing on the work of Carrington, Hollinsworth (2006, p.171), contends ‘… The white community, its institutions, agencies, and cultural practices are conveniently removed from view and revision …’ rendering the unnamed norms of white respectability unmarked. Other comments relating to resistance related to personnel simply refusing to change: ‘they don’t see the benefits of Indigenous Knowledge.’ Cooper (2012) finds resistance to change is an example of the epistemological dominance common in Western institutions and is how colonialism supports and sustains itself in the twenty-first century (Smith, 1999b; Tomlins-Jahnke, 2011; Owen, 2007; O’Sullivan, 2007; Arbon, 2008). More examples of epistemological dominance can be found in the following examples:

There are a lot of elements that are difficult for non-Māori to accept (AMM#9; AFMM#11; NMM#11).

We have had issues where legal branch has declared a proposal as unlawful, whereas it is in keeping with Māori customs - for example the seating of females on the paepae (visitors’ seats), separate from the men (NMM#11).

Some difficulties convincing command that it (the knowledge and the training) is not tokenism…for example, fear of the unknown, lack of prior knowledge leads to assumptions that it is imposed (AMM#17).

Nothing can be gained from hiding it away (differing views); it needs to be out there. I was asked to address the Women’s Forum regarding issues relevant to our women and the seating of women separately on the paepae was one of the issues they asked me to explain. It is only difficult because people do not understand. Once you explain it in a way they can understand, we can work from there. Our people are intelligent people and if you can explain
things properly, they are generally willing to accept. However, in saying that, there are issues that will continue to be contentious and therefore will continue to need explanation. Now a lot more women have gone up in the ranks and they are our greatest allies in terms of explaining things and selling them to the rest... (AFMM#11).

7.4.2 Command relationships

Another difficulty that emerged within the experience of Māori participants related to that of command relationships. Command relationships based on hierarchical controlling mechanisms are generally not found within Indigenous societies, where respect for Elders usually outweighs the wearing of rank:

The Defence perspective is not always similar to the Māori perspective, such as in the case where the best skilled people are not necessarily the ones with rank, for example some lower ranks are SMEs in Māori Indigenous Knowledge, but commanders generally only like to deal with members of sergeant, or warrant officer rank, and even then they may resist advice from the MCAs (AFMM#11).

Sometimes hierarchy who are either resistant to change or are unfamiliar with policies do not place importance on MCG activities, eg will not release staff; reference to policies can help but it is much preferred if the COC is familiar and supportive (NMM#11).

Fear of ‘non-performance’ was another concern. It was suggested that some Māori personnel might be ‘fearful’ because they were suddenly expected to ‘know everything, where government policies and practices had actively discouraged Māori identity in the past. These members might feel inadequate or ill prepared to teach others, or engage in the training initiatives at all. While many have overcome this ‘fear,’ it was suggested that perhaps others had not (AMNM#5):
It took time to help them through the lack of understanding. It was a conflict not against each other, but some Māori were against it because of past (negative) experiences. So it was a conflict of interest … is the Army going too far? (AMNM#6).

The majority of members said that they ‘had not’ experienced any negative incidents. Reiterating some of the above concerns, however, a few members felt they had experienced a ‘negative or difficult experience’ due to feeling insecure about ‘lack of prior knowledge,’ (three members), negative feedback from non-Māori, exploitation of Māori goodwill, and/or lack of respect for cultural activities by commanders (three comments each). One comment referred to ‘disagreeability of Māori spirituality,’ and two related to ‘Marae’ protocols/admin’:

at times being made to feel ‘lower’ about the lack of knowledge (fear of non-performance) (AFFNM#6).

Some negative feedback from ‘white people’ (AFNM#1).

Cultural practices to impress visitors at cocktail parties and change of command ceremonies (three comments).

Disagreeable spiritual practices that have to be observed – have to take off shoes because of holy site [Marae] – Māori spirituality carries negative spirit - Hakas are aggressive and give sad feeling – As long as spiritually disagreeable content is not forced, or is optional, then I don’t mind. Because my own religion is not tolerant of worshipping other gods/showing those other gods respect, I find it uncomfortable/disagreeable. The reality is that all cultures are not tolerable of one another, so there will not be unity unless compromises are made (AFMN#3).

People assuming that the Marae is just a place to ‘hang out and relax’ … without considering the amount of hard work and effort that goes into the many official welcomes we are committed to, and public relations etc (NMM#15).
There are some things that could be done better like explaining/translating speeches by fluent speaking people to the majority of non-Māori speaking people, this includes visitors (AMM#3).

### 7.4.3 Instructor difficulties

From an instructional perspective, some instructors noted the following areas of difficulty:

- Lack of (middle) command support
- Awareness of trying not to provide too much information
- Monocultural views
- Just being aware that Māori language and beliefs may well be foreign to a lot of people (NMM#15).

Instructional variances for example, I have seen people at the Marae trying to teach protocols their way rather than the proper way … The Māori topics taught within the NZDF have practical application, for example, welcoming, farewelling visitors/contingents etc. However, using Māori within the training environment is not common practice (AMM#3).

Three instructors involved with the Māori cultural training commented that they sometimes had people on the training courses at the lower rank who have very little experience in Tikanga Māori, but this was generally not the norm. “The younger soldiers joining now are noticeably more accepting than those nearing the end of their careers” (AMM#16). On a recent course, the instructors advised that only two people out of a group of 60+ opted out of performing the haka at the march-out parade, but later regretted their decision as they felt that they did not belong.
7.4.4 Areas for improvement

This section argues that a greater appreciation of cultural diversity fosters ‘respect’ and understanding of difference. When members were asked about areas of improvement for the training, all replies were constructive and free from any discriminatory or derogatory remarks. The majority of personnel felt that the area which required most improvement was the ‘lack of confidence,’ due to ‘no,’ or ‘little’ prior knowledge at the start of their careers. To improve the success of the training, it was considered necessary that all members, across all ranks, particularly middle management and lateral transfers, were provided with opportunities to participate in the training.

The second area of concern was the issue of non-Māori ‘resistance’. However, again it was suggested that this was likely due to ‘gaps in the training’ and/or lack or exposure to real life experiences. The third area was ‘lack’ of chain of command support:

Changeover in command structure can affect support for training initiatives and leave gaps in specific training such as the ‘whaikorero’ for senior officers and warrant officers. We have not seen some of the higher commanders’ courses for a while (AMM#9).

Pākehā feeling Pākehā guilt – so ‘not knowing’ some cultural things – ignorance can be negatively responded to so we don’t want to engage for ‘fear of offending ... the environment must be safe for people to explore their prejudices/lack of knowledge – anyone teaching Indigenous knowledge should not penalise someone for asking a ‘dumb’ question/ignorant question because ‘you don’t know what you don’t know (AFMNM#9).
Some negative attitudes are overcome because they are considered not the ‘norm’; however, some do just not want to know. I suppose you can’t do much about that ... they are only a few... but it does knock peoples’ confidence like in the old days (AMM#14).

This section has highlighted some of the difficulties experienced in the journey to include Māori Indigenous Knowledge in the NZDF. While some issues such as discrimination and cultural superiority issues have been overcome to an extent, others such as resistance and epistemological dominance remain. The positive influence that the training is having on the learning experience overall is explored in the following section.

7.5 How does Māori Indigenous Knowledge in military curricula support NZDF bicultural policies and national efforts towards biculturalism?

Biculturalism is a gateway to other cultures: it helps us to interact with other groups (AMNM#5).

I believe that this has the biggest impact for the military. Our bicultural training focus does translate to New Zealanders being more open to other cultures, ways of doing business and negotiating with others (AFNM#9).

This section explores the respondents’ views regarding whether, or not, they felt their training had enhanced their worldview, and whether this was viewed as supporting institutional and national efforts towards biculturalism.

7.5.1 Enhancement of Māori worldview

All 32 respondents who discussed the question regarding the enhancement of Māori Indigenous worldview as a result of NZDF curricula had experienced an increase in their knowledge or ability to appreciate Māori culture as a result of their
training. Members who had ‘a little’ knowledge to begin with experienced the biggest growth of knowledge and said that they felt they had learnt ‘a lot’: 9 out of 32, or 25%. This was distributed fairly evenly across personnel: 4 Māori and 5 non-Māori. However, 2 non-Māori members who began with ‘no’ prior knowledge also indicated an increase to ‘some’ and 2 others felt they had moved from ‘no’ prior knowledge to ‘a little’. Two Māori members who started with ‘a lot’ of prior knowledge indicated that they had learnt ‘a lot,’ but by contrast, 2 Māori members who said they had started with ‘a lot’ of knowledge felt that they had learnt only ‘a little.’ Table 7.5 indicates the level of Māori Indigenous Knowledge members said they had obtained as a result of the inclusion of Māori Indigenous Knowledge in the NZDF curricula.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Māori (N=15)</th>
<th>non-Māori (N=17)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lot</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=32  Largest increase in knowledge

Table 7.5: Enhancement of Māori Worldview

Showing how New Zealand society is more likely to be ‘culturally accepting’ than other societies throughout the world, the Global Peace Index 2010 rated New Zealand as ‘the most peaceful country’ in the world (Macionis & Plummer, 2012 p. 558), while in 2014, the NZDF was ranked best in the world for its diversity issues (see NZDF Press Release, February 2014). In answer to the question, ‘has the inclusion of Māori Indigenous Knowledge in military education and training assisted you in other ways, for example, on overseas deployments working with different cultural groups, foreign nationals, military or civilians in stability or peacekeeping operations?’ the responses were predominantly affirmative amongst both non-Māori,
and Māori, where very little difference was found. While members who had deployed found their training particularly useful overseas, one member commented that the level of empathy and understanding that NZDF personnel exhibit cannot be attributed to the training alone:

I don’t think that it can be all attributed to current training as the NZ soldier is a product of the society he originated from. However, I believe that we have an understanding and empathy for others of different races/cultures, which can assist us to be more effective when dealing with them. This means we are more likely to be accepted/tolerated than some other nations (AMM#3).

Overall, however, the findings suggest that the training may assist military personnel to have a greater level of ‘cultural understanding’ than the general population, therefore, a higher chance of achieving biculturalism compared to other organisations.

I believe that this has the biggest impact for the military. Our bicultural training focus does translate to NZers being more open to other cultures and ways of doing business and ‘negotiating with others (AFMNM#9).

Yes, absolutely in formal ceremonies and understanding and offering my limited knowledge. Travelled to UK to visit a community that cared for Māori Battalion sick and wounded in WW II, an inspiring experience (AFFNM#6).

Definitely makes you approach and appreciate other cultures differently. This makes it easier to assimilate with another culture when you are overseas. Helps build empathy (AFFNM#8).

Yes, when working overseas, our Māori personnel get on easy with different cultures, so we have an advantage both civilian and military. Everyone wants to make friends with the kiwis – other
cultures such as Samoans and Rarotongans also feel more comfortable (AFMN#4).

It is a gateway to other cultures (AMNM#10).

Very much so, I have been on many operational deployments where being culturally aware has been very helpful (NMM#1).

It helps with breaking down barriers with foreign nationals, especially non-Western countries (NMM#3).

It is NZ’s point of difference; RNZN personnel have a better understanding of other cultures when deployed (NMM#3).

One thing about Kiwis is that they are very patriotic; when we are in other countries, we stick together and wave the NZ flag...the uniting factor is the Māori culture... you can talk about being brothers in arms but the Māori culture just takes that one step further; you are part of the same iwi and it is this aspect that opens doors for other Indigenous people (AFMM#11).

Members frequently talked about how the Māori culture was seen as a source of strength and unity, and a great way to increase morale amongst the troops.

### 7.5.2 Improved learning experience

In response to the question ‘Do you think the use of Māori Indigenous Knowledge in military education and training “improves” the learning experience of all members: why or why not?’ the response again was very positive, with 32 out of 34 or 94% saying ‘yes’ with one non-Māori and one Māori member claiming ‘no’. The following statements are typical of the comments provided by personnel who support the claim that Māori Indigenous Knowledge improves the learning of ‘most’ members:
It expands students understanding / worldview … there is more than one way to do business.

Opens up new learning experiences and opportunities.

Getting together and performing kapa haka was a way to uplift our spirits and get on with the difficult job at hand. Anyone was welcome to join in and sometimes the Pākehā blokes would come and sing along too; it was a way of breaking down barriers and kept us going (NMM#7).

… it enriches our lives and makes us better people; it establishes our relationships and connections to others (AMM#14).

In order to enhance the learning experience, one member claimed ‘...the student or candidate must be open and willing to learn about new teachings and about Māori Indigenous Knowledge’. This is a particularly relevant point that was raised by members who claimed that unfortunately, a lot of people base their opinions on ‘what they believe’ or on negative stereotypical assumptions, rather than in-depth education from credible sources, or personal experience (senior members). The following comment confirms what can be achieved with an ‘open mind’ and a genuine ‘willingness to learn’. A new RNZN naval lieutenant commander describes his family’s experience on the Marae ‘after making a conscious decision’ to embrace the Māori culture:

On our arrival to New Zealand we were given a Powhiri, a welcome ceremony, at the Royal New Zealand Navy’s Te Taua Moana Marae. The uniqueness of the experience, coupled with our interest opened up valuable world of rich discoveries. Two weeks later we joined the kapa haka cultural group at the Marae. For the first time in our lives we found ourselves amidst the beautiful Māori language, its people and customs – and our world truly expanded … (Fleissner, 2009, p. 19).
Heeding the advice of another senior member: ‘The biggest thing I guess I could say about anyone who was considering embarking on a similar journey is ... do not expect things to happen overnight. It’s a slow process, and you’ve just got to be prepared for that’ (AFMM#11). The concerns provided by the two members who felt that overall the training had not ‘enhanced’ their learning experience are provided below:

Most New Zealanders are immigrants or non-Māori and aren’t interested especially as it’s not an international culture. Some aspects of Māori culture are disagreeable, so have negative impact on some people’s learning (AFMNM#3).

Not necessarily improves the learning experience. However is used during funerals, greetings, formal welcomes, farewells and utilised overseas. ... Sometimes it makes Māori more comfortable, but conversely can make non-Māori uncomfortable (AMM#3).

While the statement that most New Zealanders are immigrants might be partly true, the comment that non-Māori ‘aren’t interested’ in the Māori culture is not reinforced by the majority of participants. Coincidently, both members who provided these comments, identified they would like to learn more Māori Indigenous Knowledge in certain areas such as ‘culture and traditions’ and ‘Māori military involvement.’ They also stated that the training had enhanced their learning ‘a little’. As shown in this section, forging ‘stronger relationships and connections’ between Māori and non-Māori personnel by including Māori Indigenous Knowledge in military curricula was found to be particularly useful for establishing a shared identity, which is a fundamental component for achieving biculturalism. Achieving a shared identity is also a critical objective of the ADF.
7.6 The benefits

We are encouraged to practise biculturalism – let’s do it (NMM#3).

In addition to the benefits already discussed, this section explores personal experiences and the benefits Māori Indigenous Knowledge can have for the organisation as a whole. Themes from the data have been grouped under concepts relating to ‘improved cultural identity, respect, organisational pride, and what members would like to see more of.’ The bulk of this data came from the surveys, SMEs and MCA discussions and is represented in Table 7.6.

Table 7.6: Most valuable individual benefits of learning Māori Indigenous Knowledge in the NZDF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural identity, self-esteem and pride</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Marae protocols and history</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity, acceptance of others, sense of belonging and appreciating other’s viewpoint</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori military history and war-fighting strategies</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treaty of Waitangi and significance with the bicultural policies</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language skills</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to Service, unique identity including haka and esprit de corps</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased level of confidence in Māori Knowledge</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.6.1 Shared identity

The most frequent response to do with the benefits that derive from the formal acknowledgement and teaching of Māori Indigenous Knowledge in the workplace were ‘enhanced pride’ and the ability to ‘share the best of both cultures’. In other
words, the training has helped to establish a ‘shared military identity,’ which in turn enhances a positive image of New Zealand as a bicultural society. Evidence that supports this finding can be seen in the following statements:

It shows how the NZ identity came about and believe also gives another avenue for people to move to at varying times (AFFNM#7).

It is inclusive of a minority group that is an [sic] important area of New Zealand's culture and identity (AFMNM#10).

Now all personnel can feel the love, warmth and beauty of the Māori culture and language that is unique to NZ (NMM#15).

Gives the NZDF a point of difference, an identity, a bond (NMMN#1).

It opens doors with regard to other cultures overseas, a lot of cultures overseas look at us and see that we are a country that embraces diversity and embraces our own Indigenous culture – people see that and find that it is a lot more easier to interact with us Kiwis because the unique nature of our culture is easily identified (AFMM#11).

Two Pacific Islander members claimed that the Māori cultural training part of their course was extremely beneficial in that it helped them to embrace the NZDF identity, and gain a sense of belonging to the organisation. Members described the sense of ‘belonging,’ combined with a ‘better understanding about others,’ promotes a workplace underpinned by the principle of respect. For example: ‘First knowing and understanding each other’ and ‘finding out who we are, where we came from, and where we are going’ was considered very important (AFMNM#9). For Māori members, in particular, the training has resulted in increased participation through ‘opportunities’ to learn and share their inner knowledge with others:
It has allowed me to learn many new skills about my own culture, and pass these skills on to others. I have seen a complete change over the last 30 years – (we) were made to feel embarrassed in the past. It raises personal confidence to have something to share with others that is now respected (NMM#11).

Traditions and unique cultural identity, upholding values of sailors and Māori cultural values … (And teaching these to others). The Marae has always been a place of refuge that has been close to my heart since 2000, I have supported (the Marae) and staff since the beginning and it has given me strength in many ways, spiritually, physically, intellectually (NMM#15).

Māori people are a warrior race; they have a lot to offer in terms of war-fighting (AFMNM#3).

7.6.2 Respect

The second and third most popular aspects from the training were to do with the enhancement of knowledge about Marae history and protocols, as well as respecting others’ differences and opinions. ‘Respect for others’ is a common goal for achieving biculturalism and reconciliation and is of particular relevance for military personnel working in multi-national situations. Highlighting perhaps that there may still be a lack of Māori personnel at the higher command level, two senior members summarised their views:

It is good to see the young people want to learn, especially the Pākehā ... we help the commanders and they are very respectful to us. We say “no Sir, or no Ma’am, we think it is best this way because of this, or that; and we work it out together. In the old days, no one would listen and pay us respect ... it is all different now (AMM#14).
I have been fortunate enough to be involved in the cultural awareness programs and seen that it has opened a lot of eyes – to see the changes in attitudes from the start to where they are at [sic] the end for a lot of people. It’s not that New Zealanders are anti the culture or anything; it’s just that a lot of people base their opinion on what they believe. But our people are very open-minded, very intelligent people ... as long as you give them facts and back it up, they not only will accept what it is that you have to say, but on most occasions they will embrace it as well (AFMM#7).

Conversely, during conversations with other senior members, it was noted that ‘respect for others’ was not always evident when working amongst ADF personnel. Separate incidents were described where some ADF members exhibited discriminatory behaviour towards members from different cultural groups during operational activities, and reinforces some of the comments made by ADF members themselves (see Chapter 6). These findings are particularly concerning as they have been previously identified in the literature (see Chapter 1–4) resulting in loss of self-esteem and a disinclination on the part of Indigenous Australians to consider or continue a career in the ADF (Hall, 1991). It also reiterates Professor Bell’s Interest Convergence Theory by highlighting the permanence of race-based ideologies in Western societies.

Meanwhile, the ‘respect’ that has resulted from the Māori cultural training was illustrated by non-Māori members below:

How to be accepted onto the Marae and the understanding so you do not offend your hosts (non-Māori member).

Learning the protocols makes you feel more confident, being on the Marae and learning the history … am now more comfortable about not knowing the basics (non-Māori member).
Opens minds to different perspectives, encourages people to start thinking about experiences outside their own (non-Māori member).

Helps use another perspective to view problems, issues and creates empathy for others. May find better ways to do jobs, approach relationships across the military and also in deployment situations (non-Māori member).

Exposure to other cultures and encourages members to have an open mind (non-Māori member).

Improves operational effectiveness of unit through better understanding of cultural differences (non-Māori member).

Teaches you to be respectful of the culture and keeping it alive, developing awareness of all areas of the culture … (in) formal events – exposure to other organisations throughout the world and within NZ…the embracing display of cultural diversity and inclusion (non-Māori member).

The Treaty and the subsequent benefits of the bicultural policies were frequently mentioned. ‘It provides another aspect of identity for RNZAF to be proud of, and also shows the relevance between the Defence and the Treaty of Waitangi’ (AFMNM#10). Other areas considered important were: diversity, language, commitment to service, and increased levels of confidence:

Understanding the way people think who have developed in a climate with different resources and technology, also the war-fighting strategies and ethos … and generally an understanding and empathy for others (AFMNM#3).

The ability to attend tertiary studies to learn how to speak Māori language has allowed me the opportunity to learn many new skills, which have also been taken up by others … (Māori and non-Māori members)
Greatly improves unity and fosters understanding amongst personnel (Māori and non-Māori members)

Proud to belong to an organisation that is seen as forward moving (Māori and non-Māori members)

We are now respected for who we are rather than what others would like us to be (Māori member)

Provides an all-inclusive involvement of Māori and ... ensures strong identity and culture (non-Māori member)

Cohesiveness, enables others to feel they can express who they are as individuals - respect for other's ideas (Māori and non-Māori members)

Focus more on the people rather than the machine … (Māori member).

7.6.3 Organisational pride

According to one Kaumātua, the organisational benefits of learning Māori Indigenous Knowledge in the NZDF are ‘huge.’ All members, particularly members who had been overseas including the CDF, supported this statement wholeheartedly. Providing a case in point during the handover of the NZDF MCA at Defence Headquarters in Wellington, the CDF described an incident where the MCG was instrumental in dispelling potential hostilities between the crew of a New Zealand naval vessel and a group of Papua New Guinean villagers. Obviously unsure of the reasons why a military vessel was attempting to berth in their shores, villagers brandishing weapons gestured animatedly for the ship to leave. The commander, not about to abort the mission, made an executive decision to send forward members of the MCG who performed a cultural routine to show no hostilities were intended. Recounting the incident with members of the crew and the CDF, it was stated that
while the situation was ‘potentially dangerous,’ hostilities were avoided by using a ‘culturally appropriate approach’:

(The culture) … brings people together and makes the organisation stronger, others see us in a positive light, if we can work well together ourselves, other nations are more comfortable about working with us … it opens doors … (AMM#17 pers. comm.).

The ability to diffuse potential hostile situations through increased cultural understanding provides a distinct military advantage and is becoming increasingly important for Western militaries (Cowen, 2008; Phillips and Scherr, 2009; Scoppio, 2007). Being able to work ‘cohesively’ utilising the strengths of all personnel is also one of the reasons the bicultural policies were established. The findings in this section provide further evidence that suggests the teaching and learning of Indigenous Knowledge in military curricula capitalises and develops the strengths of all NZDF personnel, and establishes a sense of ‘pride and identity’ in the military. Organisational morale and operational effectiveness have therefore become the ‘key drivers’ of the policies:

Particularly on deployments. It is one point of difference that NZ does very well in comparison to the bigger countries such as the USA, England, Australia and France. The local population can normally relate to another language and is especially apparent with children who call out, “Kia ora, Kiwi” … By implementing some of the key aspects of Māori culture supports our national identity and is also a way of drawing New Zealanders together – you can’t help but notice the feeling when a Haka breaks out – it belongs to them – a unique identifier that separates us from other air forces, armies and navies around the world (AFMM#11).
Improves operational effectiveness of unit through better understanding of cultural differences (AFMNM#5).

Comments relating to the ‘organisational benefits’ included: increased values, improved motivation, unified spirited aggression (haka), better team environment, awareness, empathy, and understanding for others, and fostered inclusion, to name a few. Comments that related to ‘operational effectiveness’ included: an increased knowledge base, provided positive relations with other organisations, set standards for others, created harmony, increased out-puts (better ways of doing things), and enhanced recruiting and retention benefits:

Embracing our Māori Indigenous culture and teaching it to all personnel is fundamentally important and it encourages other cultures to join our organisation; we are now finding that we have a lot more Samoan and Pacific Islanders joining than in the past. How can we expect a new Leading Air Craftsman from the Niue Islands to join an organisation that has not embraced its own Indigenous culture? (AFMM#7).

Members were also asked if they thought that Māori Indigenous Knowledge and education methodologies were valued in the NZDF and whether or not this supported equal opportunity legislation. All members agreed that the NZDF valued Māori Indigenous Knowledge within the NZDF; however, one member commented that Māori education methodologies are not ‘fully understood,’ highlighting again the issues of epistemological dominance and ruling relations (see section 7.4), while another member said only ‘practical, social, and some economic practices were valued’. This finding suggests that neo-liberal influence and human capital theories govern the ways in which education is seen primarily as a key factor in economic
growth. Other comments ranged from ‘absolutely, command supported and fed down’ to ‘yes, however, a lot more awareness and education is required in my opinion’ (non-Māori member). This was further supported by a Māori member who stated, ‘Even though it is a changing environment where some members of the NZDF have embraced Māori Indigenous Knowledge, others are still resistant.’ For example, one non-Māori member said, ‘Yes, as long as it is not compulsory.’ Overall, the majority of comments, both Māori and non-Māori, mentioned that Māori Indigenous Knowledge provides many benefits to the workplace: ‘NZ is a multicultural country and Māori culture is a part of our history.’ Reiterating the importance of the initiatives and allaying Cooper’s (2012) fears about potential issues of tokenism, after leading a kapa haka performance, a female non-Māori officer claimed: ‘… It’s just what we do around here; it is the norm’ (NNM#12 pers. comm.).

**What members would like to see ‘more’ of in their training?**

Thirty-one members responded to the question ‘What Māori Indigenous Knowledge would you like to learn more about?’ There were nine choices (see below). Members chose between one and seven areas with 14 responses indicating that they would like more coverage in all areas (with the exceptions of ‘none’ and ‘other’). The area most popular was ‘cultural traditions’ receiving 26 votes, followed closely by ‘war-fighting strategies’ with 25 and ‘medicinal knowledge’ third with 24 votes. The area least chosen was ‘Indigenous survival techniques’ with 9 votes. The responses are represented in Table 7.7.

---

60 See *Academic Networks and Neoliberal Economics* (Stewart-Harawira, 2005, pp. 102–104) for a brief analysis of the literature and the impacts of globalization on education and the market economy.
Table 7.7: What members would like to see ‘more’ of in their training?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural traditions</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori war-fighting strategies</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori medicinal knowledge</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori Indigenous environmental knowledge</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori military involvement</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Māori Indigenous Knowledge</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori Indigenous survival techniques</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This section has explored the benefits of Māori Indigenous Knowledge in the NZDF and enquired into what aspects of Māori Indigenous Knowledge members would like to see more of in their training. Emergent themes related to the benefits of ‘shared identity, respect, and organisational pride’. Participants indicated that they would like to see ‘more’ knowledge about cultural traditions and Māori war-fighting strategies included in their training. The comments suggest that current NZDF initiatives are, on the whole, improving the learning experiences of the majority of members.

7:7 Conclusion

There are few examples of nations proactively recognising the importance of the knowledge of Indigenous peoples within education (Ma Rhea, 2004). As has been highlighted throughout this chapter, however, the NZDF learning environment is one such example. By upholding the principles of the Treaty and redefining the
organisation to reflect its shared military heritage, the NZDF is committed to serving the interests of the New Zealand government and its people. Through formal and informal measures coordinated through the service bicultural policies, Māori Indigenous Knowledge is being successfully included in various NZDF contexts, and has impacted positively on the learning experiences of the participants in this study.

The findings are seen to be directly related to improved organisational morale and operational effectiveness, which provide a useful framework for understanding the benefits that derive from the inclusion of Indigenous Knowledge systems in military curricula. Owing to the pervasive nature of colonialism, however, some members commented that there were still a few renegade attitudes that surface within the organisation now and then. This finding is consistent with Professor Derek Bell’s Interest Convergence Theory (ICT) and the continuing presence of racism and discrimination in Western societies (see Chapter 1). Nonetheless, participants considered incidents of individual racism to be ‘rare,’ and felt that this was likely to be attributed to the Māori cultural training. Some mentioned that there was still a long way to go before the NZDF would achieve biculturalism, and commented that efforts to include Māori Indigenous Knowledge in the NZDF would not have occurred without leverage gained from the Treaty and the bicultural policies. Highlighting the perseverance of Māori resistance to Western education practices and reinforcing the principles underpinned in the ICT (see 1.4), progress was only made, for instance, when the dominant society realised that benefits could be gained by capitalising on the informal teaching and learning of tikanga Māori that was already taking place within the organisation to align with Crown Treaty responsibilities. This chapter has found that there are numerous individual, organisational and societal advantages that result from embedding Indigenous
Knowledge in military curricula. Actualising the hermeneutic qualities of Makere Stewart-Harawira’s metaphor of the spiral (see Chapter 1), these findings are reinforced by members from a remote Indigenous community in the Northern Territory, in the final analysis chapter.
Appendix 1 to Chapter 7 - Survey instrument for NZDF members

1. In which NZDF service are you currently employed?
   Army full-time □    Air Force full-time □    Navy full-time □
   Army Territorials □    Air Force reserves □    Naval reserves □

2. Do you identify as a person of Māori descent?
   Yes □    No □

3. Do you speak Māori language as your first language?
   Yes □    No □

4. Is the use of Māori language encouraged in the NZDF?
   Yes □    No □

5. How are Māori language and Indigenous Knowledges included in military education and training?

6. How often do you speak Māori language during NZDF work hours?
   □ never    □ a little    □ often    □ all the time

7. Do you think the use of Māori/Indigenous Knowledges in education and training improves the learning experience of all members?
   Yes □    No □ Why or why not?

8. What sex are you?
   male □    female □

9. Please tick the appropriate box to indicate your age.
   □ under 18    □ 18-30    □ 31-43    □ 44-56    □ over 57

10. How long have you served in the NZDF?
    □ under 2 years    □ 2-5 years    □ 5-10 years    □ 10-15 years
    □ 15-20 years    □ over 20 years

11. As a student, how many NZDF professional development courses have you completed in the last two years?
    □ under 2    □ 2-4    □ 5-10    □ over 10

12. On average, as a student, how much time was spent on your courses learning Māori/Indigenous Knowledge content in the last two years?
    □ none    □ a little    □ often    □ most of the time

13. What Māori/Indigenous Knowledge content would you like to learn more about during your NZDF career? (tick as many as you like)
    □ none    □ local Māori/Indigenous knowledge    □ culture and traditions
    □ Indigenous survival techniques    □ Indigenous military involvement
    □ Indigenous war fighting strategies    □ Indigenous medicinal knowledge
    □ Indigenous environmental knowledge
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Instructors only

(If you are not employed as an NZDF instructor, please go to question 20.)

14. As an instructor, how many NZDF courses have you instructed on during the last two years?
   □ under 2 □ 2-4 □ 5-10 □ over 10

15. As an instructor in the last two years how much time was spent instructing in Māori or using adaptations of Māori/Indigenous Knowledge content, including Māori/Indigenous Knowledge methodologies or perspectives?
   □ none □ a little □ often □ most of the time

16. Can you describe some of your experiences in teaching/instructing in Māori/Indigenous Knowledge in the military? For example, what support do you receive, if any?

17. As an instructor, what do you think are some of the advantages of including Māori/Indigenous Knowledges in military education and training?

18. As an instructor, what have been some of the difficulties of including Māori/Indigenous Knowledge in military education and training?

19. Who is responsible for the curriculum development and maintenance of Māori perspectives in NZDF education and training?

All participants

20. As a student, how much Māori/Indigenous Knowledge did you have prior to joining the NZDF?
   □ none □ a little □ some □ a lot

21. Has the inclusion of Māori/Indigenous Knowledge in military education and training enhanced your understanding of Māori/Indigenous worldview and your ability to appreciate Māori culture?
   □ none □ a little □ some □ a lot

22. Has the inclusion of Māori/Indigenous worldview in military education and training assisted you in other ways, for example, on overseas deployments working with different cultural groups, foreign nationals, military or civilians in stability and peacekeeping operations?

23. Overall, based on your individual educational experiences in the NZDF, what have you found most interesting and beneficial about learning Māori Indigenous Knowledge in military education and training: why?

24. What organisational benefits do you feel result from the inclusion of Māori perspectives in military training?

25. Overall, based on your individual educational experiences in the NZDF, can you describe any negative experiences you have had regarding the inclusion of Māori Indigenous Knowledge in military education and training? Can you provide comments on how these could be improved?
Recruitment experience

26. Overall, was your recruitment experience satisfactory?

Yes □  No □  (please provide a comment if you wish)

27. If you identified as someone of Māori descent in Question 3, apart from identifying as such, were you granted any recognition, during the recruiting process, for any Indigenous Knowledge and experience you have, either formal or informal?

□ none  □ a little  □ some  □ a lot

28. If you answered yes to Question 3, were you able to have an interpreter with you to assist you during the interview process?

Yes □  No □  (please provide a comment if you wish)

29. Do you think Māori Indigenous Knowledge and education methodologies are valued in the NZDF?

Yes □  No □  (please provide a comment if you wish)

30. Do you think the inclusion of Indigenous Knowledge and learning through appropriate Māori Indigenous education methods in the NZDF supports NZ’s Equal Employment Opportunity legislation and diversity in the workplace?

Yes □  No □  Why or why not?

Thank you for your support. Your feedback is valued.
Appendix 2 to Chapter 7- Survey instrument 2 for NZDF subject matter experts

1. When is Indigenous Knowledge (IK) or adaptations of IK most commonly used in NZDF education and training?

2. What were the main reasons for including IK in NZDF education and training, for example Acts, legislation, Government initiatives?

3. How long has the NZDF been actively including IK in its education and training practices and how was this organised?

4. What do you see as being the main organisational benefits for including IK in your training and has a deeper understanding of Māori IK assisted personnel on OSs deployments?

5. What individual benefits do you think accrue from the inclusion of IK in NZDF education and training?

6. What difficulties, if any, have been encountered from the inclusion of IK in NZDF education and training and how have these been dealt with? For example, overcoming negative attitudes, lack of resources, professional development for instructors, finances, accountability, curriculum development & maintenance, reporting progress etc?

7. Who teaches IKs? Are there any non-Indigenous members keen to instruct in this area and can you describe how your Service cultural performance groups are involved? Are non-Indigenous members encouraged to participate?

8. What IKs have been found to be inappropriate for inclusion in NZDF education and training and what improvement areas are foreseeable in the future?

9. How have IKs been adapted for your training purposes and who was involved in the decision-making processes and curriculum development?

10. What are your personal thoughts on the inclusion of IKs in military education and training and how has it benefited or not benefited your military training experiences overall?

11. Have there been any issues with regard to ownership of IK?

Other discussion points may include, but are not limited to, the following:

- What is the effect, if any, on the morale of personnel of teaching IK?
• What is the survival benefit of teaching IK? (Will IK continue to be included in training?)

• Do you draw on IK from cultures other than Māori?

• How has the NZDF employed IK in combat, or on deployment, situations?

• Is there a pre-recruitment course or pathway designed for Māori personnel with low academic qualifications, for example, under the ‘closing the gap’ initiatives?
Chapter 8

Indigenous Knowledge in military curricula: Yolŋu community participant perspectives (Analysis III)
8.1 Introduction

In the previous chapter, some of the benefits of centralising Indigenous Knowledge systems within the New Zealand Defence Force (NZDF) were discussed. Outside of this example there have been few studies exploring the potential benefits of Indigenous Knowledge systems in the Australian Defence Force (ADF). Drawing on the previous chapter, and highlighting the potential benefits ADF members perceive would result from including Indigenous Knowledge systems in military curricula, this chapter explores similar questions through interviews and discussions with 14 members from Galiwinku Community to elicit and record a Yolŋgu perspective on the topic. Galiwinku community in the Northern Territory (NT) of Australia has a long association with the Australian military. While relationships with the military and Galiwinku may be well established, the issue regarding the lack of Indigenous Knowledge systems in the ADF has never been formally addressed.

This chapter focuses on gathering data that answers the following questions:

- What aspects of Yolŋgu Knowledge might Galiwinku community be willing to share with the Australian military?
- What aspects of Yolŋgu Knowledge would benefit the military the most?

---

61 Balanda is a Yolŋgu word meaning pale skinned, non-Indigenous people, or a person.
Would the inclusion of Indigenous Knowledge systems in ADF curricula improve the learning experiences of all members?

What shared Indigenous Knowledge systems would help Indigenous people and the ADF meet the goals outlined in the Defence Reconciliation Action Plan (DRAP), and the Indigenous Employment Strategy (IES, see Australian Government Department of Defence)?

Some perceived difficulties are also examined. However, due to there being a multiplicity of Indigenous Knowledge systems, each with its own particular language base, dialect, ceremonies, traditions, and laws, and also due to the fact that no one Aboriginal voice exists in Australia, interviewing a group of voluntary participants from Galiwinku community provides just one example that can be drawn upon to understand an Indigenous perspective. The intent is that this will lead to a broader and perhaps more complete picture in the future by providing the basis for further research in different regions and amongst different tribal language groups. It is not meant to provide a definitive or descriptive outlook that represents the community or Yolŋu perspectives as a whole, but the aim is to provide a starting point from the viewpoint of the participants concerned.

8.2 Background

Galiwinku community is a traditional collectively owned Aboriginal community, located on Elcho Island, East Arnhem Land, in northern Australia. It is currently the largest Aboriginal community on the Island, where most of the residents either know someone who is/are currently in the military, or have worked for the military in the past. This makes Galiwinku community an ideal place to focus
this study. In 2010, the *Weekend Australian* news reporter Nicholas Rothwell labelled the Island a ‘magic’ island largely because of its remoteness and little-known whereabouts by the majority of non-Indigenous Australians (Rothwell, 2010). Despite the influence of missionaries in the twentieth-century, the Island is steeped in Aboriginal tradition. In the 1970s, transcultural psychiatrist John Cawte described it as a spiritual place, ‘… a world almost unknown to the missionaries and managers of the North’ (Rothwell, 2010). Figure 8.1 shows the locality of Arnhem Land situated in the NT, Australia.

![Map of Northern Territory](http://letsobtainayield.wordpress.com/about/)
Even though there has been a migration of people arriving on the Island in recent years, particularly since the establishment of the ‘homelands movement’ in the latter half of the twentieth-century, the majority of Islanders were born on the Island and identify belonging to the Yolŋgu clan groups (Rothwell, 2010). Figure 8.2 shows the position of Galiwinku Community, Elcho Island, in North-East Arnhem Land.

![Map of Arnhem Land showing Elcho Island, Northern Territory, Australia, 17 June 2014](http://letsobtainayield.wordpress.com/about/)

**Figure 8.2:** Map of Arnhem Land showing Elcho Island, Northern Territory, Australia, 17 June 2014, source adapted from http://letsobtainayield.wordpress.com/about/

In 2011, the population of Galiwinku was 2121. Figures indicated that 1890 or 89.1% people identified as Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander descent (ABS, 2011). There are over 20 known clan groups living on the Island with each group’s social organisation based around its own land area or country, song lines, ceremonies, and dialect. The predominant language spoken in Galiwinku is Djambarrpuyngu with figures suggesting that 87% of people speak Djambarrpuyngu as their first language (ABS Censusquickstata, 2011). Some Galiwinku residents can speak up to 12 different languages including Gupapuyngu, Galpu, Gumatj, Wangurri, Daatiwuy, as
well as English. Many adults on the Island are also highly skilled linguistic communicators and interpreters (see also Young, cited in Ball, 1991) whose language skills are increasingly sought after. However, English which is the language of instruction in the ADF is one of the least spoken languages on the Island. English is generally only used when in the company of non-Indigenous people who have a limited understanding of the Yolŋgu dialects. The current lack of recognition of Indigenous languages in the ADF was found to be a significant challenge for some Indigenous members currently in the military, and requires further analysis (see Chapter 6, Indigenous Language use within the ADF).

### 8.2.1 The participants

This chapter presents the views of 14 participants, ten Indigenous and four non-Indigenous, living in and around Galiwinku during the period September 2013 to April 2014. Apart from one Indigenous participant, who was born in another NT community, nine Indigenous Australian participants had lived in Elcho Island all their lives. All Indigenous participants were fluent in Yolŋgu Matha. The four non-Indigenous participants had been working in Galiwinku for six-months to six-years. They spoke English as their main language, but also had a basic understanding of Yolŋgu Matha. Three of these participants also spoke their own Indigenous language from Aoteraoa (New Zealand). Employed in a variety of roles, all participants were engaged in at least one of the following employment areas: ranger work, health, interpreter, legal, cultural mentor or employment services, government positions, research positions, and Indigenous engagement services.
8.2.2 Community

Connection to people

In 2009, the Directorate of Indigenous Affairs (DIA) of the Department of Defence stated it was committed to achieving greater participation of Indigenous Australians in the ADF. This was to be achieved through ‘building respect, broadening opportunities, and strengthening relationships … with Indigenous communities …’ (Defence Reconciliation Action Plan, DRAP, p.4). Relationships with people and place form the basis of community life in Galiwinku. Understanding these relationships and the connections Yolŋgu people have with the land, their culture and the vested interest that is shared with the Australian military is critical to the success of DRAP outcomes. Therefore, it makes good sense to include some investigation of how the broader community sees this happening. By identifying aspects of knowledge that Yolŋgu people perceive to be useful for military personnel, opportunities for respect, and the centralisation of Indigenous Knowledge systems in military curricula are explored.

Belonging

The sense of belonging to family, extended family, community and place was found to be extremely important among participants (see also Fogarty, 2010; Giner, 2007; Graham, 2009; Sinatra and Murphy, 1999). When questioned regarding their views about living in Galiwinku community, participants described a strong sense of ‘belonging to the people, the place and the land.’ Three Indigenous rangers described using their knowledge, language, and methods of looking after their environment as being the most important reason for staying and working on the Island. ‘We can walk through the bush with just our knowledge and find food. We know where everything is like wild yams, stingray, finding eggs, turtles, and fish’ (IAM#5). Knowledge of
the environment and the hunting, tracking, and medicinal skills required to survive in the remote regions was thought to be extremely beneficial for military personnel. Staying connected through familial relationships was considered equally important:

… it is our community, our home, we love it … we born here, we get to know each other, I get to know both sides of the family who have been here for a long time, going to school and growing up… there is too much humbugging in the cities, here is safer than the town, we can settle down easier, town is only good sometimes … we like our own environment, gardens, our seas, our bush … (IAF #8).

Among the non-Indigenous participants, being accepted into community and enjoying working alongside Yolŋgu people and their culture was one of the most rewarding aspects about life in Galiwinku:

What I like most are the people really. It’s really about the honesty of the people … Their strength is in their culture and their innate ability to hang on to that culture and to pass it down through the generations…and also the potential that exists in this community. I think that is huge and I think that something big will come out of this community to lead the way in which Aboriginal people will build capacity within themselves … After being away and then coming back to the community, the people just remember everything, they just embrace you … they are not reserved they open their hearts to you and their homes to you in their way, which is very special … it’s all about the people, you know … that’s what brings me here (NIAM #1).

I enjoy the beautiful setting and living and working amongst the Yolŋgu people … (NIAF#2).
The sense of belonging, evident in these extracts, is also important in the military context. Recognising the role that Indigenous Knowledge education can play in developing these connections is further explored in the following section.

**Connection to land**

Like relationships with people, ‘connection to land’ was perceived as an extension of familial and community relations. This place: ‘… it’s special; it’s already in me, and this is why because my ancestors are here…’ stated one participant as she gestured widely towards her surroundings (IAF#10). North American Indigenous academic Vine Deloria Jr (1994) states that connection to land is a common characteristic of Indigenous tribes as they were ‘…reluctant to surrender their homelands to the whites’ because they knew that their ancestors are still spiritually alive on the land’ (cited in Graham, 2009, p. 4). The learning of language, observance of ceremonies, and maintaining traditions and responsibilities in accordance with Yolŋu Law, known as the *Madayin*, is an important part of everyday life in Galiwinku:

*Madayin* embodies the rights of owners of the law, or citizens (*rom watangu walal*) who have the rights and responsibilities for this embodiment of law. Madayin includes all the people’s law (*rom*); the instruments and objects that encode and symbolise the law (*Madayin girri’*); oral dictates; names and song cycles and the holy, restricted places (*dhuyu nungat wana*) that are used in the maintenance, education and development of law (source Marthakal Homelands Resource Centre, 2012).

All the participants noted this, but perhaps it is best summarised in the following extract:

The place we live in, the land, we are the traditional owners, we have been here a long, long time. Our school was here, we married
here, we love this place, we can’t move, we get sick to come back … we lived here in the mission days, and we can live without the shop. It was easy to collect food then. We can still fish anywhere on the island without a permit. But learning from the white society has changed all that … even the environment is changing … the winds come from the different six seasons … the traditional ways are better than the new ways … Yolŋu people here know what to do from reading the signs in the environment (IAM#11, IAF#12, & IAF#13).

Opportunities to build connections with Indigenous communities through educating mainstream society about the importance of place holds the key for respectful Reconciliation. Learning others’ languages also ‘… opens the door to appreciation of cultural differences, freeing students from the bondage of ethnocentrism’ (Kurfiss, 1988, p. 79). This is an educational challenge that reinforces the need to provide alternative and equitable discourses and methodologies that sit outside of the current neo-liberal agenda. Equal recognition and value placed on the maintenance and development of Indigenous traditions, stories, histories, ceremonies, laws, and local languages provides a pathway for transformational change. However, despite recent State, Territory and Federal commitments to supplement and support mainstream educational services for Indigenous people, and the fact that steady growth of individual successes has occurred, changes to educational services have largely been implemented through ‘cultural add-ons’ to the current discourse of deficit presently underway (see Chapter 3). Mainstream discourse which is based on paternalism and the formation of disadvantage has yet to adapt to the needs and aspirations of Indigenous Australians, as shown in the above examples.

Instead, educational priorities and government initiatives are represented on an agenda of cultural appropriation and the recognised attributes of ‘other
Australians’ (Nakata, 1991, p. 55). At best, these programs can only provide a very limited understanding of Indigenous experiences, and are unlikely to meet the diverse educational needs of all Australians. Furthermore, to level the education experience to those of ‘other Australians’ is to misrepresent the educational interests of Islanders and Aboriginal people, and supports the neo-colonial compensatory view that Indigenous Australians must see themselves inferior to other Australians (Nakata, 1991, pp. 58–61). It is difficult to imagine transformational or paradigmatic change emanating from such a perspective. What is required is a social agenda that is based on mainstream cultural adaptions and equal status awarded to Indigenous Knowledge systems, not cultural add-ons to unchanged institutionalised practices (Nakata, 1991, p. 60; see also Cooper, 2012). In this way, the spiral of understanding, and diversity of difference, will then have the ability to transform all institutional learning experiences (Chapter 1 and 5).

**Connection to military (the past)**

Connecting histories from local examples also allows a new perspective of Australia’s military history. Themes from the data suggest that there is a diverse range of memories and experiences regarding past and present associations with the military that could be influencing recruitment and retention efforts today. For example, experiences ranged from those of ‘pride’ that came from ‘service to country’ combined with experiences of ‘distrust’ resulting from the unjust institutional policies imposed on Indigenous people during the previous century (see Chapter 3). Past connections with the military are therefore still very much a part of participants’ families’ lived realities. One senior elder, whose father had been the leading tracker for the anthropologist and Squadron Leader Donald Thomson, stated that most of the men who assisted the military during WW II from the remote
communities in Arnhem Land were paid for their work in tobacco (IAM#11). The psychological impacts of centuries of racism, discrimination and exclusion that White Australia and its representative institutions sanctioned against Indigenous people has never been accurately assessed. The establishment of the Regional Force Surveillance Units (RFSUs) from the 1980s, which rely heavily on the involvement of Indigenous personnel from the remote communities such as Galiwinku, has made some progress in building these relationships. However, recent DRAP incentives to establish even ‘stronger relationships’ with Indigenous communities and ‘change perceptions on Indigenous cultural issues’ suggests that more needs to be done.

Despite underlying issues, relationships with the military were perceived valuable for the community. Being in the military is one way to defend your country, and to work with other Australians to help protect national interests. Most of the participants were able to trace military connections back to their parents’ and grandparents’ generations. Contrary to popular belief that Indigenous Australia did little to support the military during WW II, one in six Indigenous Australians in the north actively supported the war effort. This was ‘… a higher proportion than the enlistment rate among the Australian population as a whole’ (Windus, cited in the cover of Ball, 1991). Family members of many of the participants performed a wide range of tasks for the military during WW II. For instance, many fathers, grandfathers, uncles, brothers and cousins provided the labour to clear large strips of land, and construct military outposts such as the Army Base on Wessel Island, and were generally well regarded for their tracking, and reconnaissance skills (IAM#5, IAM#9, IAF#10, IAM #11).

During the war, Yolŋu people’s knowledge was sought after due to a number of reasons. Where military personnel lacked intimate knowledge of the environment
and the technical expertise to utilise its resources to their advantage, Yolŋgu warriors were utilised to conduct reconnaissance tasks and report on enemy activities (IAM#9 & IAM#11). Generally not issued with service rifles, owing to the controversial nature of their relationship with the military, Yolŋgu warriors carried their spears as their weapon of choice for protection. Spears were silent lethal weapons in the hands of skilled men and were far more effective in the bush than a rifle. Each spear had a range of tips designed for a specific purpose, such as the Warrarri, a steel tip designed for hunting or personal protection reasons, and other tips were used for shovelling, hammering, or digging purposes (IAM#11). Warriors would hide their spears at the bottom of their canoes covered in food or leaves in case of an attack (IAM#9). Military personnel developed a healthy respect for Yolŋgu warriors and often relied on their goodwill and expertise (Peterson, 2003; Rosenzweig, 2001). Yolŋgu warriors have an unmatched ability to ‘creep up on an enemy’ only to disappear instantly without a trace (IAM#9).

In addition to construction and reconnaissance tasks, respondents talked about the Japanese bomb attack at Milingimbi, in 1942. ‘The missionaries and soldiers told our people to run and hide in the swamps and the mangrove trees to escape the bombs. The mud was not only good camouflage but it helped to protect us from the mosquitoes and biting insects, and was a good way to keep cool’ (IAF#10). Sadly, one of the two people killed at Milingimbi, when a bomb landed in the community, was one senior elder’s grandfather who had just sat down to play cards with the Army soldiers. The Army soldiers taught Yolŋgu how to play cards which is a popular pastime to this day (IAF#12). According to one Elder:

When the Japanese army attacked, the machine guns sliced all the trees, and our people could not light any fires for weeks in case of being spotted by the enemy. The residents of Milingimbi are still waiting for
the Japanese Government to come and fix the church, which was destroyed by the Japanese bombs (IAM#9).

Today, much of the wreckage and shrapnel that was dropped on Milingimbi can be found lying about the area (IAM#9). Elders suggested that a museum should be placed there to record this important part of Australia’s history.

Indigenous service experience in Australia’s military history has become a major focus of Professor Mick Dodson and the team at the Australian National University (Francis, 2014; Riseman, 2012). While researchers are working hard to ensure Indigenous service men and women take their rightful place in Australia’s military history at the institutional level, Elders and participants in this study have a wealth of knowledge at the local level. This poses an excellent research opportunity in accordance with the DRAP. The following story provides just one example:

My mother told me that story, that story is in me. It was at Buckingham Bay. Their plane was crashed there but they were still alive. But the Americans made a raft out of the shrapnel and they went sailing, sailing, sailing until they reached Jurranalpi. And when they landed, they walked back and they walked to Dhadiya and Gawa, Muynguy. They sat down at the beach and my father was in the bush. They were eating crayfish. My father and one of his brothers, they showed them how to hunt. They said Balanda, Balanda (white person) and they were speaking to them in a small bit of English. They helped them. They made them honey, tea and yams and my father made a big canoe and took them to Milingimbi. When there, they went on a plane to Darwin. They sailed back home. My mother told me their names were George and Bill and ? (cannot recall) … American Army soldiers … No Japanese actually came to Elcho but they heard the bombing. My mother was at Wessell Island and heard the bombing at Milingimbi. Grandmother was at Milingimbi (IAF#10).
This extract shows just how important these stories are to Indigenous people: ‘My mother told me that story, that story is in me’ (IAF#10). The healing and recognition that occurs as a result of public acknowledgement of Indigenous military history is happening amongst other Indigenous groups throughout the world. Examples include the official recognition of the Papau New Guinean carriers, the Navajo Code Talkers, and the Māori Battalion (Chapter 2–4; Riseman, 2012). The deep connection to place, language, knowledge of the land, and military history is evident in all of these examples.

**Connection to military (the present)**

To gain an understanding of present day relationships with the ADF, participants were asked what they perceived community members might gain or learn, from being in the military today (see Question 12, Appendix 1). There were two noticeable themes that emerged: the first was a sense of ‘pride and confidence’ about being able to utilise and share their Indigenous Knowledge skills, albeit informally, with others in the military, and secondly was the sense of ‘working on country.’ Other advantages included learning a new trade, meeting new people, learning how to speak other languages including English and other Indigenous languages, and being involved in the national effort to defend Australia.

**Personal pride**

An increased sense of personal pride from sharing Indigenous Knowledge with others was considered the most important advantage. Mentioned equally by Indigenous and non-Indigenous participants alike, sharing culture was perceived as an empowering opportunity for Yolŋgu personnel to reach their full potential (see also Rosenzweig, 2001; Wilson, 2004):
I think what was going on there was because he knew survival skills and all the rest of it so much better than any Balanda could possibly know, even with all the years of training, um, that he felt more valued there. That’s the thing with the diversity of learning … what I’ve noticed that as soon as we start to tap into that area of self-esteem and people feel valued, we start to see great things happen, and I think that’s what happens with these guys in Norforce. They suddenly realise “Hey gee, I know more than them,” where it’s usually always the other way around … there’s a transfer of knowledge (from Indigenous to non-Indigenous) … suddenly becoming a valued part of that group, the Norforce community (NIAM#1).

Some participants saw the tangible rewards that come from ‘doing a job well.’ This included the development of skills from the Balanda world that complement Indigenous Knowledge skills such as patrolling, learning about procedures, communicating with Balanda, weapon mastery, fitness, pack marching, increased self-discipline, and other military-type tasks. These findings suggest that embedding expert local Indigenous Knowledge within military curricula would not only enhance the organisational knowledge base, but provide practical application of the principle of ‘respect,’ which is now recognised as one of the Army’s core values, and a key aspect of cultural change (Department of Defence, 2012).

Working on country

Like ranger work, employment in the military was described as an extension to working on country. Participants described the ability to learn new skills and protect country as being important reasons why they might consider joining the military. It is a way to bring two people together through teaching and understanding about differences, but with a common cause to ‘look after the land.’ The responsibility of looking after the land was described as an opportunity for Balanda people to learn
and respect the richness of knowledge found within Yolŋu culture. Creating reciprocal learning ‘opportunities’ is an excellent opportunity where teaching and learning could flow respectfully between cultures (IAM#9).

Even though all the participants felt that there was a range of opportunities community members might gain from military enlistment, it was perceived that the current Eurocentric education and training environment would make learning and meaningful engagement particularly difficult for Yolŋu soldiers. Participants who knew those who had experienced this situation felt strongly that Balanda could learn more from Yolŋu people (IAF#7; see also Gaykamangu with Taylor, 2014). Yolŋu understanding about ‘respect and reconciliation,’ for example, was explained in terms of collaboration and reciprocation (learning two-ways, or transformative learning) that benefit both the ‘giver and receiver of knowledge.’

Utilising difference, and drawing on the deep connections that participants have highlighted in this study, provide a strong foundation for change:

The ADF IES (Indigenous Employment Strategy) will not be sustained unless the culture of the ADF is conducive to, and committed to, change. Defence needs to ensure that all workplaces embrace cultural diversity on a daily basis (p. 6).

First and foremost to this understanding is that Indigenous Knowledge systems need formal recognition in the ADF. Applying critical thinking to uncontested simplistic accounts of history, by highlighting multiple perspectives as it has been shown in this section, would also challenge the issues of ethnocentrism (see Kurfiss, 1988, p. 81).

62 Freire (2014) provides a detailed analysis of the different approaches to knowledge acquisition in colonised and coloniser societies. He also describes the Western reliance on the transmission of knowledge from those who propose to know ‘everything’ to those who are proposed to know ‘nothing’ as the ‘banking’ concept of education. In this system, it is believed that revolutionary dialogue is virtually impossible.

63 See Dei & Kempf (2006); Greives (2009); Sarra (2005); Rigney (2003 & 2006); Simpson (2004); Smith, (2014) and Tangihaeare &, Twiname (2011) who provided some insight into creating the spaces that would allow for Indigenous dialogue in contemporary spaces.
The findings presented herein seek answers to the following questions: ‘What aspects of Yolŋu Knowledge might Galiwinku community be willing to share with the ADF?’ and ‘How best this might be achieved?’ It also explores perceived difficulties and benefits.

8.3 What aspects of Yolŋu Knowledge might Galiwinku community be willing to share with the ADF?

The Indigenous Employment Strategy (IES) states that greater participation of Indigenous Australians in the Australian Defence Force (ADF) will not be achieved unless the military culture is ‘conducive’ and ‘committed’ to change. This section explores the attitudes of Galiwinku participants by enquiring what aspects of knowledge they may be willing to share with the ADF. At this stage, it is perhaps necessary to have a basic understanding as to why Indigenous Knowledge systems have not been formally recognised by Western institutions in the past.

Indigenous people’s knowledge was once regarded by formal research institutions and scientific councils as being primitive and unscientific (Doxtater, 2004; Grenier, 1998; Koitsiwe, cited in Mertens, Cram & Chilisa, 2013; Simpson, 2004; Smith, 1999b; Wilson, 2008). Because Indigenous people generally passed on their knowledge through oral and participatory means, the lack of recognition of Indigenous Knowledge systems in Western institutions was largely based on the fact that Indigenous Knowledge holders and practitioners did not obtain their knowledge from formal education institutions. This situation has resulted in widespread marginalisation of Indigenous Knowledge throughout the world (Arbon, 2008; Koitsiwe, cited in Mertens, Cram & Chilisa, 2013, see also Smith, 1999b; Wilson, 2008). The development of modern science, lack of political and institutional power, and the imposition of mainstream education practices has added significantly to this
difficulty (Koitsiwe, cited in Mertens, Cram & Chilisa, 2013). With a steady increase in Indigenous scholars, knowledge holders, and their supporters on a global scale (Ford et al. 2014; Kovach, 2012; Rigney, 1997), this situation has slowly been improving (see Chapter 1).

To provide a baseline for the question, ‘What knowledge might Yolŋgu be willing to share with the ADF?’ the participants were asked whether they knew if any Indigenous Knowledge content was currently being taught in military curricula (see Question 16, Appendix 1). The majority of the participants, 9 out of 14, or 64%, thought that ADF members were not taught any Indigenous Knowledge content formally in the ADF, while 4 out of 14, or 28%, were unsure. However, while formal Indigenous Knowledge teaching in the military learning environment was generally not perceived as being a regular occurrence, it was said that this was happening on an informal basis. One member recalled seeing a picture during a recruitment campaign of a Yolŋgu person showing other Yolŋgu soldiers how to do something:

I saw in the picture some of the Yolŋgu teaching other soldiers and telling them what they needed to go out to camp, to get something from the bush and the sea. This is our Aboriginal knowledge being taught to other soldiers and instructors (IAM#7).

Even though it was clear that participants did not think Indigenous Knowledge was taught on a formal basis in the military, which is consistent with the findings amongst ADF members themselves (see Chapter 6), all participants were largely positive and willing to share their knowledge with others. Participants were provided with a list of options to choose from (see Question 17, Appendix 1) and asked if they could think of any other aspects of Indigenous Knowledge, or specific Yolŋgu Knowledge, that

64 The difficulties and benefits of Indigenous and non-Indigenous educators and instructors learning about or from each other are analysed in Alison Jones and Kuni Jenkins Rethinking Collaboration: Working the Indigene-Colonizer Hyphen (2008) in NK Denzin, YS Lincoln & L Tuihiwai-Smith, 2008 (see also Hall, 2014).
could potentially benefit all ADF members. The results were separated into Indigenous and non-Indigenous responses to disclose any similarities or differences amongst the selections. This helped to gain a better understanding of what particular aspects of knowledge are considered the most important by the parties’ concerned, and what each party perceives might best be gained, or imparted, from each other. The results from the Indigenous participants are ranked numerically and summarised in Table 8.1.

**Table 8.1: Yolŋu Indigenous Knowledge possibilities (Indigenous responses)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge Possibility</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous hunting skills</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Indigenous Knowledge, culture and traditions</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic local language skills</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous medicinal and bush tucker knowledge</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous survival techniques</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navigating with and without maps</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational awareness skills</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous war-fighting or tracking skills</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous history and military involvement</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous environmental knowledge</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral histories</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge about the Dreaming</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasonal knowledge</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire knowledge</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of the message stick</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tactical knowledge e.g. (how best to hunt and stay camouflaged)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Illustrating the importance and benefits of living and working on country, the Indigenous participants in this study felt that military personnel are likely to benefit the most from learning practical skills, such as how to ‘hunt’ in a given location using local Indigenous Knowledge. Related skill areas of finding food, water, medicines, navigating without maps, making and using spears, and using the environment to your advantage in accordance with the Yolŋu calendar were considered critical soldiering skills. Although local knowledge is generally not transferable, ‘the principles’ of knowledge are, for example, knowing the best likely places to find water, situational awareness, understanding environmental patterns, interpreting shadows, and the movement of animals. This knowledge was relied upon during WW II, and can still be utilised today as noted in the following comment:

Balanda will learn and understand culture and traditions\(^{65}\) and how to hunt and how to get bush foods and how to get sea food and how to know the right trees in the environment and also what to eat, eg. Bush knowledge. When they are out from the community in the bush, they will know how to find things (IAM#7).

While acknowledging that there are limits to be found within all knowledge systems (Grenier, 1998), Elders described, as examples, the use of bush fires and the message stick as a highly effective alternative methods for sending and receiving secret information. These old ways can sometimes be more reliable than the technology which the military uses, because they do not break down and are not easily intercepted by others:

Yolŋu know when people are sleeping and can send messages with bush fires. They know how to read and use the environment and tell people someone is coming … military should use the message stick, with a runner, to tell them the CO, the bossman …

---

\(^{65}\) These were important lessons evidenced in the NZDF example (See Chapter 7).
we are going to be at Milingimbi at 2 o’clock … Our community can teach these things, we can show the military how to use the environment better … (IAM#9).

Looking after the country and people in accordance with Yolŋu traditions was understood to be a valuable learning opportunity for military personnel. Understanding the six different Yolŋu seasons and weather patterns\(^{66}\) and knowing when are the best times to move around and find foods in the local area were thought to add significantly to a soldier’s chances of survival. This knowledge applies to every locality in Australia, and would therefore contribute significantly to the organisation’s knowledge base:

> The military safety of our country and people are important. We need to protect our nation and the people in it. Yolŋu deals with these things that nobody knows. Everybody knows modern day communications, but the message stick and using the six seasons and wind talk, in Yolŋu Matha, nobody can find out. When the wind is calm, we can tell that the weather is such, so nobody will move around, calm, but in the knock em down winds, traditionally it is the season of high activity … (IAM#9).

A basic understanding of the local language, culture, and traditions was considered essential in order to learn Yolŋu Knowledge,\(^{67}\) or any other Indigenous people’s knowledge of a given area. One senior Elder who could recall being taught by his grandfather as a young man and continued to follow in his grandfather’s footsteps explained that learning in the environment was a ‘lifelong’ intergenerational journey and the best way to learn because it helps people to fully appreciate and understand changes in the environment, over time (IAM#11). The increased capacity to

\(^{66}\) For information on the six different seasons referred to, based on thousands of years of Aboriginal knowledge, see *Six Seasons* on the Kakadu National Park website (Parks Australia).

\(^{67}\) In different areas and geographical terrains, nations such as the Aranta and Warlpiri, for example, will have specific knowledge, such as desert knowledge, applicable to their local environment.
understand and learn from the environment was illustrated by another member when discussing the differences between Western and Indigenous methods of learning: ‘… people need to understand that the ocean is their supermarket, their eyesight, their hearing is incredible…’ (NIAM#1). Elders described this intimacy with, and knowledge and trust in, the environment, as if it was an extension of themselves:

… the land is our map and it tells us where to go. The knowledge is still transferable. Can still find the way from the sun, stars, moon, the wind. We can teach that knowledge (to the military) like in culture camps … (IAM#11).

The answers provided in this section again reiterate how important it is to stay connected to the land (see section 8.2). The requirement to provide education that is holistic and reinforces relational accountability in the human, metaphysical and environmental sense underpins Indigenous philosophies (Arbon, 2008; Wilson, 2008; Fogarty, 2010; Stewart-Harawira, 2008; Smith, L.T., 2014), which is fundamentally different to the atomistic approach commonly found in Western societies. Aspects of knowledge that the non-Indigenous participants perceived would benefit ADF members the most included, but were not limited to, the areas listed in Table 8.2.
Table 8.2: Yolŋu Indigenous Knowledge possibilities (Non-Indigenous responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge area</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous survival techniques</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navigating with and without maps</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous history and military involvement</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous war-fighting or tracking skills</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous medicinal and bush tucker knowledge</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous environmental knowledge</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous hunting skills</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Indigenous Knowledge, culture and traditions</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic local language skills</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational awareness skills</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral histories</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge about the Dreaming</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind and fire knowledge</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge about the message stick</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasonal knowledge (When and where to find water and collect food)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All non-Indigenous participants perceived ‘Indigenous Knowledge survival skills’ would have the most benefit. Areas that are directly related to survival in the bush, such as navigating, hunting, finding food and water, and medicinal knowledge, were considered vital:

(Regarding navigational skills) … You never have to worry about these guys being lost out there … their situational awareness skills are much better than ours. Navigating without maps is a good example of that. We had to do a search and rescue for some Balanda in their country. They knew it intimately and circumnavigated the island two times and found it exactly … (NIAM#1).
Military history, culture, traditions, and local knowledge were also popular choices. One member suggested fire knowledge, and knowledge of how and when to use the message stick and seasonal knowledge may have relevance for military personnel, but erred on the side of caution with regard to ‘knowledge about the dreaming’:

This is where I think some traditions are for Yolŋu only … it’s ok to share basic knowledge but certain depth should be kept within the realms of their clans, under the protection of their own laws and their own ways of doing things (NIAF#14).

There was not a marked difference between the preferred selections from Indigenous and non-Indigenous participants, however, the area of ‘survival skills’ was perceived to have the most benefits for personnel overall. This choice was also found to be consistent amongst ADF members (See Chapter 6). All other areas related to survival, such as food, tracking, navigating, medicinal, and environmental knowledge were considered necessary. Knowledge about local people including the culture and traditions, and military history was noted as important, although learning basic local language skills was seen as more important by the Indigenous participants, i.e., 9 out of 10 participants, or 90%, than non-Indigenous participants 2 out of 4, or 50%. This finding again highlights the importance for the need for official and equitable recognition of Indigenous languages in education. The least chosen area from the given choices by all participants was knowledge about the Dreaming. One member stated that while there is clear Yolŋu support for the teaching and learning of their knowledge in military curricula, Yolŋu do not always have enough support about how to ‘survive’ in the Balanda world (NIAM#1).
8.4 Addressing aspects of Indigenous Knowledge in the ADF: the “how” it could be done

This section explores some of the ways participants thought Indigenous Knowledge systems might best be included within military curricula. Examples were perceived to support or exceed Reconciliation initiatives and increase understanding of the current DRAP and IES.

A way forward

Following consideration regarding ‘what knowledge might be suitable for sharing with the ADF,’ participants were asked to consider some of the ways members of their community could teach ADF members about their local knowledge (see Question 20, Appendix 1). The results from this question are highlighted below in Table 8.3.

Table 8.3: How Indigenous Knowledge systems could be included in the ADF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small group tours of the area</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making videos or creating a website for members</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help teach and mentor on Norforce courses</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous Knowledge survival courses on country, during promotion courses or field exercises</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit local ADF bases to provide training</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcome to country ceremonies for military personnel on military establishments during enlistment, or other important occasions</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral histories</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Practical hands-on-type activities were considered the best way for passing on Yolŋu Knowledge. For example, ‘direct and equal face-to-face contact is preferable for authentic learning encounters’ (NIAF#2). The senior Elder who considered the possibility of a museum at Milingimbi said that regular visits could be arranged to
show ADF members around the historical sites to learn some of the Indigenous military history from Yolŋu Elders (IAM#10). This approach supports the ‘Development of a consistent Defence approach to building relationships with Indigenous communities’ outlined in the DRAP (p. 11), and is consistent with Indigenous approaches to learning (Fogarty, 2010; Sarra, 2005 & 2012; Stewart-Harawira, 2005; Tolerton, 2012). However, while ‘Yolŋu love to teach and pass on their knowledge’ (NIAM#1), there was some concern regarding tokenism with reference to ceremonies.

Ceremonies, without deeper meaning and practical involvement, were noted as potential areas of risk through the possibility of being considered ‘tokenistic’ (NIAF#14). Cultural practices, celebrations or units of competency, for example, do not adequately challenge or critique issues of epistemological dominance that preside in Western institutions (Cooper, 2012), but may inadvertently reinforce the myth that Indigenous people are cultural bearers and not knowledge holders or producers in their own right. Even worse is that cultural practices, without meaningful engagement, could be perceived as cultural add ons (Nakata, 1991), or contemporary expressions of ‘essentialism.’ Essentialism dates back to early ethnographers and anthropologists assessment of Indigenous peoples, where they were viewed under the microscope as ‘objects’ of study, or the exotic ‘other,’ and not as ‘subjects’ with their own knowledge systems and multiple perspectives of the world (McConaghy, 2000; Smith 1999b).

To overcome the dangers of tokenism and provide situations for meaningful engagement, another non-Indigenous participant stated that perhaps an arrangement could be made between the ADF and the Indigenous rangers (many of which are employed in Norforce) to take small group tours through their area and hold
workshops, or culture camps. Here Indigenous members are the subject matter experts, teaching survival skills, living and hunting in the bush from their own knowledge base and country (NIAM#3). Field activities, such as these, were found to be much more preferable than coming onto the base; however, making a video or website where Elders and knowledge holders were walking through the area talking about certain things, such as plants, animals and the environment, or military history, was found to be popular, as was the idea of Elders being invited to instruct and mentor on promotion courses.

**Current initiatives – the DRAP and the IES**

While the findings indicate plenty of support for Indigenous Knowledge systems in military curricula, there were some concerns raised regarding the lack of knowledge about current ADF initiatives. This situation warrants further investigation as it is a missed opportunity for strengthening community relationships. Even when taking into consideration the small sample size of this study, due to fiscal and time restrictions beyond the researcher’s control, when participants were asked what they knew about any of the ADF Reconciliation initiatives, the overall consensus was ‘very little.’ When asked what was known about the DRAP and the IES in particular, one participant replied, ‘… not much except they (the military) claim to want to engage in the Reconciliation process?’ (NIAF#2). For example, another senior elder stated that Yolŋu people are not always invited to contribute in consultation processes:

> We would like the DRAP explained … we don’t know yet, there was no communication or consultation regarding the plan. We don’t know about it. Maybe, the urban Aboriginal people know only a little bit of knowledge, make a plan with the government, the Yolŋu people aren’t asked (IAM#11).
Highlighting the importance of Elders in the learning process and the incongruity of collaboration processes, this senior elder further commented, ‘We have the knowledge that would help our people better in the Army’ (IAM#11). Another senior Elder, who has recently published on the topic of Reconciliation, said ‘not really heard of the DRAP, but Reconciliation is about understanding about who you are, your identity’ (IAM#9). The following statements express community views about their knowledge, or lack thereof, regarding the DRAP and the IES:

(DRAP) … Not a lot, but it has to do with creating equality in both cultures, walking together in both worlds … (NIAF#14).

(DRAP) … Means to me in every area of work and admin, there must be something like (using a gesture) holding hands together. There must be agreement by everyone. Some people in the community know some things, some maybe Elders, the women and the men, some Balanda not know the respect between each other, or from the Yolŋgu … (IAF#10).

(IES) … heard of that one, Yolŋgu people that can work. But education must be two-ways. At present, there is only discussions in the state governments. The military must have more access (more communication) with the communities, show that there is support for the people (IAM#9).

(IES) … Focused recruitment of Indigenous youth to the Defence Force (NIAF#2).

The DRAP states that the ADF is currently implementing ‘Cultural Awareness Integration Education Programs’ across Defence (DRAP pp. 16–17). The findings in this section indicate that although there is little awareness of the DRAP initiatives in general, the support for Reconciliation is positive. There is also a genuine willingness to engage in learning ‘opportunities’ such as teaching personnel about Yolŋgu people
and their knowledge of the area: ‘We have the knowledge that would help our people better in the Army’ (IAM#11); ‘... it has to do with creating equality in both cultures, walking together in both worlds …’ (NIAF#14). In order to achieve the paradigm shift that will enable this to be achieved, it is considered useful to acknowledge the perceived difficulties that might be encountered along the way.

8.5 The difficulties

This section discusses some of the perceived difficulties regarding centralising Indigenous Knowledge systems in military curricula. It is organised under related themes, in particular: difficulties for the community, difficulties for community ADF members, community Elders and instructors, and difficulties for the organisation.

8.5.1 Difficulties for community

Due to the historical experiences of dealing with government organisations, researchers, and non-Indigenous people in general (Arbon, 2008; Bishop, 2005; Martin, 2008; Mertens, Cram & Chilisa 2013; Rigney, 1997; Smith, 1999b; Wilson, 2008), there was some considerable discussion about whose interests would be served by sharing Yolŋu Knowledge with the military. Some of the main concerns were to do with miscommunication, for example, talking while not comprehending, listening without hearing, and a lack of respect. These issues can be problematic during inter-cultural relationships (Metge & Kinloch, 1993; Gaykamangu with Taylor, 2014; Hall, 2014). When discussing the difficulties that could eventuate during the collaboration processes, it was stated that outsiders have a habit of disregarding community Elders, and have either devalued or misappropriated community knowledge in the past:
… planning and agree (ing), not really get(ting) to the next step, getting put into the rubbish bin … both not listening to each other…telling your story from Yolŋu knowledge, knowledge being taken from us and written in a book and put away somewhere in a cupboard … sometime Balanda brainwash us, some Balanda come here and do not share our knowledge back or pass it on to others (IAM#8).

Deficit view of Indigenous culture; racist or discriminatory attitudes; language impatience through failure to listen, learn from more informed Indigenous ‘others (NIAF#2).

Discussions with Balanda, who are often in positions of power, can be confusing and controlling. This was regarded as a lack of respect frequently committed by outsiders, and is just one example of the continued disrespect displayed towards Indigenous communities:

   Government makes a report, need to meet in a partnership, needs to be both ways, don’t tell us … (what needs to be done) (IAM#11).

Besides the consultation issues, deciding on content and whose knowledge is considered important’ could become a big strain for Indigenous people. Outsiders call upon us for many different reasons (IAM#10). To avoid this situation, non-Indigenous people must ‘go to the Elders and council members first and they will show you how to talk to people’ (IAM#10).

   Again, recognising the importance of Elders in the collaboration and education process is critical. In the NZDF, kaumatua68 are regularly consulted regarding the

68 Kaumatua are generally known as highly respected Indigenous Elders in New Zealand society. In the NZDF case, the kaumatua are often ex-defence members who play a predominate role in the Rūnanga (council) within each Service, providing leadership roles in all matters pertaining to Māori education and the implementation of Tikanga (customs/protocols) Māori across all levels of the institution (see 7.3, 7.5 & 7.6).
Māori education content and issues to do with correct cultural protocols and procedures, in the military. An extended multi-tribal collaboration process proved to be well worth the effort in this example (see Chapter 6). Similar to some of the issues that needed to be addressed in the NZDF, the participants in this study expressed legitimate concerns about intellectual property rights, controlling bureaucracies, and lack of awareness of Reconciliation initiatives.

One of the biggest fears was that: ‘Our Indigenous Knowledge might get taught by Balanda instead of us’ (IAF#13). Illustrating the need to retain autonomy over what, and how Yolŋgu Knowledge is taught is evidenced in the following comment:

…it's … easy for Yolŋgu to teach, we decide what to teach [with reference to survival and environmental skills] we make spears, the right spears for turtles, stingrays, kangaroo, emu, buffalo etc. The same spear but different techniques used for each animal. At night time, fire on the tip. Night time, dugong, turtle, crayfish, night time the best time, full moon, good time for hunting, good sharing of knowledge … (IAM#6).

The main point to note here is that Yolŋgu people felt very strongly that they were the ones to be responsible for teaching their knowledge to outsiders.
8.5.2 Difficulties for community ADF Members

As discussed in Chapter 6, joining the military can present a number of challenges. The difficulties which participants perceived individuals from Galiwinku community might experience are discussed in this section (see Question 15, Appendix 1). The participants summarised that difficulties could occur as a result of:

1). lack of understanding and respect shown by the organisation for Indigenous Knowledge systems in the learning environment, and

2). lack of understanding exhibited by non-Indigenous members about the value of Yolŋu culture (for example, notions of cultural superiority/inferiority, racism, and discrimination).

This section provides further evidence to the ‘perceived lack of cultural awareness within the ADF,’ which has been identified as a ‘known inhibiting’ factor to some Indigenous Australians joining the ADF (IES, 2007-2017, p. 2).

Lack of understanding

The perceived lack of formal recognition for Indigenous Knowledge systems was found to be the main reason that Yolŋu people might have difficulty joining the military. This is not an issue particular to the military, but is one that educators, researchers, Elders, and social justice advocates have been debating for years (Arbon, 2008; Bin-Sallik, 1989; Dodson, 2007; Gaykamangu with Taylor, 2014; Grimes, 2009; Harris, 1990; Hughes and More, 1997; Keeffe, 1992; Ki-zerbo et al. 1997; Kovach, 2012; Lippmann, 1994; McConaghy, 2000; Pearson, 2009; Rigney, 1999; Sarra, 2005; Short, 2008; Smith, 1999b). Empirical research shows that lack of Indigenous perspectives in Western education institutions contributes to minimal success and disengagement in the classroom. The literature also shows that Indigenous people are much more likely to succeed when education reaffirms the
knowledge systems that are important to the people concerned (Sarra, 2005). When learners’ knowledge is ignored, the opposite usually occurs (Arbon, 2008; Fogarty, 2010; Grimes, 2009; Osborne, 2001). Similarly, institutional acknowledgement of Indigenous Knowledge systems in the ADF is likely to have many positive benefits. This is evident in the following statement where three senior Elders stated that they would like to see a policy that protects the perspectives of Indigenous people within the military:

[The Army should] become like an Indigenous Army too, well trained in both worlds, should look at ADF strategies, something to plan for. There should be changes to policy, if you want Indigenous Australians to join from an Indigenous Australian perspective in the Army, make a policy to share the knowledge already. Balanda needs to know, needs to learn our history, our culture, our way of life … (IAM#11, IAF#12 & IAF#13).

Other difficulties that Yolŋgu have experienced in Western learning institutions are highlighted in the following comments:

... it is hard to listen to Balanda … listening and processing information … communicating, military members should acknowledge these difficulties and try to learn two ways … (IAF#10).

Learning is hard … it is not balanced Yolŋgu and Balanda (IAM#8).

Elders talked about the differences in discipline systems and said that what the military might see as acceptable behaviour may not be acceptable from a Yolŋgu perspective. These understandings about the military (either real or perceived) need further exploration:
Yolŋgu people talk but do not see eye to eye contact in the same way as Balanda do, it is rude maybe, shouting is disrespectful, pointing is disrespectful. Shouting in front of Yolŋgu in front of others causes shame … This maybe has happened to our people in the Army (IAM#11).

Participants in this study suggested that military members, particularly educators and instructors, should have a basic understanding of the Raypirri Rom and Mawul Rom systems of dispute resolution and discipline and how women’s and men’s business is a set of rules about how to ‘respect’ and get along with other people (IAM#11, IAF#12, IAF#13). According to one senior elder, these things do not always happen when working in whitefella (mainstream) institutions (IAM#11). Elders suggested that to overcome some of the difficulties in joining the military and to assist Yolŋgu in feeling more confident, Yolŋgu discipline and respect needs to be taught to everyone. Lack of institutional acknowledgement of Indigenous perspectives in the learning context was evident in the following scenario.

During an informal discussion with a Yolŋgu Elder, who had previously served with the ADF for a period of 12 years, lack of recognition of Yolŋgu Knowledge and language in the military learning environment was regarded as institutionally discriminating, and it was a likely reason why very few Yolŋgu members make it to the senior ranks. The ex-member suggested that Yolŋgu were often overlooked for promotion because of their perceived cultural deficits, while their strengths in their Indigenous Knowledges were ignored; this situation was mentioned as a likely contributing factor for some Indigenous members no longer being in the military (pers. comm., March, 2014) and was not an isolated case. The ex-member felt that

69See also Craven & Parante (2003); Davidson (1988); Freire (2014); Larkin (2012); Osborne (2001, Chapter 1) for a critique of some of the Cognitive Deficit and Cultural Disadvantaged explanations of underachievement.
although Indigenous members can be highly regarded in their community, their Indigenous expertise and potential were not recognised or respected by the ADF. Educational philosopher Paulo Freire writes that failure to recognise and value the knowledge of Indigenous people is typical within neo-colonial institutions:

Those who steal the words of others develop a deep doubt in the abilities of the others and consider them incompetent. Each time they say their word without hearing the word of those whom they have forbidden to speak, they grow more accustomed to power and acquire a taste for guiding, ordering and commanding. They can no longer live without having someone to give orders to (2014, p. 115).

Another issue which participants felt would be difficult for community members in the military included being away from home for long periods.

**Cultural issues**

The issues that non-Indigenous participants perceived could be difficult for their community members joining the military were found to be little different from the ideas of the Indigenous participants, but pointed more to do with the issues of ‘in-equality, cultural dominance, and discrimination.’ These findings were consistent with ADF members’ perceptions and experiences (see also ‘Cultural Issues’ and ‘Instructor understanding’ in Chapter 6). For example, one member felt that there was a probability that there would be difficulties in ‘being accepted as equals in a Balanda world’ (NIAM#6). Another participant commented that joining the military had the potential to make Indigenous people feel ‘inferior’ and ‘treated as a minority,’ as a result of their knowledge not being recognised and valued in the ADF (NIAF#14). This finding has been reinforced in the literature, where the absence of Indigenous Knowledge in educational curricula reinforces the myth that Indigenous
Knowledges are culturally inferior or secondary order to other Australian cultures (Nakata, 1991). In this particular case, it was highlighted that the sacrifices of joining the military are perceived more than the gains.

Others felt that more could be done so that Yolŋgu would feel less culturally isolated. The DRAP (p. 9) states that the ADF is committed to ensuring that Defence maintains an environment free from discrimination. This statement was reinforced by Elders, in the previous paragraph, who suggested that there needs to be better understanding about what constitutes ‘respect’ from both Yolŋgu and Balanda perspectives. Apart from including Yolŋgu language and culture within the learning environment, it was suggested that Yolŋgu Elders should be involved as mentors and advisors in the education process:

(there is) … safety in numbers, if one Yolŋgu and others not from the same community then the barrier would be being on their own, for example, one Yolŋgu man and one Balanda man, then communication (issues) become so great that the Yolŋgu man will just disengage, or go away because he’s got no one to communicate with, but if two guys were together … then this can work really well…What we find works well in our programs with high Indigenous unemployment, the thing that makes it stick is the Yolŋgu person who has a very good foot in both worlds (like a mentor/elder) … The person who has the foot in both worlds brings it all together to communicate effectively in both … It just works, its important and makes a huge difference, someone working in that middle space … (maybe just for a while) (NIAM#1).

Another suggestion was that more could be done with regard to advertisement and communication within the community regarding recruitment:

Very little effort appears to be made to recruit Indigenous Yolŋgu cadets. It is not advertised widely enough …it should be (NIAF#2).
Potential difficulties regarding language barriers and concerns about Yolŋu soldiers’ confidence in the Balanda world were noted (IAF#11 & NIAM#3). However, as one member suggested, there are enough Yolŋu translators, confident in both worlds, that even the language barriers can be overcome with support (NIA#14). In order to accommodate for different learning styles, involving Elders in the knowledge sharing process is another ‘opportunity’ to expand community relationships (see Dei & Kempf, 2006; Denzin, Lincoln & Smith, 2008; Grieves, 2009; Hughes & More, 1997; Osborne, 2001):

… sitting under a tree, it’s a process in itself, when I reflect on the ways they teach the young fellas, so the older man teaching the younger fellow, it’s almost by osmosis, it’s not like now they’ll do a follow, watch and learn, not a lot of language involved in it, or verbal communication involved. It’s watching, learning, telling stories, it’s something that happens over a long period of time, a little bit more; it’s a process. I went with an old Yolŋgu man and a young man who should have been at school. I could see his thirst for knowledge. The old man didn’t say a word to him, but his job was to do things and the young fella’s job was to watch and learn. But I was told that the young fella … he’s learning, he’s learning, little things like he’d given him specific instructions like hold the boat there, and then he’d go off an watch him, make sure he’s learning. And then he’d just say, he’s learning, he’s learning (NIA#1).

Many participants thought that some Balanda ADF members might not be ready to learn about Indigenous Knowledge, and highlights the taken for granted institutional epistemological dominance and limitations of knowledge referred to by Garrick Cooper (2012) and David Hollinsworth (2006) in Western institutions. Notions of cultural dominance and racial superiority are also concerning, for example:
Some Balanda know, some don’t, some don’t want know (IAM#5).

Depending on whether they (the Balanda) want to acknowledge their Yolŋgu brothers and sisters or not. This would cause huge difficulty (NIAF#14).

Some knowledge not to be shared. Would ADF members be interested or respect the knowledge of Indigenous people? (NIAM#3).

Language and cultural ignorance; failure to appreciate diversity and difference; reluctance to share power and decision-making processes; reluctance to engage; deficit view of Indigenous culture (NIAF#2).

Even though the consensus was that Indigenous Knowledge in military curricula would improve the learning experiences of all members, the biggest area of concern was discrimination that may be encountered from ‘some’ non-Indigenous members.

8.5.3 Difficulties for the organisation

The most difficult organisational issues related to cultural issues. Highlighted under ‘Changing perceptions on Indigenous cultural issues,’ (DRAP p. 2), lack of knowledge and understanding regarding Indigenous cultural issues is a societal and organisational predicament that stems from the history of colonialism, and the Western discourse that everyone should be the same. Nowhere is this more evident than within the field of education. Educational theorist Michael Apple (1987) argues that even while education is recognised as fundamental to living in a globalised world, it can inevitably formulate and reproduce societal inequality. Institutional policies based on non-Indigenous societal norms, exclude Indigenous perspectives in favour of Western norms and values. In other words, class setting based on
universalised standards are setting societal norms. For example, one Indigenous participant whose son currently serves in the ADF stated:

They [the military] have different perspectives, for example, our sorry business. They do not know our feelings when family have ceremony. There is a lack of understanding of sorry business (IAM#8).

Sorry business is understood in this context to be the accepted community protocols and practices related to the passing of a family member. Participants felt that organisational time constraints were likely to conflict with Indigenous epistemologies and ontologies and the importance placed on differing value systems, particularly to do with ceremonies and traditions. Time constraints and prescribed periods of time in the military are different to the ways that Indigenous people conduct business, and therefore it could be met with significant resistance on the part of the organisation (NIA#1). Another member claimed that ‘appreciating the need to open up and accept change, challenging the status quo as a prerequisite for growth and improvement’ is likely to be disconcerting for military personnel (NIAF#2).70 This comment can be related directly to the education environment where failure to take into account the differing learning needs, teaching methodologies, and worldviews of Indigenous people was seen as one of the biggest issues:

… time constraints, the business culture and business environment is not set up to manage that type of learning (referring to Indigenous methodologies) and that style of communication. So it always comes back to not having enough time. That’s what needs to be worked on from an organisational point of view. [There] has

---

70 See Billett et al. (2008); Carnoy & Lingard (2000); Dei & Kempf, (2006); Denzin, Lincoln & Smith (2008); Dewey (2008); Hage (1998); Ki-Zerbo et al. (1997); Osborne (2001); Seddon et al. (2004) for some of the challenges individuals and organisations face in the changing field of education in the twenty-first century.
to be a compromise in learning and teaching. You can’t teach Indigenous Australians guys the same way say in a Balanda 10 week course. For some of these guys, it might take two years at a pace that meets their commitments, their capacities and the language and culture above all those things (NIAM#1).

Prioritising the time to define and implement a clear training plan that has been respectfully negotiated with community members, with measurable outcomes was also considered a major challenge (NIAM#6). It was noted that breakdown in communication between the organisation and the community in the past had resulted from a lack of effective dialog.

As it has been highlighted, major organisational concerns related to a lack of respect for Indigenous Knowledge, lack of institutional understanding, cultural dominance, and time constraints. However, while there were a number of concerns, there were many more positive suggestions that align with the DRAP and IES. Interestingly, the issues raised by community participants were similar to those raised by ADF members themselves, and were found to be mostly overcome in the NZDF example. The benefits of Indigenous Knowledge in military curricula are explored in the following section.

**8.6 The benefits**

In this section, the perceived benefits of centralising Indigenous Knowledge systems in military curricula are discussed (see Question 19, Appendix 1). The findings are grouped under three themes: benefits for community, benefits for community ADF members and Elders, and benefits for the organisation. Overall, the findings are positive and provide further evidence that Indigenous Knowledge systems would indeed improve the learning experiences of all personnel.
8.6.1 Benefits for community

The participants were asked what benefits they perceive would result from embedding Yolŋgu Knowledge in military curricula. For the ‘community as a whole,’ the participants felt that there were many valuable benefits. For example, the appropriate teaching of Indigenous Knowledge would promote ‘respect’ and the sharing of ideas and new knowledge opportunities between the organisation and the community. The most common perception was the aspect of an increased sense of community pride. ADF members will then:

… recognise Aboriginal knowledge so they can see how proud and happy we are to teach for the future, it’s good for our kids to want to learn too, [we] feel proud of ourselves (IAM#6).

All participants shared this view and suggested that there would be many positive spin offs. These included increased employment opportunities, increased recruitment and retention rates, improved relationships, community confidence, and an increase in individual and community self-esteem.

8.6.2 Benefits for community ADF members and community Elders

The perceived benefits for the community, as a whole, trickled down to the individual level:

From my experience, all of a sudden people’s self-esteem is built up and confidence comes out. I’ve seen it happen. People will step up, in a Balanda world, they feel they don’t have any answers or get anything right, too shy, no confidence, you start doing stuff like this (emphasises this study) putting Yolŋgu and Indigenous Australians in the position of the knowledge holders and teachers, they’ll step up … there’s no question about it … (NIAM#1).
Career development benefits, (also) for spouses/children or parents being employed including economic social stability (NIAF#2).

Strengthened relationship, mutual respect for both cultures, working together meaningfully (NIAF#14).

Might be good for people to learn about Yolŋu, if the Yolŋu people instructing in both ways (IAF#11).

Other ways of doing things that don’t cost money and are much better (IAM#12).

Noticeable themes suggest an increase of cultural respect, personal pride, and confidence. For example, ‘We’ll be proud of ourselves to share our knowledge’ (IAM#7). It will also be an opportunity for employment, because Yolŋu culture will be recognised and ‘valued’ (NIM#7). Children were seen to gain much from seeing community members regularly engaged in military activities:

Good for community, (its) important for our Elders to teach and others to show the children that it is good to learn both ways. Create opportunities for sharing information and learning, educating the military. Education is the key, when it includes everyone (IAF#11).

Community engagement programs targeted at school-aged children are recognised as one of the key factors for the success of Reconciliation objectives. As the participants have also identified, the benefits of sharing Indigenous Knowledge in military curricula can be considered to have a positive influence towards achieving these goals.
8.6.3 Benefits for the organisation

The participants were asked what they thought might be some of the organisational benefits that would result from teaching and learning local Yolŋu Knowledge in the military training environment. Emerging themes enhanced the previous comments to do with community and individual pride but related more abstractly to issues such as ‘workplace relationships,’ and ‘opportunities to appreciate differences’. Combined, these themes have the potential to result in improved organisational pride and operational effectiveness as shown in the NZDF example (Chapter 7). The participants felt that embedding some aspects of Yolŋu Knowledge would be an acknowledgement by the organisation of the value which Indigenous Knowledge has in the wider Australian society. It was felt that this would inevitably help soldiers develop ‘a greater acceptance of other cultures’ (NIAM#3), which has positive impacts for other organisations. The flow on benefits related to breaking down negative attitudes, promoting a positive organisational image, and increased recruitment and retention outcomes. The corresponding themes were mentioned by both Indigenous and non-Indigenous participants, and require little explanation:

… better understanding about cultural contributions to society and acceptance, willingness to teach, for example, the winds (and seasonal calendar), confidence increased in our people (IAM#10).

Better to be able to learn between two worlds, to acknowledge a different worldview. It helps both ways, and new people will want to join the organisation (IAF#11).

International recognition for including the knowledge of Australians First Nation People. Reconciliation strategies that share mutual objectives, creating a sense of pride … (NIAF#14).
Better for ADF, opportunities for kids, positive image to communities, protecting and recognising the country and First Nations people as the first people and original owners and caretakers of the land … we have to have equality of both systems, not just one (IAM#9).

Problem solving using alternative knowledge bases leading to innovation; … more communication and cooperation with Indigenous communities; greater understanding of the Indigenous peoples of this country (NIAF#1).

By assigning plans, resources, including economic and human resources and the political will to actually make it happen (NIF#2).

These examples show how thinking outside of the current neo-liberal discourse of disadvantage creates a dialogue conducive to growth. By increasing people’s individual knowledge of alternative ways of viewing and existing in the world, the capacity for positive change is increased.

8.7 Conclusion – it is all about respect

This chapter has explored the perspectives of 14 Galiwinku residents as they discuss the potential benefits of centralising Indigenous Knowledge systems in military curricula. Much of the knowledge that participants identified that would be of a benefit to the ADF related to the close relationships that Yolŋu people have with each other, the land and the military history of the area. Knowledge that Yolŋu people and Galiwinku community might be willing to share with the ADF includes their systems of knowledge to do with language, survival, hunting, bush knowledge, local Indigenous culture, histories, environmental knowledge, and law, to name a few. These systems have been handed down through the generations over thousands
of years (see also Fogarty, 2010; Graham, 2009; Grenier, 1998) and were thought to have the potential to improve Indigenous and non-Indigenous relationships, community pride, and organisational morale. While it was noted that Yolŋu Knowledge is particular to the local environment, and should be taught by the Yolŋu Elders in accordance with the local protocols, the principles behind the knowledge such as ‘survival’ and increased cultural ‘understanding’ are universal, and can be applied in different regions.

Continued support for Galiwinku community members joining the ADF was apparent. However, concerns regarding the perceived lack of formal recognition of Yolŋu Knowledge within the organisation were not uncommon. Furthermore, failing to explore local Indigenous Knowledge learning ‘opportunities,’ and the perceived lack of Indigenous content in military curricula could be considered contrary to the DRAP’s intent, thus constituting a lack of institutional respect towards Indigenous people. The suggestion that some Yolŋu personnel could be leaving the institution on account of their ‘not being considered suitable for promotion,’ warrants urgent investigation. The perceived lack of policy to protect and promote Indigenous languages and cultures within the military was also considered unlikely to attract a greater number of Yolŋu personnel, although participants felt that better communication and collaboration would result in improved participation and achievement of Reconciliation initiatives.

Despite the difficulties, all participants were supportive of Reconciliation measures and felt that Indigenous Knowledge systems in military curricula would have a positive impact on Reconciliation endeavours. Therefore, one of the questions that is worthy of consideration is ‘What are the ramifications of not embedding Indigenous Knowledge systems in military curricula in the twenty-first century?’
This question provides the scope for further reflection as the answers to the thesis questions are summarised in the next and final chapter.
Appendix 1 to Chapter 8 – Survey instrument for community members

1. Are you currently employed in one of the following services?
   Army full-time □ Air Force full-time □ Navy full-time □
   Army reserves □ Air Force reserves □ Navy reserves □

2. Have you ever served in the Regional Force Surveillance Unit, Norforce?

3. Do you identify as an Indigenous Australian of Aboriginal or Torres Strait Island descent?

4. Do you speak an Indigenous Australian language as your first language?
   (If yes, what language or languages do you speak?)

5. What is your clan group?

6. What sex are you?

7. Please tick the appropriate box to indicate your age.
   □ under 18 □ 18-30 □ 31-43 □ 44-56 □ over 57

8. What community do you live in?

9. How long have you lived in this community?

10. What do you like most about living in your community?

11. If you currently serve, or have served, in the military, what was your most memorable experience?

12. Has anyone else in your family ever been employed in the military, or the Australian Defence Force (ADF)? Can you describe their military experience, for example, what jobs were performed, what they liked the most, or found most difficult?

13. Do you know any Indigenous Australians who worked for the military in World War Two? Can you briefly describe their experience?

14. What are some of the advantages for community members of being in the military? For example, what are some of the things members learn?

15. What are some of the things members from your community find difficult, or might find difficult, if they joined the military?

16. Are ADF members from your community taught any Indigenous Knowledge in the military? If yes, what and how is this taught?

17. What aspects of Indigenous Knowledge do you think might benefit all ADF members?
   □ local Indigenous Knowledge □ culture and traditions
   □ Indigenous history & military involvement □ basic local language skills
□ Indigenous war-fighting or tracking skills □ Indigenous hunting skills
□ Indigenous medicinal & bush tucker knowledge
□ Indigenous environmental knowledge □ Indigenous survival techniques
□ Situational awareness skills □ navigating with and without maps
□ oral histories □ knowledge about the Dreaming □ other

Comments

18. How might the inclusion of aspects of local Indigenous Knowledge in the military training environment benefit your community? Benefits for community ADF members? Benefits for community Elders/instructors?

19. What might be some of the organisational benefits that could result from the inclusion of local Indigenous Knowledge in the military training environment?

20. What might be some of the ways members of your community could teach ADF members about your local knowledge, including the military history of this area?
   □ small group tours of your area
   □ making videos or creating a website for ADF members
   □ oral histories/book
   □ help teach and mentor on Norforce courses
   □ visit local ADF bases to provide training
   □ Indigenous Knowledge survival courses on country during promotion courses or field exercises
   □ welcome to country ceremonies for military personnel on military establishments during enlistment, or other important occasions

21. What might be some of the difficulties involved in teaching local Indigenous Knowledge to ADF members? Difficulties for community Elders/instructors? Difficulties for ADF members? Difficulties for the ADF organisation?

22. What do you know about the Defence Reconciliation Action Plan?

23. What do you know about the Indigenous Employment Strategy?

24. Overall, how might the inclusion of Indigenous Knowledge and Indigenous perspectives in the military training environment support the Defence Reconciliation Action Plan, the Indigenous Employment Strategy, and benefit members of your community?

25. Do you have any other comments about the topic?
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If you have come here to help me, you are wasting your time. But if you have come because your liberation is bound up with mine, then let us work together (Lilla Watson & Aboriginal activists group, Queensland, 1970).

9.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the research conclusions and implications in light of the research question: Would the inclusion of Indigenous Knowledge systems in Australian Defence Educational curricula strengthen and improve ADF members’ educational experiences? With significant support, this thesis argues that the inclusion of Indigenous Knowledge systems in Australian Defence Force (ADF) education curricula would strengthen and improve the learning experiences of all members. As evident in the experiences of New Zealand Defence Force (NZDF) participants (Chapter 7; Hohaia, 2015), ADF participants exhibited majority support for this argument (Chapter 6), along with community members (Chapter 8), where a number of potential benefits were identified. In order to achieve this, however, a paradigm shift needs to occur at every level of the organisation. A paradigm shift needs to involve a critical analysis of ‘whose’ and ‘what’ knowledge is considered important in the context of a military learning environment, and the wider political context of a government institution seeking to achieve Reconciliation between its Indigenous and non-Indigenous members.

This study finds that there are many benefits that would result from centralising Indigenous Knowledge systems within military curricula. In the case of the ADF, however, the findings suggest that issues surrounding a paradigm shift are complex,
and are not merely based on societal or members’ attitudes alone. Even though increased institutional pride and organisational morale were found to be key benefits that have resulted from embedding Māori Indigenous Knowledge in the NZDF, ADF and community participants perceived that there must be some significant difficulties surrounding the centralisation of Indigenous Australian Knowledge systems in the ADF. Identified difficulties, addressed in Chapter 6 and 8, related to resistance including organisational values, ruling relations, and unexplored opportunities. The first difficulty related to the differing perspectives of ‘respect’ and the ways in which knowledge is controlled in the context of a military establishment founded on British colonial traditions and Western values. The second was influenced by the ‘relationships’ that Indigenous and non-Indigenous people have, or do not have, with each other and the military and included the public and institutional policy context in which the ADF and Indigenous people operate with similar but sometimes conflicting objectives and ideological goals. The third difficulty related to lack of institutional support for Indigenous Knowledge ‘opportunities’ in daily practice. Difficulties were identified alongside national Reconciliation goals and subsequent efforts made by the organisation to adopt a Reconciliation Action Plan (The Defence Reconciliation Action Plan, DRAP, see Chapter 6), and were found to directly or indirectly affect the level of Indigenous participation in the ADF.

In line with the DRAP initiatives: to ‘build respect, broaden opportunities and strengthen relationships’ between Defence, across the government and with Indigenous communities throughout Australia, it is important to have an understanding of the underpinning values, expectations, and perceptions that Indigenous people and the ADF have of each other. To achieve this, the educational experiences and attitudes of a group of ADF members, and community members,
were explored to identify current practices that might promote or inhibit the centralisation of Indigenous Knowledge systems in military curricula. Across each phase of the research, the participants identified aspects of Indigenous Knowledge systems that have the potential to exceed current initiatives. Themes that emerged related to improved cultural understanding; stronger relationships, individual, community and institutional pride. As shown in the NZDF example, these benefits can result in respectful relationships between Indigenous and non-Indigenous personnel. In light of this study, the benefits of Indigenous Knowledge education in the ADF could have similar advantages, thus, maximising Indigenous potential, increasing the participation rates of other minority groups, and providing the much needed pathway to a shared identity within the ADF. Using a qualitative research approach through discussion, observations and surveys, this study has subsequently allowed me to address all of the objectives to answer the research question.

9.2 Main research findings

The first feature that predominated each phase of the research, and fundamental to the DRAP, related to the principle of ‘respect.’ Participants displayed varying levels of individual and institutional understanding, and assigned different values to the principle of ‘respect’ when applied to Indigenous Knowledge systems in military curricula. NZDF and community members assigned a greater value and respect for Indigenous Knowledge education than did the majority of the ADF participants. While NZDF and the community participants valued Indigenous Knowledge systems, and considered them important to the military learning experience, most ADF members exhibited little understanding regarding the value and importance that Indigenous Knowledge systems may have, or could potentially have, in relation to
military education (see Chapter 6–8). Coincidently, the principle of ‘respect,’ with reference to the centralisation of Indigenous Knowledge systems held little or no relevance when applied to current educational practice, and in some circumstances, the absence of respect for Indigenous perspectives undermined the learning experiences of ADF personnel. Lack of understanding by some military instructors, combined with little knowledge about the DRAP, suggests current educational practices can inadvertently contradict the success of Reconciliation objectives, as neither party fully understands or appreciates each other’s values and perspectives. As a result, instructors are unable to apply the principle of ‘respect’ for alternative knowledge systems through sound educational practice and in ways that confirm both non-Indigenous and Indigenous identity. Despite these difficulties, there was a clear indication of goodwill conducive to the spirit of Reconciliation and support for centralising Indigenous Knowledge systems in military curricula. This was perceived amongst the majority of ADF participants and all community respondents. Learning ‘from’ difference rather than ‘about’ difference (Hall, 2014; Jones & Jenkins, 2008) leads to understanding and an alignment of values that provides a baseline for improved relationships. Relationships were found to be the second most important feature necessary for centralising Indigenous Knowledge systems in the ADF.

In the NZDF, relationships between Indigenous and non-Indigenous participants were enhanced through coordinated military education practices and Indigenous Knowledge learning opportunities, and were well established in light of the current political agenda to promote a shared bicultural identity. Professional development activities, including representational opportunities, have reinforced the members’ learning experiences and were aligned with achieving national and institutional goals of biculturalism.
Community participants’ relationships with each other and the ADF also provided an important framework for strengthening community relations. In the absence of national and institutional legislation that protects and develops Indigenous Knowledge systems in Australia, however, the ADF participants were less informed with regard to how important these relationships were unless they had prior experience, or had been involved in the DRAP or the Regional Force Surveillance Units (RFSUs). Lack of a legal framework and effective policy to protect and develop Indigenous worldviews in Australian institutions leads to maintenance of the status quo (Altman & Fogarty, 2010; Billet et al. 2008; Nakata, 1991 & 2007; Pearson, 2009), the undermining of Indigenous interests (Altman, 2007 & 2010; Hinkson, 2007), and perpetuation of an assimilationist agenda (Arbon, 2008; McConaghy, 2000; Rowse, 2005; Sarra, 2011, 2012). Moreover, when critiqued through an Interest Convergence lens (see 1.4 Interest Convergence Theory), the evidence suggests that Reconciliation goals are unlikely to be met with long-term epistemological success.

Without committing to a major theoretical and critical review of how Australian society through its ideological apparatuses works to protect the normalisation of white hegemony, as Irene Watson suggests, there is merely an illusion of change (Watson, 2007). Similar to Professor Derek Bell’s (1980) findings concerning the failure of the United States government to deliver quality of education for Afro-Americans, quality learning from Indigenous perspectives in Australian institutions is awarded little priority. This finding was demonstrated in this study by lack of formal recognition for Indigenous languages and knowledge systems in military curricula, and by lack of opportunity to learn Indigenous worldviews overall. However, as it was to be expected, RFSU members, whom were
predominantly Indigenous Australians, and those who worked or resided in the remote regions of the Northern Territory, were found to have increased perceptions of the value and importance Indigenous Knowledge systems might have in formal military education, and the role they play in strengthening relationships.

The third feature applicable to the centralisation of Indigenous Knowledge systems in the ADF related to the concept of ‘opportunities.’ ADF and community members’ understanding and perceptions regarding ‘opportunities’ in the military were found to be disparate and suggests that there is a disjunct between the objectives embedded in the institutional Reconciliation literature, members’ actual experiences, and the underlying assumptions and expectations held by community members. Sociologist Dorothy E. Smith (1999a) and others believe it is here that the objectified relations of ruling and institutional discourse come into play because the testimony of experience is divorced from participants’ realities (Smith, 2006).

Community and ADF member perceptions relating to educational ‘opportunities’ appeared largely disparate. Lack of investigation into the benefits of reciprocal learning relationships between Indigenous and non-Indigenous personnel is a missed opportunity and is where the main disjuncture lies. For example, the community members understood Reconciliation to be a two-way learning process (Chapter 8; Dean, 2013; Gaykamangu with Taylor, 2014; Grimes, 2009; Harris, 1990; Ober, 2009; Rigney, 2003 & 2006), based on reciprocal partnership approaches to education, while institutional Reconciliation objectives focused primarily on recruitment and retention issues, and aligning Indigenous educational experience to meet the dominant standards and norms set by non-Indigenous Australians. While creating Indigenous education pathways into the military are important, without meaningful Indigenous Knowledge engagement and the
opportunity to learn Indigenous worldviews, it is difficult to envisage how current practices could contribute to transformational change. The issue of reverse racism, which can stigmatise Indigenous people even further (see Hollinsworth, 2006), also warrants urgent investigation.

Moreover, the non-alignment of values and lack of Indigenous Knowledge learning opportunities provide some scope and evidence of the Interest Convergence Theory, when critiqued in accordance with Reconciliation objectives. As Jacinta Maxwell (2012) discovered about the lack of consultative processes between schools and Indigenous communities in Queensland, failure by the government to provide adequate funding and time to implement the necessary framework to affect ‘genuine change,’ resulted in little progress or gains being made. Applying an anti-colonial framework then seeks to emphasize the effects of marginalization on the military learning experience at the hands of colonialism and works to challenge the rationale for continued inequities (Nabavi, 2006, p. 176; Arbon, 2008; Nakata (1991 & 2007) Rigney, 2003; Smith, 2014; Stewart-Harawira, 2005). Adopting the spiral of understanding to embed Indigenous Knowledges in military education and practice would mean encapsulating the past as constitutive of the present and a future that encompasses the totality of the shared human experience (Stewart-Harawira, 2005, p. 251). This is a critical component of this study. Embedding Indigenous Knowledges and pedagogical approaches to military curricula would not only provide valuable learning opportunities for non-Indigenous personnel, leadership and instructional opportunities for Indigenous personnel, but reinforce the democratic principles of freedom and respect, which is a fundamental tenet of a shared society and Reconciliation. While ADF and community members identified various aspects of
Indigenous Knowledge that are worthy of consideration, the experiences of NZDF members either reinforced or exceeded these views.

Despite ongoing issues related to epistemological dominance (see Cooper, 2012; Mahuika, 2011), training improvements, and resistance that stemmed from gaps in the Māori Indigenous Knowledge training in the New Zealand example, NZDF respondents expressed a good level of Māori Knowledge understanding and sense of institutional pride as a result of their military education and training. Organisational opportunities and processes that supported Indigenous Knowledge in military practice were experienced as respectful and beneficial.71 Efforts to achieve a paradigm change by embracing Māori Indigenous Knowledge were seen as crucial for achieving a distinct New Zealand identity and were not considered ‘tokenistic’ (Scoppio, 2007). In accordance with Indigenous traditions (Arbon, 2008; Bishop, 1999; Edwards, McCleanor, & Moewaka-Barnes, 2007; Martin, 2008; Sarra, 2011; Tolerton, 2011) kaumatua (Elders) act as key advisors and mentors in the proceedings, which is an important feature of the learning process. Moreover, the importance of Elders in the learning environment aligns with one of Mason Tolerton’s (2011) findings in a report on some of the military Culture Camp programs in Canada. Similar to the DRAP initiatives, these programs are aimed at increasing Aboriginal employment opportunities and participation in the Canadian Forces (CF). Tolerton (2011) found that 100% of the Aboriginal youth participants stated that they found the Elders either ‘vital,’ or ‘helpful and beneficial’ to have around. Respect for Elders and the critical role they play in education is not well understood in non-Indigenous societies, however, Elders can contribute markedly to

71 Chief Executive, Business Council of Australia, Jennifer Westacott (Reconciliation News, Issue #29, May, 2014, p. 5) also comments on some of the positive benefits that can be realised through the sharing of Indigenous Knowledge: ‘… the interest we showed in her culture (ref a young Aboriginal intern) contributed to her pride and confidence and her wish to learn more about her own background.’ This finding was reinforced amongst the Māori personnel in the NZDF.
the learning process particularly taking into consideration the differences between Indigenous and non-Indigenous learning methodologies (Bishop, 1999 & 2005; Edwards, McCleanor, & Moewaka-Barnes, 2007; Fogarty, 2010; Ma Rhea, 2004; Martin, 2008; Stewart-Harawira, 2005; Nicholls, 2009; Ober, 2009; Purdie et al. 2010; Sarra, 2011; Simpson, 2004; Smith, 2014; Tolerton, 2011; Williams, 2003; Worby et al. 2010).

Meanwhile, misunderstanding due to lack of communication, collaboration, and unexplored opportunities regarding Indigenous Knowledge education within the ADF provide the basis for this, and subsequent research. While the institutional documents clearly support inclusion and participation of Indigenous members, ‘little’ or ‘no’ recognition for Indigenous Knowledge systems could be considered contrary to participants’ understanding of Reconciliation, and a lack of respect towards Indigenous worldview. Empirical studies show that separation from Indigenous languages and cultures in education continues to cause alienation, low self-esteem and has contributed to the lack of success of Indigenous students in mainstream classrooms (Bird et al. 2009; Bishop, 1999, 2005, 2008 & 2010; Grimes, 2009; Hughes & More, 1997; Nabavi, 2006; Simon & Smith et al. 2001; Stewart-Harawira, 2005). However, freedom of expression through language is critical for Indigenous empowerment, the re-generation of Indigenous languages (Dean, 2013; Rigney, 2006; Walsh, 2004), and individual/community emancipation (Altman & Fogarty, 2009; Altman & Kerins, 2012; Fogarty, 2010; Warner, 2009). Drawing on the work of Franz Fanon (1963) and Albert Memi (1969), Nabavi (2006, p. 181) argues that the use of language and oral tradition in resistance movements is central to building non-violent, communal, and spiritual approaches to liberation (Kanu, 2011). In the NZDF, for instance, the benefits of teaching and learning Indigenous language in
everyday practice has contributed markedly to increased levels of cultural understanding (Neill, 2004; Scoppio, 2007).

However, educational reforms are unlikely to be successful if there is a lack of consultation, and unrealistic expectations agreed to at the local level (Maxwell, 2012). Focusing on unrealistic ideological assumptions, while failing to adequately deal with issues of racism in Australian society also ensures that it will continue (Dodson, 2007; Hollingsworth, 2006; Maddison, 2011; Malin, 1997; McConnachie et al. 1989; McGregor, 2011). In the United States, for example, Driver claims that:

By constantly aiming for a status that is unobtainable in a perilously racist America, black Americans face frustration and despair. Racial equality for blacks will remain a permanently elusive goal because the racist structure will absorb and adapt to any challenges: Black people will never gain full equality in this country. Even those herculean efforts we hail as successful will produce no more than temporary ‘peaks of progress,’ short-lived victories that slide into irrelevance as racial patterns adapt in ways that maintain white dominance (2011, p. 164).

Similarly, Anthias & Yuval-Davis (1992, pp. 138-139) have found that white supremacist assumptions about the self and other have ‘… been part of the unconscious history of reasoning in Western civilization and have been made to function as an instrument of class and ethnic domination.’ Understanding how multiple manifestations of racism exist in contemporary institutions helps to explain the ‘deep-rooted resistance’ to anti-racist struggles (Dei & Kempf, 2006; Hollinsworth, 2006). More specifically, the long history of failing to address issues of racism in Australia (Maddison, 2012; McGregor, 2011; Stanner, 2009), is mostly brought about by anti-dialogical action (Freire, 2014, p. 125) and the bureaucratic
denial of its existence. Sarah Maddison (2011, p. 73) expands on this in her book *Beyond White Guilt* drawing on the works of W. Stanner when she argues that Australia might have taken a different path if it had followed a course informed by consciousness and a sense of justice for Australia’s original inhabitants, rather than one based on white superiority and a denial of Aboriginal existence. This finding was taken up by the community participants, and some ADF members, who felt that much more could be done to combat racism and promote Indigenous worldviews within the organisation. Effective anti-racism education (Dansby et al. 2012; Silk et al. 2000), and providing alternative Indigenous education methodologies lay the foundations for achieving this goal:  

… a critical approach to ‘multilogicality’ should involve a global effort to act educationally and politically on the calls for diversity and justice…that allow for Indigenous self-sufficiency while learning from the vast storehouse of knowledge that provide compelling insights into all domains of human endeavour (Kincheloe and Steinberg 2008, p. 135).

The difficulties in centralising Indigenous Knowledge in military curricula are discussed further in the following section.

### 9.3 Difficulties of centralising Indigenous Knowledge systems in ADF Curricula

In recent decades, the participation rates of Indigenous people, people of colour and minority groups in Western military establishments has become increasingly important (Bergin et al. 1993; Bertone et al. 1998; Cheatham, 1988; Cowen, 2008;  

72 Bishop & Glynn (1999); Dewey (2008); Freire (2014); Harris (1995); Heshusius (1994); Kincheloe & Steinberg (2008); Ma Rhea (2004); Osborne (2001); Scoppio (2007); Tangihaere & Twiname (2011).
Dansby et al. 2001; Scoppio, 2007; Silk et al. 2000; Williams and Gilroy, 2006; Zoroya, 2014). As mentioned throughout this thesis, the participation of rates of Indigenous personnel in the New Zealand and Australian militaries is particularly relevant because they are linked to the wider socio-political goals of achieving Biculturalism in New Zealand and Reconciliation in Australia. Both discourses rely on effective communication and established relationships between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people.

In the NZDF, Māori participation, including social aspirations relating to the maintenance and promotion of Māori Knowledge in the military is clearly articulated within the NZDF’s bicultural policies. Underpinned by the three principles of ‘participation, partnership, and protection,’ these policies govern institutional protocols and state clearly how Māori Indigenous Knowledge is to be protected and shared within the military learning environment (Neill, 2004; Scoppio, 2007). Results of this study show that NZDF members’ learning experiences were clearly shaped in accordance with these goals.

By contrast, where no treaty or partnership arrangement exists between Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australians, Indigenous aspirations to protect and maintain their systems of knowledge, within the context of the military learning environment, did not appear to exist. While Indigenous participation and DRAP initiatives are purportedly underpinned by the principles of ‘respect, opportunities, and relationships,’ findings suggest that these principles were rarely extended to Indigenous pedagogies in educational practice. Without a legal framework, as Professor Nakata suggests, the ideological goal of Reconciliation presents merely another politically accepted conceptual image for the democratic inclusion of Blacks into the decision-making processes usually afforded to White Australians (1991, pp.
116–117). Not only does this situation continue the separation of Indigenous people from their own systems of knowledge, reinforcing Western hegemony by virtue of assimilation into the dominant culture (Anthias & Yuval-Davis, 1992; Freire, 2014) but it does little to challenge or redistribute the power and control mechanisms that caused Reconciliation to become a national objective (Arbon 2008; Bishop, 2010; Bell, 1980; Martin, 2008; McConaghy, 2000; Moreton-Robinson, 2007; Nakata 1991 & 2007; Pearson 2009 & 2014; Rigney, 1997; Rowse, 2005; Short, 2008; Watson, 2007).

Furthermore, continuing to ignore the United Nations Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples and deny the repeated requests of Indigenous Australians to be recognised as their own sovereign identities (Falk & Martin, 2007)73 with equal support for language, knowledge and cultural development in all educational curricula, is another example of the epistemological dominance that has existed in Australian institutions, since European arrival. Findings suggest that ADF members’ current attitudes and learning experiences were not well informed regarding the benefits that Indigenous Knowledge systems may have for the military learning environment, and perhaps more importantly, nor did they reflect the principles espoused in the DRAP.

In order to gain understanding of the perceived difficulties related to Indigenous Knowledge systems in the ADF, it is useful to reflect on the discourse of disadvantage. Closing the gap initiatives have been widely criticised by Indigenous educators, scholars and their supporters in New Zealand and Australia because they have failed to deliver in accordance with Indigenous aspirations, sovereignty, and self-determination (Altman & Fogarty, 2010; Bishop, 2010; Mahuika, 2011; Watson,

2007). The deficit view of Indigenous people perpetuates notions of white superiority by asserting the belief that Indigenous people have little or no knowledge to offer contemporary or future society (Bedford et al. 2010; Nakata, 1991). Educational reforms are subsequently designed by people who claim to be representative of, or who make a profession of, speaking for Indigenous people, which leads to a division of power to a distribution of new power, which is consequently a double repression (Foucault cited in Nakata, 1991). It is here that the similarities and differences between Indigenous participation, diversity, and Indigenous Knowledge use in the ADF and the NZDF are noteworthy.

9.3.1 Similarities

In the wider context of this study, there were a number of similarities that came to light. Most notably was that Indigenous Australian and Māori military participation has been greatly affected by the processes of colonisation. Regardless of the socially acceptable ideology of the time, both Māori and Indigenous Australians have suffered large scale land, cultural and heritage loss as a result of the colonising process. Both groups have also shared similar social challenges with respect to education, health, incarceration rates, and employment opportunities. One of the major differences, however, is that Māori have gained considerable political leverage from the Treaty of Waitangi 1840 and through having their own political voice in New Zealand. This has resulted in greater autonomy with regard to education, social issues and a sense of shared identity in New Zealand society. While both Indigenous Australians and Māori are becoming more politically active, greater autonomy over their own affairs has perhaps helped Māori to achieve higher levels of military participation, political and educational autonomy than Indigenous Australians (see Chapter 3 and 4).
9.3.2 Differences

Without a legal framework that recognises Indigenous sovereignty, in Australia, Indigenous interests are awarded subordinate priority in the majority of Australian institutions. It is thus pertinent to reflect on the Interest Convergence Theory in relation to the findings. Professor Bell writes that the human rights of ethnic minorities will never be served by the interests of the dominant group; it is only when the interests of the dominant group are served more than the interests of minorities that minority groups will be supported (Bell, 1980). Applying the Interest Convergence lens to this study then helps to make sense of some of the findings. The serving of majority group interests over minorities, for example, was played out in the NZDF example where the centralisation of Māori Indigenous Knowledge in the NZDF did not occur without significant non-Māori resistance. Collaboration and agreement only occurred when increased international pressure was placed on the New Zealand government to abide by its Treaty responsibilities, post the late 1980s. Coinciding with increased Māori aspirations to embed Māori Knowledge in every aspect of public society, the New Zealand government capitalised on the benefits of being seen to support national bicultural objectives. This finding, however, should not detract from the steady increase of support that was taking place from within the organisation. As Franz Fanon suggests:

The final settling of accounts will not be today nor yet tomorrow, for the truth is that the settlement was begun on the very first day of the war, and it will be ended not because there are no more enemies to kill, but quite simply because the enemy, for various reasons, will come to realise that his interest lies in ending the struggle and in recognizing the sovereignty of the colonised people (Fanon, 1971, p. 113).
Today, the Treaty of Waitangi 1840, and the Treaty of Waitangi Act 1975, formalise the basis for the relationship between Māori and the Crown, and provides the legal framework for Indigenous Knowledge use in the NZDF. Unlike Māori, who were represented significantly in overseas conflicts throughout the twentieth-century, due to significant political and institutional support (see Chapter 4), Indigenous Australians were not encouraged to seek military careers during much of the twentieth-century (Hall, 1997). Many still find it difficult to enlist, particularly in the full-time services. While targeted recruitment campaigns are now necessary in the ADF, this is generally not the case in the NZDF, where recruitment campaigns are targeted towards all youth.

Another factor that is likely to have impacted the findings in some way is that Indigenous Australia is not considered a homogenous society. While clan groups speak different languages, some Indigenous Australians can speak a number of languages, (see Chapter 8) and outwardly share some similar traditions and cultural practices (Broome, 1994). Indigenous languages, however, are not officially recognised in Australia and attract little funding and government support when compared with English, or Asian languages. By contrast, Māori language is now an officially recognised language in New Zealand, with some dialectal differences, and attracts widespread government support. Māori are also considered a more homogenous group than Indigenous Australians.

Another important point is that Australia is viewed as a multicultural country. In the absence of a critical mass, and while Reconciliation is considered ‘voluntary,’ Indigenous Australians do not appear to have much public support for their

---

74 See also Scoppio (2007) for the effects of the critical mass theory in relation to Māori military participation, also Neill, (2004).
75 While recruitment and retention of Indigenous personnel is important in both militaries, it is more so in the ADF, where Indigenous representation remains low, particularly in the senior and full-time ranks.
knowledge systems in education (see Chapter 1, 3 and 6; Christie, 1987; Crawford, 1988; Dean, 2018; Rigney, 2006; Waller, 2012; Walsh, 2004). By comparison, since the 1990s, New Zealand has been promoted as a bicultural country, where Māori and Crown relationships are recognised as a ‘partnership,’ thus Māori have gained considerable support to embed their knowledge in all aspects of New Zealand society.\textsuperscript{76} In line with national objectives to achieve biculturalism in New Zealand, Indigenous Knowledge was considered extremely important to the NZDF, as both parties (Māori and non-Māori) acknowledged the need to understand a range of different perspectives and alternative worldviews (Neill, 2004; Scoppio, 2007).\textsuperscript{77} Māori also appear to be more evenly represented across all ranks in the NZDF (Scoppio, 2007). In the RFSUs, the majority of Indigenous Australians are employed on a part-time basis and come from remote, or very remote, Indigenous communities. While Indigenous Australian language use in the Northern Territory is perhaps the highest in the country, English literacy levels in most of the remote communities is well below the national average. Consequently, few Indigenous Australians appear to be represented in the senior RFSU ranks, and are still underrepresented across all ranks in the full-time services (see Chapter 2–4).

In light of these findings, the real and perceived difficulties related to Indigenous Knowledge in the ADF were: cultural issues, including issues of racism, discrimination, and resistance. Organisational power relationships including attitudes of cultural superiority that surfaced as negative stereotypical comments and assumptions made about Indigenous people were also apparent, as were issues of

\textsuperscript{76} Of particular note is the understanding that Māori Indigenous Knowledge is recognised as a fundamental component for achieving a bicultural identity.

epistemological dominance.\textsuperscript{78} For example, some non-Indigenous ADF members displayed a total disregard for Indigenous Knowledge systems, commenting that the organisation had done ‘OK’ without them until now, while others failed to consider their relevance at all. Lack of instructor understanding regarding the importance of Indigenous perspectives was identified, and is similar to the ongoing struggles that Indigenous people throughout the world have in reclaiming their Knowledge systems, and embedding them within mainstream institutions (Arbon, 2008; Beckett, 1987; Bedford et al. 2010; Bishop & Glynn, 1999; Choudry, 2003; Collins & Lea, 1999; Coombs et al. 1983; Cooper, 2012; Dei & Kempf, 2006; Keeffe, 1992; Osborne, 2001; Smith, 1999b; Sarra, 2011; Rigney, 2006; Youngblood Henderson, 2002).\textsuperscript{79}

Highlighting how majority group interests protect the status quo, the following difficulties related to the centralisation of Indigenous Knowledge systems in the ADF:

1. **Perceptions and values** – the differing perceptions and values that are assigned to Indigenous Knowledge systems by ADF and the community members, reflected or not reflected, as the case may be, in institutional values (norms), attitudes, curricula practices, and member perceptions.

2. **Power and Policy** – a lack of institutional policy creates power differentials and a lack of opportunity for Indigenous Knowledge

\textsuperscript{78} In this context, the ways in which knowledge is created and ‘known’ in a Western military establishment.

\textsuperscript{79} See also the works of Ball (1991); Cheatham (1988); Cowen (2008); Dansby et al. (2001) Enloe (1980); Erai (1995); Hall (1981, 1995, 1997); Holm (1997); Krouse & Dixon (2007); Ministry for Culture & Heritage, NZ, (2013); New Zealand Army (2007); Nez with Schiess Avila (2011); Riseman (2008 & 2013); Soutar (2000); Stasiuk (2002 & 2004); Williams & Gilroy (2006); Winegard (2009) and Zoroya (2014) who provide detailed accounts of some of the military experiences of ethnic soldiers in various countries.
education in the ADF, which are reinforced within the context of a military establishment founded on British traditions, and Western contemporary values.

3. **Expectations and behaviours** – the differing expectations surrounding Reconciliation, and the subsequent inclusion of Indigenous Knowledge systems in military curricula, amongst ADF and the community members, and discriminatory attitudes and behaviours exhibited by ‘some’ ADF personnel towards Indigenous people.

It is important that these difficulties are considered in the wider context of a colonised society that has yet to formally recognise its Indigenous people (Pearson, 2014). Identified issues aligned with a number of studies conducted in educational contexts where the voices of Indigenous people continue to be marginalised in the absence of sufficient institutional and political power, and the pursuit of national mainstream objectives.80

Results suggest that ADF personnel are largely influenced by societal values which are currently recognised through British inheritance, policies and practices that ‘normalise’ the English language, English laws and English structures of government (Pearson, 2014; Gaykamangu with Taylor, 2014). Evidence of this was portrayed amongst the recruitment and educational experiences of the majority of ADF personnel, where little or no value was awarded to Indigenous Knowledge systems, or experience. The imbalance of power at the individual and institutional
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80 See Bell (1980 & 1992); Bennett (1989); Bishop (2008); Dei & Kempf (2006); Dewey (2008); Du Bois (1990); Drurie (1998); Fleras & Spoonley (1999); Harris (1990); Ki-zerbo et al. (1997); Lewis (2001); Lippmann (1994); Ma Rhea (2004 & n.d); Marx, & Engels (1973); Maxwell (2012); McConaghy (2001); Milner (2008); O’Sullivan (2007); Rowley (1986); Rupesinghe & Tishkov (1996); Smith, (1999b); Spivak (1994); Stromquist & Monkman, (2000); Welch (1996) and Williams (2003).
level, as well as the wider socio-political level, directly and indirectly impacted upon all of the participants in this study. Members’ perceptions of the value that Indigenous Knowledge systems may have for the ADF were therefore largely influenced through a lack of understanding and the imposition of mainstream values.

The invisibility of Indigenous Knowledge systems in institutional practices is similar to Didi Khayatt’s (1995) study where it was found that the school’s administrative practices generated a *compulsory heterosexuality*, which, in turn, produced a sense of marginality and vulnerability among lesbian students. Homosexuality was excluded from curricula content lest it appear as an alternative to heterosexuality (Babbie, 2008; Khayatt, 1995). While ADF members exhibited little knowledge regarding the value and benefits Indigenous Knowledge systems might have for the military, maintaining the status quo of Indigenous Knowledge invisibility in ADF educational curricula, all NZDF and community participants assigned a much higher value to its importance. However, in the case of the latter group, Indigenous Knowledge systems governed the actualities of experience (see Chapter 7 & 8; Smith, 2006), and were naturally expected to be included in education.

The differing perceptions and value that each group assigned to Indigenous Knowledge systems affected individual and group relationships. Issues of epistemological dominance were evident amongst participant experiences, amongst both the NZDF and ADF personnel. Acknowledging that there is an exercise of power in relation to knowledge production and curricula content processes in military establishments is imperative, as power relations impact on members’ understanding about whose knowledge systems are considered important, or not
important, in the military context. Although just over half of ADF members who participated felt that Indigenous Knowledge systems were valued within the organisation, this was not reinforced through professional development ‘opportunities’ or illustrated amongst members’ learning experiences. Views of cultural superiority (Watson, 2007), fuelled by imperfect knowledge (Bennett, 1989) of a situation, and an assumption that Indigenous Australians must have similar attitudes towards knowledge as non-Indigenous Australians, remain unchallenged. Furthermore, lack of institutional policy to protect and promote the knowledge systems of Indigenous Australians was seen by the community members as unlikely to attract greater participation of Indigenous members. Indigenous perceptions about knowledge, such as maintenance and development of Indigenous languages, practices, ceremonies and worldviews, and their application to everyday life did not align with those of the organisation. Others felt that Indigenous people would be treated inequitably in the ADF, as a result of their Knowledge systems being ignored.

Lack of respect for Indigenous Knowledge systems, which sometimes resulted in discriminatory treatment, was evident amongst some of the long-serving NZDF participant experiences, prior to the implementation of the bicultural policies. This situation aligned with some of the findings in Michelle Erai’s 1996 thesis entitled *Māori Soldiers: Māori Experiences in the New Zealand Army* when she stated: ‘What the literature has shown is that ethnicity and gender may restrict the corps an individual enters, the rank which they subsequently achieve, and therefore the path
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81 See Cooper (2012) for a discussion on the knowledge versus culture debate, and the implications of ‘coloniality’ and multiple epistemologies. See also Du Bois (1990); Enloe (1980); Erai, (1995); Yosso (2005); Milner (2008); Scoppio (2007); O’Sullivan (2007) for an insight into ‘whose culture has capital’ in contemporary education systems, with reference to some Western military establishments.

82 A military unit, or group of people associated together through trade or profession, for example, the education corps, or the nursing corps.
of their career within the army’ (Erai, 1996, p. 45). Through the Interest Convergence lens, the discourse of disadvantage can then be seen to contribute to the perpetuation of racism in Western societies. ‘[T]he only way one race of people can keep another down is if deep down we believe the other is not as capable as us….’

While urgent work needs to be done in this area, potential Indigenous recruits might exercise various characteristics of ‘resistant power’ towards the military because they perceive their cultural beliefs and/or the authoritative power of the institution will dominate their own knowledge systems and beliefs. ‘Counter-hegemonic resistance to Eurocentric domination is essential in reclaiming ownership over knowledges and worldviews’ (Nabavi, 2006, p. 178).

The differing expectations and overall lack of understanding regarding the DRAP initiatives was particularly concerning. Dr Irene Watson writes that many people have already asked the same question: ‘… like what does reconciliation really mean? Will it provide homes for the homeless, food for the hungry, land for the dispossessed, language and culture for those hungry to revive from stolen dispossessed spaces … how can you reconcile with a state and its citizens that have yet to acknowledge your humanity’ (Watson, 2007, p. 20)? Without aligned expectations, both the ADF members and the community participants exhibited little understanding regarding their roles and responsibilities towards Reconciliation. Miscommunication, or insufficient communication, is not uncommon where national objectives are imposed from the outside of communities, or from the top down within organisations, rather than the other way around; this was evidenced in the

---

83 Bono, cited in Readers Digest, July, 2013, Unforgettable Nelson Mandela: The man within the icon (pp. 32–45).
84 Bennett (1989); Foucault (2000); Freire (2014); Lippman (1994); Wegner (2007) provide discussion and examples of ‘resistant power’ in action.
findings by attitudes of negative resistance to Indigenous Knowledge systems and a general lack of awareness, or interest regarding DRAP initiatives.

Differing expectations and perspectives were perceived by community members as exclusionary and prevented them from exercising any decision-making powers and how they could contribute to the Reconciliation process. In line with the lack of consultation processes found by Maxwell (2012), Arlo Kempf found that in these types of situations, not only are Indigenous peoples made foreigners in their own lands, by way of the colonial encounter, but education has in a myriad of ways ensured that differences are ignored, suppressed or excluded by dominant pedagogical practice (2006, p. 130; Fanon, 1971; Freire, 2014). While Reconciliation is espoused as everybody’s business, the community participants had little or no knowledge of the DRAP (see Chapter 8). ADF members fared little better. The lack of consultation meant that community members held views about Reconciliation that differed from those of the organisation. Community members thought Reconciliation was a good ‘opportunity’ to share their knowledge with others, however, little evidence was found to suggest that organisational opportunities were viewed in the same way. Casting a critical gaze wherever impositions occur means that instances of this kind are interrogated (Kempf, 2006, p. 130). Familiarity with different ways of knowing (Arbon, 2008; Kurfiss, 1988; Martin, 2008; Worby et al. 2010), and understanding how Interest Convergence works within the context of military education could assist in finding ways that empower rather than silence the voices of Indigenous Australians.

Negative behaviours and attitudes which were exhibited by some instructors and personnel were perceived disrespectful towards Indigenous people, and reiterated the lack of interest in acknowledging the knowledge systems of others.
Behaviours that reflect attitudes of cultural superiority act as barriers to ‘respectful’ relationships and undermine the intent of Reconciliation. To move towards transformative encounters, educators must resist the dominant discourse to seek alternative paradigms for change, which are essential for meaningful encounters (Whitely, 1995). An anti-colonial framework that embeds oral traditions, languages, and histories in education curricula in ways that see these as important educative tools is one alternative paradigm (Barker, 2008; Nabavi, 2006). Recognition and promotion of Indigenous Knowledge systems in the ADF is an important part of this process and relates directly to issues of equity and power, and how power is held within contemporary institutions (Cooper, 2012; Foucault, 2000; Smith, 1999a & 2006; O’Sullivan, 2007). Such a framework was evident in the NZDF where the implementation of Māori Indigenous Knowledge learning opportunities had resulted in a number of positive improvements. Besides a notable reduction in negative behaviours, some of the benefits of including Indigenous Knowledge systems in military curricula are discussed in the following section.

9.4 Benefits and opportunities for Indigenous Knowledge systems in military curricula

There are few examples of organisations proactively recognising the importance of Indigenous Knowledge in education curricula. The NZDF learning environment is one such example. By upholding the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi, equal employment legislation, equity and diversity values, and redefining the organisation to reflect its shared military heritage, the NZDF is committed to serving the interests of the New Zealand government and its people. Through formal

---

85 See Dr Bronwyn Campbell’s (2011) article Te Tiriti o Waitangi: a blueprint for the future in which she discusses some of the implications of ‘Te Tiriti o Waitangi’ and how this influences the future of New Zealand.
and informal measures coordinated through the Service Bicultural policies, Māori Indigenous Knowledge education is included in various NZDF contexts and has impacted positively on the learning experiences of the NZDF participants in this study. Moreover, the establishment of the Runanga(s) (councils) has created a collaborative environment where decisions are shared, and the teaching of Māori Indigenous Knowledge has been conducted by the members who are competent in teaching Māori, and mostly sought from within the organisation. This has created an empowering and transformative military learning environment.

The findings are seen to relate directly to improved organisational morale and operational effectiveness, which provide a useful framework for understanding the benefits that can derive from embedding Indigenous Knowledge systems in military curricula. While Māori members acknowledged the support they received from particular commanders, the organisation, and their non-Māori peers, there were those who were not afraid to reflect on the racism and discrimination they experienced along the way. These stories are an important part of the journey, as members’ experiences of the past, both good and bad, are part of the reasons for change. Similar to Dorothy E. Smith’s (1999a) analysis of the ‘chilly climate’ that women often experience as a minority group in large institutions, this study provides some of the evidence.

The first benefit that emerged, across all three phases of the study, related to improved cultural understanding. The sense of unity that had developed as a result of the Māori cultural training in the NZDF was that members expressed the ability to share the best of both cultures. Institutional pride was not only viewed as a benefit for the individual, but as a collective benefit for the organisation and the nation. The members were able to explore and embrace Māori Indigenous Knowledge in many
aspects of their military life, and apply this knowledge in various contexts (see Chapter 7, Organisational Benefits). These findings complement the works of Ball (1991); Erai (1995); Enloe (1980); Hall (1995 & 1997); Jackomos & Fowell (1993); Mulvaney et al. (1992); Neill (2004); Riseman (2008, 2008a & 2013); Scoppio (2007); Soutar (2000); Stasiuk (2002 & 2004); Tolerton (2011); Winegard (2009), and others, who have studied issues relating to military diversity and Indigenous participation.86 Creating an ‘open environment’ that values the contribution of ‘difference’ has meant that NZDF members’ understanding and appreciation of diversity can then be applied in different contexts, such as religions, sexual preferences, gender, socio-economic backgrounds, and ethnicities. One recent example was when the NZDF was ranked first in a world diversity study, 2014 (See Lieutenant General Keating’s comments, NZDF Press Release, 21 February, 2014). Other benefits, such as respect for other cultures, were evident amongst the deployment experiences of NZDF personnel.

Cultural understanding aligned with what community and ADF members perceived to be the most important benefit for the ADF, and the community. Indigenous Knowledge systems in military curricula were considered essential for creating an environment where respect and a better understanding of Indigenous cultural issues would be achieved. Although ADF members thought that improved cultural understanding was important at the macro (organisational) level, Army members in particular were interested in the benefits that micro-level skills such as ‘survival skills, bush tucker, and medicinal and environmental knowledge’ would have for personnel at the individual level. Likewise, RFSU members perceived that

86 See also Granatstein, (2007); Lackenbauer, Sheffield, & Mantle (2007); Royal New Zealand Navy (2001).
bush tucker would have a higher practical benefit value than improved cultural understanding. Even though these findings are positive and show a degree of willingness on the part of the majority of ADF members to learn, it suggests that skills-based training, typical of today’s commoditised society, is considered the ‘norm.’ Kincheloe and Tobin (2009) argue that the positivist approach to knowledge, which decontextualizes knowledge into commoditised units, is still very much alive in the twenty-first century. Cathryn McConarghy (2000, p. 185) further warns that: ‘The linking of training with employment skills, re-establishes the links … which were a feature of early colonialism.’ The implication here is that without careful planning, and the absence of a legal framework, Indigenous Knowledge in military curricula could become an exercise of resource, skill and knowledge exploitation.87

Indigenising curriculum is also not the ultimate goal. Without an understanding that Indigenous Knowledge systems are important for everyone, they could be viewed as cultural ‘add ons’ rather than viable sources of valuable knowledge. Professor Nakata (2007) explains how the use of a ‘cultural interface’ can assist students to move between the cultural expectations of differing knowledge systems and situations. ADF members would need to welcome Indigenous Knowledge in military curricula, not just so they can add another ‘skill’ to their military tool box but rather experience ‘Indigenous Knowledge education’ as philosophically and intellectually inseparable from military life. While there was clear evidence of this happening amongst the NZDF experiences, there was little evidence of it occurring in the ADF. The work of many Indigenous scholars and social justice advocates has achieved considerable progress in relation to these issues. Meanwhile, the issues of epistemological dominance, including behaviours of cultural superiority, were not

uncommon amongst the experiences of ADF members, and some NZDF members (mostly prior to the bicultural policies, \textsuperscript{88} see Chapter 7).

Community members, all familiar with multi-perspective approaches to learning, provided a range of benefits not explored by the majority of ADF members; these included institutional and community pride, improved relationships, Indigenous protocols, how to work collaboratively with others, increased job opportunities, alternative ways to do things in the military, better recruitment and retention rates, and Indigenous approaches to learning (Arbon, 2008; Bishop, 2010; Harris; 1990; Hughes & More, 1997; Stewart-Harawira, 2005; Wilson, 2008). In addition, community members appeared to be more tolerant, ‘open,’ or accustomed to learning the knowledge systems and learning styles of others, whereas ADF members, for various reasons identified in the previous section, were not as receptive. Scoppio (2007) and Whitley (1995) consider the ‘openness’ of an organisation to change is a key determining factor for achieving a diverse organisation. Indigenous Knowledge in military curricula would be a proactive approach to achieving cultural diversity, by addressing some of the issues that are inhibiting change.

The second most important benefit perceived by community members, some ADF members, and evident amongst the NZDF experiences, again related to ‘respect.’ Respect for alternative knowledge systems in the NZDF altered members’ perceptions of each other, and were reflected in themes relating to individual and institutional pride, increased confidence, and knowledge. Owing to the pervasive nature of colonialism, however, some NZDF members commented that there were still a few renegade attitudes that surface within the organisation now and then.

\textsuperscript{88} Garrick Cooper (2012) discusses issues of epistemological dominance and what he refers to as the Culture Thesis. Cooper believes certain ‘cultural practices’ such as embedding ‘cultural competencies’ into curricula are not enough to overcome notions of ‘cultural superiority’ that exist in Western institutions. He suggests this type of training often falls short of challenging the underlying issues of epistemological dominance, and can actually have the reverse effect.
Nonetheless, incidents of individual racism were considered to be ‘rare,’ and members felt that this was likely attributed to the Māori cultural training. Highlighting the resistance to transformative change, others mentioned that there was still a long way to go before the NZDF would achieve biculturalism, and commented that efforts to include Māori Indigenous Knowledge in the NZDF would not have occurred without leverage gained from the Treaty of Waitangi (see also Bishop, 2008; Bishop & Glynn, 1999; Drurie, 1998).

Similarly, community participants felt that ‘respect’ for Indigenous Knowledge systems in the ADF would have enormous benefits, and related these directly to increased ‘individual, institutional and community pride.’ Pride and respect for Indigenous Knowledge was considered a solid platform from which to build stronger relationships between Indigenous and non-Indigenous people, and would have many flow on effects for the community. For example, young people would see their knowledge being valued by the organisation, which in turn would raise confidence levels and make a career in the military a more rewarding and foreseeable prospect. Elders could be collaboratively engaged in a variety of roles, such as mentoring instructors, or sharing their experiences on courses so Indigenous personnel would feel that they did not have to sacrifice their identity to join. The biggest benefit for the community, however, was the respect that was perceived to result from sharing their knowledge with others. This finding was illustrated by many NZDF members, where Māori personnel were able to reconnect with their knowledge systems, thus exploring their potential and teaching their knowledge for the benefit of others. There was also the added advantage of having more Māori personnel in leadership and advisory roles. While the majority of ADF members had little experience in

89 See Silk et al. (2000) and Scoppio (2007) for some of the benefits of tapping into the diversity that exists within an organisation.
Indigenous Knowledge education, 69% felt that Indigenous Knowledge education would contribute to achieving the DRAP.

Opportunities for Indigenous Knowledge identified by both ADF and community members involved a variety of methods. These include introducing Indigenous military history topics on promotion courses; incorporating learning modules such as the Mawul Rom course (a cross-cultural and mediation leadership course surrounding the Yolngu system of law)\(^{90}\) for instructors and managers; inviting local Elders to share their military experiences; learning local customs, traditions, and mentoring on courses; conducting military history research in the area; developing policy for the protection and promotion of Indigenous languages and cultural practices in the ADF; and visiting local communities where knowledge can be shared first-hand. Practical hands on opportunities, such as the learning experiences that occur within the RFSUs on operation, or for example, when HMAS Warramunga visited its namesake community in 2012\(^{91}\) were thought to provide the most benefit. Other opportunities could include an oral history website or booklets; the inclusion of Indigenous military stories and local narratives in training establishments, units, messes and Defence establishments; welcome to country ceremonies during members’ attestation period, or recruitment courses; including Indigenous professional development opportunities in areas of Indigenous Knowledge education, language, philosophy, advocacy, policy, and administration; ceremonial protocols; exchanges with the NZDF; increased National Aboriginal and Islanders Day Observance Committee opportunities for all personnel; and establishing ADF, regional, and base representational groups with community


\(^{91}\) See Chapter 6, or http://news.defence.gov.au/2012/09/24/warship-strengthens-indigenous-connection/
Elders. While these are just some of the possibilities, and all community members were willing to share their knowledge, the main concern related to intellectual property rights and the dilemma that community knowledge might be misappropriated, or taught by less informed others (see Arbon, 2008; Martin, 2008; Marrie, 2007; Wilson, 2008; Smith, 1999b).

Opportunities for Indigenous Knowledge systems in ADF curricula could be achieved through adjustments at the individual, instructional, organisational, and policy level. Using the spiral of understanding (Stewart-Harawira, 2005), and collaborative processes to research (Kovach, 2012; Wilson, 2008) that take into consideration the multiple values and perspectives of the participants concerned (Greenwood & Levin, 2007), a proactive approach to military education could be achieved. To be successful, it needs to address and initiate change at every identified level (Wegner, 2007). Action research, using a core values approach (Whiteley, 1995), and taking into account Indigenous ethical and moral research methodologies and theories, provides useful strategies when considering organisational and educational change. Such an approach would allow stakeholders to establish relationships that are based on respect, focussed on the sharing of knowledge (see Tangihaere & Twiname, 2011), and where the participants understand the injustices that have occurred as a result of colonisation. The chosen approach should stress
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92 The NZDF has established Māori cultural groups within each unit, ship, base, Service and Tri-service that are extremely popular amongst members.

93 Greenwood & Levin (2007) provide a variety of different approaches to Action Research: educational, participatory evaluation, emancipatory and liberationist, human inquiry, action inquiry, action science and organisational learning, etc. as some examples that can be used to improve a situation. The authors invite readers to investigate and explore options with an open mind, selecting or devising an approach that best suits a situation.

‘personal accountability, caring,’95 the value and freedom of expression, the capacity for empathy, and the sharing of emotionality.’96 In order to achieve this, participants need to employ critical and reflexive methodologies that begin at the inter-personal level (Nicholls, 2009) and extend far beyond the institutional to the societal level. Participants need to commit to altering any power relationships that exist in order to establish effective dialogue.97 The first step of the process would be acknowledging that the benefits of Indigenous Knowledge inclusion are not only necessary for developing stronger relationships in the ADF, but are fundamental to building a reconciled organisation and a shared future and identity. Opportunities for Indigenous Knowledge can then occur when relationships are ‘open’ to the possibilities, and where every level of the organisation is committed to change.

9.5 Further research: where to from here?

Based on the above findings, opportunities for further research can be explored. Firstly, using a similar approach to the one undertaken in this study, such as interviews, focus groups, observations, and surveys could be conducted in other communities, states, and territories throughout the world. Alternative collaborative and participatory approaches could be considered such as personal narratives, yarning and auto-ethnography.98 Further research in different locations, particularly in Australia, would help to address the geographical research limitation that was

95 See Osborne (2001) and Perez (2000) for explanations and examples of the ‘ethics of caring’ when applied to education, and when working with culturally diverse groups.
97 Dewey (2008); Foucault (2000); Freire (2014); Grande (2008); Hall (2014); Nicholls (2009); Smith (1999a); Smith (1999a & 2006); Wilson (2008).
98 See Barker (2008); Cooperative Research Centre for Aboriginal and Tropical Health (Australia) (2000); Ellis (1999); Ellis & Bochner (2000); Fitzgerald (2005); Hall (2014); Heshusius, (1994 & 1995); Jones & Jenkins (2008); Lincoln & Gonzales (2008); McCaslin & Breton (2008); Mills et al. (2013); Rigney (n.d); Sarra (2011); Williams (2003) and others for descriptions and examples of some of the alternative approaches to research and education, particularly useful when working with Indigenous people.
beyond the researcher’s control; it would also enrich the data and help to draw conclusions Australia-wide with respect to differing states, Indigenous Knowledge systems, and the attitudes and experiences of different communities and personnel. Nonetheless, many of the findings support or complement others work in relation to Indigenous Knowledge, diversity, military participation, education curricula, and social justice concerns.

The findings present insight into the complexities that surround Indigenous and non-Indigenous relationships with respect to behaviours, experiences, and attitudes regarding Indigenous Knowledge use in military curricula. While the findings cannot be generalised outside of the scope of this study, the benefits experienced by the NZDF personnel, and attitudes and experiences articulated by the ADF and community members provide valuable evidence to suggest that Indigenous Knowledge in ADF curricula would improve members’ learning experiences. The benefits identified would have significant positive societal implications that are likely to exceed the goals of the DRAP and transcend the boundaries of the organisation in accordance with the current socio-political agenda. Furthermore, the outcomes of this study assist understanding regarding the impacts that societal values, largely upheld through British colonial influence, Western ideals, and institutionalised texts in the English language are shaping, or not shaping, members’ military learning experience. Thus these understandings can be applied to inform further research amongst different groups, in order to develop theory and build a body of empirical evidence across a broad spectrum of interests.

Developing such an understanding leads to the second possibility. Further research could be implemented from a number of different perspectives to raise public awareness and support for embedding Indigenous Knowledge systems and a
bio-centric philosophy, in all aspects of Australian society. While there has been an increase in literature that focuses on the need to increase diversity within military establishments, and other government and non-government organisations, few studies have discussed the organisational, psychological, sociological, environmental, ecological, or medical benefits that are found within Indigenous Knowledge systems. Embedding Indigenous Knowledge systems in military curricula is just the tip of the iceberg. The relationships that Indigenous and non-Indigenous people have with each other and the military are not only limited by our imagination, and our inability to articulate a truly ‘inclusive’ military, but are more likely to be limited by our inability to act.

9.6 Final comments

As has been shown throughout this thesis, the relationships that Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australians have, or do not have, with each other determine the future of the nation. As highlighted by Freire, however:

The capitalist system, and globalization theory which speak of ethics, hide the fact that their ethics are those of the marketplace and not the universal ethics of the human person. It is for these matters that we ought to struggle courageously if we have, in truth, made a choice for a humanized world (cited by Denzin, Lincoln & Smith, 2008, p. 1).

Understood in this way, Reconciliation and Biculturalism become more about ‘respect, and relationships’ than institutional or societal goals. Although closing gaps, creating employment opportunities, and increasing the participation rates of Indigenous people are undoubtedly important to the ADF, and it is not suggested
here that they are not, Reconciliation as a humanised project is so much more than that. Reconciliation is about ‘respect for difference,’ ‘respect for multiple values’ and ‘respect for the differing knowledge systems’ that co-exist in the world. In the context of this study, it is based on meaningful interactions that should allow personnel to learn in a dignified manner that draws on the ‘strengths’ (Saleebey, 1992) and knowledge systems of all Australians. However, perhaps the most significant challenge is the understanding that Indigenous Knowledge systems have something to offer everyone (Battiste, 2008). This research has identified that while both ADF and community members have a ‘willingness’ to include some aspects of Indigenous Knowledge systems in ADF curricula, there was little evidence to suggest that ADF members were ready to embrace such a change.

Furthermore, poor understanding regarding each other’s values, and the influences that mainstream objectives are having on participant relationships, means that more education needs to occur so that each party can ‘respectfully’ engage with one another. While Reconciliation aligns with a need for including Indigenous Knowledge systems in military curricula, both Indigenous and non-Indigenous parties need to come together to align common values and goals. This will require a ‘shared space’ that fosters two-ways communication and the merging of multiple worldviews (Hall, 2014). In order to produce the most effective military possible, the best and most effective knowledge needs to be drawn from any source. Even though this is not going to be an easy task, as evidenced by the NZDF example, it is well worth the effort.

Support for this argument was evident in the experiences of NZDF personnel, who exhibited an overwhelming sense of pride and achievement, as a result of their military education and training. In a similar manner, the community members
expressed avid interest in the potentiality of sharing their knowledge with others. They perceived reciprocated knowledge practices important to the success of the DRAP and Reconciliation initiatives and were willing to engage. ADF members, while showing majority support, however, will require much more education and understanding in relation to the identified issues. Notwithstanding the challenges, and in order to build on the positive support shown, equitable education through the inclusion of Indigenous Knowledge systems in ADF curricula should be the ultimate aim.

‘It always seems impossible until it’s done’ (Nelson Mandela).

9.7 Epilogue

As I reflect on this journey, I think of the conceptual framework outlined in Chapter 1 of this thesis, where it all began. Embedded within Makere Stewart-Harawira’s spiral of understanding, I am reminded of how the struggle for democracy and freedom of expression in many ways becomes ‘... the struggle of us all’ (2005, p. 254; Freire, 2014). While this research can be viewed as a cultural product, part of the larger anti-colonial effort that seeks to work from a multicentric framework (Dei & Kempf, 2006), locating myself both within and external to the study has not been an easy task (Innes, 2009). However, as a Māori woman and a military educator, who grew up embedded within two very different societies, and deeply connected to another place, has meant that I was able to draw on a number of understandings to re-tell participants’ stories with some sensitivity and insight. Citing the work of Minh-ha Trinh, Stewart-Harawira (2005) writes of the dilemmas involved in locating one’s self in relation to the research; no matter what position I take, eventually I will be made to choose from three conflicting loyalties: Writer of
colour? Woman writer? or Woman of colour? There are also the dilemmas of purpose. For example, for whom do I write, and for what purpose? Is it the institution in which I am currently employed, reinforcing the need for institutional ethnography, or is it for the sake of community, and individuals, including self, in whose experiences I am hoping to improve (Smith, 2006)? Or is it part of a larger philosophical journey that we all have responsibility for, through revolutionising (Freire, 2014) and re-humanising the planet? My understanding is that it is for all of these things.

Stewart-Harawira notes that Māori writers are often attacked on the grounds of being either ‘too Māori,’ and therefore not sufficiently ‘academic’ enough, or ‘not Māori enough’ and not qualified to speak, act or write from a Māori perspective (2005, p. 255). Others might claim that I am not qualified to speak or write from an Indigenous perspective at all, as I too, like many other Indigenous researchers and educators have fallen prey to the Western academic machine, even if this was a subconscious or acquiescent passage (Kovach, 2012). Throughout this journey, I have been challenged on every account. By taking an anti-colonial standpoint, it became imperative that I seek out critical new perspectives in order to de-centre the prescriptive hegemonic paradigms that continue to dominate our current existence (Dei & Kempf, 2006, p. 314). Taking such a viewpoint is known amongst minority group researchers as ‘researching back,’ (Smith, 1999b) or breaking away from the ‘parasitic nature of knowledge production’ to speak of education in terms of mutual gain (Dei & Kempf, 2006, p. 314), and in ways that benefit both the giver and receiver of knowledge. This is an Indigenous philosophy and is why this journey became one of resistance and hope, rather than description and reform.
As a journey of resistance, the study critiqued some of the systemic processes potentially inhibiting Indigenous ways of knowing within a Western military context. As a journey of hope it ‘... offers a theory of change and transformation, and a methodological artifice to assist liberation and self-determination’ (Mahuika, 2011, p 27). It also provides a way forward that recognises and validates the knowledge systems of Indigenous Australians, within the context of a Western military learning establishment. For the researcher it was like ‘... a map home’ (Mahuika, 2011, p. 27) or a pathway back to self in ways that revalidated and re-connected me with the knowledge systems I had grown up with as a child. Veronica Arbon finds that what emerges from such intellectual, interrogative work is a ‘much more nuanced understanding of the realities of our societies’ (2008, p. 162). Researchers and educators then have the ability to:

open up the site(s) where our own activities as participants in discourse enter into and contribute to forces that stand over against us and overpower our lives (Smith, 1999a, p. 288).

As the spiral completes a full twist and begins a new turn, the Australian Defence Force has just released its latest Defence Reconciliation Action Plan. This is a positive sign, as it coincides with the forwards and upwards movement of the spiral, and the potentiality of a more in-depth understanding of Reconciliation. While I have endeavoured to answer all of the thesis questions, I cannot presume that I have answered them to a degree that satisfies the complexity of the individual experience. That is a journey that only individuals can make. At best, however, I hope that it has started a new conversation.
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