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Abstract

This thesis draws together three strands for analysis: the social, political and historical narrative of race-relations, which has framed Māori subjectivity in the 20th and early 21st century. The themes identified are namely, the politics of representation of Māori subjectivity from extinction, to assimilation and then to biculturalism in film in eight New Zealand films: *Rewi’s Last Stand* (1925/40), *Broken Barrier* (1952), *To Love a Maori* (1972), *Utu* (1983), *Ngati* (1987), *Mauri* (1988), *Once Were Warriors* (1994) and *Whale Rider* (2002). While this claim has its roots in some of the earlier New Zealand films, the primary area of analysis will be upon the fundamental shift from 1985 onwards on the representation and interpretation of Māori subjectivity. It is argued that this fundamental shift is influenced by two significant developments in the New Zealand context: namely the Treaty of Waitangi settlement process and the State’s adoption of the socio-political ideology of biculturalism in which to theorise race-relations.
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Chapter One: Introduction – Examining a nationalised race-relations narrative between Māori and Pākehā

This thesis provides a chronological examination of eight New Zealand films that feature Māori-Pākehā interactions from the 20th Century into the early 21st. The New Zealand film director, John O’Shea (1996), once described this country’s “essential drama” as the relationship between Māori and Pākehā. In O’Shea’s view, race relations or the Māori-Pākehā relationship has been one of the most enduring features in New Zealand films. Whether this relationship is explicit, as in films such as Rewi’s Last Stand (1925/40), Broken Barrier (1952), To Love a Maori (1972), Utu (1983), Ngati (1987) and Mauri (1988), or less overt as in the works of Once Were Warriors (1994) and Whale Rider (2002), the argument made is that the subject of race-relations is a key thematic in New Zealand films featuring Māori-Pākehā interactions. This thesis draws together three strands for analysis: the social, political and historical narrative of race-relations, which has framed understandings of Māori subjectivity in films from the 20th and early 21st century. What is examined in this work is the influence of a nationalised race-relations narrative on Māori subjectivity by tracing the changing representations of Māori in film from notions of extinction, to the justification of assimilation and integration, and the move toward biculturalism. The purpose of this analysis is to identify how the race-relations narrative functions in the works, in a socio-historical context and to relate the relationship (and response) to the political directives of the State. Thus, the films form a socio-historical narrative of their own, alongside the State narrative in the public record.

It is argued that ideas about race-relations and importantly, Māori subjectivity are socially constructed which, in turn, reflect not only the dominant views about race-relations, but also the contextual discourse of the same occurring when the works took shape. In this instance, as CK Stead (2002, p.2) notes, context is: “all” in that “criticism never exists in a vacuum, but is a response to what has been said, or is being said – or even to a silence in which it has become imperative that something be said”. Drawing upon Stead’s statement it is argued that notions of Māori subjectivity are best understood in terms of a larger dialogue occurring about race-relations and national harmony. In this fashion, race-relations is utilised as a reference point and indicator to investigate the influences on the portrayal of Māori in film.
1.1 Hypothesis: a new form of cinema or a continuous nationalised race-relations narrative discourse?

Primarily this work is focussed on examining the claim that films from 1985, such as Ngati (1987) and Mauri (1988) onwards signal a fundamental shift in the representation of Māori subjectivity as “emphatically Māori” or a “new form of cinema” (Perkins 1996, pp.17-27). Such a claim suggests that there has been a rupture or demarcation between “old forms of cinema” and new accounts that can be seen as progressive. A major argument of this thesis is that the films analysed are thematically underpinned by a nationalised race-relations narrative discourse. It is important to note that the significance of Ngati (1987) and Mauri (1988) for their contribution to New Zealand cinema cannot be overestimated. These were the first feature films to be directed by Māori and to provide a Māori point of view of New Zealand’s history, society, politics and importantly, race-relations. In one sense, Ngati (1987) and Mauri (1988) do provide a turning point in New Zealand cinema in that, for the first time, Māori directors were producing works about Māori. What is argued, however, is that these films can be seen as “responses” to earlier works and portrayals of Māori that are influenced by bicultural views of race-relations at a time when the country underwent significant reforms.

As Alice Te Punga Somerville (2007, p.97) states:

Māori writers [and artists] are writing into/against images of Māori – created by both non-Māori and Māori – that have been unhealthy/unfair/untrue. Not only is the idea for Māori to show ‘how we are’, to quote Grace’s story ‘Parade’, but it is also to show how we are not, through the dismantling of stereotypes and the recognition of distorted images.

It is, however, Te Punga Somerville’s notion of writing into that is of particular importance to this thesis. It is argued that this renegotiation of Māori representation and interpretation is based upon contemporary bicultural views of race-relations, and how Māori are situated within that framework. As a result, it is argued that works from 1985 onwards are not a clear demarcation between “old” and “new” forms of cinema, but a continuation of the nationalised race-relations narrative in an attempt to add present-day Māori perspectives to the discourse.

1.2 Films as a nationalised “race-relations” narrative

It is important to note that this thesis is not a Film or Cultural Studies thesis and does not analyse the visual language or aesthetics in the films. Primarily, the main areas of consideration are: the race-relations narrative, Māori subjectivity inside that framework and how these are linked to the character encounters in the films. Furthermore, the purpose of this thesis is not to analyse all New Zealand films featuring the Māori-Pākehā relationship. The main focus of this thesis is to reorient and historicise the Māori subject, by placing the same in its time and place, in order to identify the continuous influence of race-relations.

The central importance of analysing the influence of race-relations on Māori subjectivity both in historical and contemporary contexts is to evidence the continuous pattern of framing the wider social concerns of the Māori group into a predetermined set of factors about Māori-Pākehā interactions, and national harmony. Previously, national concerns about maintaining unity and social cohesion through race-relations have taken precedence over Māori interests in ways that caused not only dispute, but harm to the Māori population. By examining Māori subjectivity through the lens of a nationalised race-relations narrative, however, primarily identified are specific constraints upon Māori to conform to particular ideas that are connected to dominant notions of Māori-Pākehā interactions occurring in society.

These views can include utopian or dystopian constructions, but are referenced to the notion that national harmony and cohesion can only be maintained through race-relations. It is argued that this overt focus on the importance of national harmony through race-relations, however, inculcates the idea that the relationship between Māori and Pākehā is potentially problematic and is an ongoing process of conflict-resolution. As a result, arguments are presented in the works as ways forward and moral claims made about legitimate or conversely, unsavoury positions to hold regarding race-relations.
It is important to note, however, that dominant ideas about Māori are not politically or ideologically neutral. Many notions about Māori subjectivity, ways of being, the construction of the Māori ethnic group and Māori social concerns are reflected in legislation and State policy. As will be shown, the State has at times been actively engaged in sanctioning and privileging particular views of Māori over other competing perspectives from inside the Māori population. Moreover, a number of State policy prescriptions regarding “correct” or legitimate views about race-relations and Māori-Pākehā interactions are directly referenced in the works.

If, however, “context is all” (Stead 2002) then this thesis provides an historical overview of the changing discourse of race-relations where Māori subjectivity has been framed by ideas now considered to be outdated. In their time and place, these views were presented as authoritative notions about the relationship of Māori and Pākehā. The motivation of analysing the historical discourse of race-relations in the works is to investigate what underpins contemporary understandings of Māori subjectivity when determining meaning and how current representations form part of a broader, ongoing and contested dialogue regarding the relationship of Māori and Pākehā.

1.2.1 Narrative discourse in films

While this thesis analyses eight New Zealand films, it is, in fact, an examination of the narrative of race-relations of Māori and Pākehā contained within those works. It is argued that in their essential form, films are narratives in that they produce stories for an audience (Turner 1996). Storytelling is one of humanity’s oldest forms of social interaction and is also a “universal”, shared by peoples of all cultures. Films may differ in structure and function from other types of narrative such as literary works, but there are similarities in these forms regarding the manner in which they convey central ideas to the audience (or reader).

In terms of race-relations as a form of national narrative, this works draws upon Tom Gunning (2004) which, in turn, utilised the work of the literary critic, Gerard Genette (1980) as a basis to analyse the structure of storytelling. Genette described three different meanings for the term narrative and its application to film namely, “the means of expression, the events conveyed by these means, and the act of enunciation that expresses them” (Gunning 2004, p.70). As Gunning (2004, pp.470-471) notes:
First, narrative can refer to the actual language of a text that tells a story or, as Seymour Chatman puts it: “the means by which the [narrative] content is communicated”.

The second meaning of narrative refers to the content communicated by the discourse, “the succession of events, real or fictitious, that are the subject of the discourse” and which can be studied “without regard to the medium, linguistic or other” in which they are expressed. The third meaning refers to the event of “someone recounting something, the act of narrating in itself.

It is important to note that the act of storytelling, producing a story, its function, purpose and the way in which these narratives are conveyed to the audience are points of contestation in the literature. Issues such as the point of view of directors, the ways in which characters and groups are depicted, the historical accuracy of the story, accusations of myth making and also the ideological and institutional practices that influence narratives have been noted as areas of some dispute (see Braudy and Cohen 2004; Edwards 1989; Partridge and Hughes 1998). In terms of a nationalised race-relations narrative contained within the eight works, some directors have actively contributed to the discourse presenting particular points of view that form part of the broader dialogue about the key thematic, using film as an educational or nation building exercise. As Sam Edwards (1989, p.21) notes films have not been used to just entertain, but also to carry their own message to an audience “it is the taniwha which carries with it the attitudes and expectations of its makers, and the society and history from which they come”.

In the New Zealand context, the social function of film is often entitled “telling our stories”, but in actuality, a better title might be “telling the stories we want told about ourselves”. This is not a criticism of the art or exercise of national storytelling, however, but the identification of the constructed nature of narratives and how “stories” can often be a matter of elision. The notion of “speaking for ourselves” has a strong association with the author Frank Sargeson, who edited a landmark New Zealand story collection in 1945 under that very title (Wevers 2004, p.109). Even in 1945, the topic of national identity appeared to be fraught with politics, which are evident in Sargeson’s question of “who [ourselves] might be” (Sargeson & King 1945). In this fashion national forms of storytelling draws upon the works of Benedict Anderson (1983) and Ernest Gellner’s (1983) notion of an “imagined community” or the shared culture of the nation.
When examining how we view “ourselves” or “tell stories” about “ourselves” within a race-relations framework, what is evident is that race-relations have been a core part of New Zealand’s national and international profile. Having harmonious race-relations or being a model for the world is the way New Zealanders have told stories about ourselves, and presented the country at both national and international levels. Notably, this view of ourselves continued to be presented to overseas audiences even when the Māori protest movements of the 1970s responding, in part, to long-standing issues of racism were in the public domain. From the earliest films in the 20th Century (Rewi’s Last Stand) to works in the 21st (Whale Rider), a key thematic is a race-relations narrative used to convey ideas about national identity from the settlement of the country to maintaining social cohesion. In contemporary times, the reconciliation of Māori and Pākehā in settling historic breaches through the Treaty settlement process has also reinforced the notion that harmonious “race-relations” are crucial to national identity and social cohesion.

In turn, the nationalised race-relations narrative has been shaped by the politics occurring in particular social contexts under specific conditions. As argued, the representation and interpretation of Māori is context specific, where meaning functions within particular codes and conventions directed at the intended audience. Codes contained in films have to be recognised and interpreted by the audience receiving the works in order to elicit “meaning”. It is advanced that works are made and directed toward a particular audience within a narrative structure that the intended recipients will recognise. Some films, for example, are described as “not finding an audience”. Thus the “story” the film was trying to convey did not connect with those receiving the work.

What this means is that the reception of works by the audience has some bearing on the creative process and how films are made and stories are told. Therefore, the audience has a considerable role to play in the production of film and is not a passive receiver of film. Films are also part of institutional practices, which Dinah Partridge and Peter Hughes (1998, p.2) describe as a set of “… codes and conventions by which films are produced, exhibited, consumed and understood”. In terms of analysing a race-relations narrative and how the same is constructed in the works, there are three key concepts and a specific set of recurring patterns that are utilised in the films. It is argued that these key concepts and patterns are intended to direct audiences into making correct or legitimate decisions regarding race-
relations as depicted on screen. How effective this strategy has been is open to debate and will be discussed in the filmic chapters, but, at times, directors have been overt in their motivations to use the works to examine race-relations. For example, Rudall Hayward explicitly described his intentions when making *To Love a Maori* (1972) as an attempt to “stir the national consciousness” about the state of race-relations.\(^5\)

### 1.2.2 Films as narrative case studies

The films are presented as case studies, situated in their broader, historical, social and political contexts. It is argued that there is a causal relationship between State directives and the films produced, where the films exist in a linear-historical relationship to each other. What are used as reference points and indicators in examining the race-relations narrative are:

1. The dominant views of race-relations in the context when the works were produced and the governing State policy;
2. The wider social concerns that form part of the broader dialogue about how to effect or maintain harmonious race-relations and national cohesion, and
3. The situation of the Māori population in those social contexts.\(^6\)

A brief biography of each director, the synopsis of each film, cast and reviews of the films are included in Appendices at the end of the thesis.

When exploring the “essential drama” of this country, the thesis focuses on:

a. The central plot of the work, the use of actors as representative of social forces.

b. Inter-ethnic love affairs between Māori and Pākehā and also inter-ethnic conflicts/friendships between men which is termed in this thesis “contested masculinities”.\(^7\)

c. The resolutions of the story-line or as Martin Blythe (1994, p.34) describes: how Māori and Pākehā can be brought together, or explanations as to why the two peoples are apart.

d. How characters are depicted as representative of particular social forces or wider concerns about race-relations in order to create “transitions”\(^8\) in the storyline to move the narrative from one event to another and the final resolution (see Bal 1985, p.5).
These transitions, stages, events and scenes are pivotal in directing the audience to draw specific types of conclusions about race-relations or in essence, subscribe to the director’s point of view.

1.3 Cultural authentic and cultural degenerate dichotomy – local variant of the fatal impact thesis

When analysing Māori subjectivity and representation in the race-relations narrative there is, however, an additional key dimension. A principal argument of this thesis is that underpinning the nationalised race-relations narrative is the meta-narrative of a cultural authentic and cultural degenerate dichotomy. This meta-narrative has been a central theme in New Zealand films when examining the relationship between Māori-Pākehā and this key thematic should be viewed in conjunction with the nationalised race-relations narrative. The cultural authentic and cultural degenerate dichotomy posits Māori in a contradictory fashion as both crucial and potentially problematic to the nation. The cultural authentic/cultural degenerate dichotomy is conducted in films at the inter-personal level through inter-ethnic love affairs, friendships and conflicts. It is employed as a strategy to examine wider concerns in New Zealand society of how to bring the two peoples together or to provide explanations as to why Māori and Pākehā are apart. Essentially, characters are employed in the films as representative of particular social forces that frame concerns about Māori into the binary categories of “good” or “bad”. Ultimately, the cultural authentic/cultural degenerate dichotomy provides directors the opportunity to make moral claims on how Māori should act within the national framework.

Underpinning the depictions and portrayals of Māori are categorical beliefs and strong directive codes based upon ways to ameliorate or radically transform Māori, as well as the nation. Moreover, the directive codes and thematics of social cohesion and national harmony through the vehicle of race-relations are linked to State policy which has, at times, justified actions in accordance with those views. The cultural authentic/cultural degenerate dichotomy is referenced by the location of Māori characters into a rural-urban divide which has engendered a local variant of the fatal impact thesis. The urban centres of New Zealand are depicted as potentially corrupting to Māori, whereas conversely, rural Māori are portrayed as the holders of “essential” Māori qualities and characteristics. In this fashion, through the use of location and setting as a plot device, the audience is able to draw upon a strong frame of
reference that has long historical roots in New Zealand society about cultural decay and the fall from grace of Māori.

The continuation of the previously defined meta-narrative is a central component of this work and in order to identify the same, it is essential to engage with the primary nationalised race-relations narrative. It is argued that any understanding of Māori subjectivity must be considered in conjunction with the dominant views of race-relations occurring at the time the works were produced. By examining films in a chronological fashion, this thesis examines the meaning by which social concerns about race-relations continue to be a primary influence on an understanding of Māori subjectivity in film.

1.4 Organisation and structure of thesis
This thesis consists of three sections namely:

1. Section One outlines theory and methodology
2. Section Two examines films dating from 1925 to 1983

This division allows the investigation of the claim that works from 1985 represent a fundamental shift in the representation of Māori.

Chapter Two – Theory and methodology
The theoretical position adopted in this thesis is social constructionist and draws upon the works of Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann, Kenneth Gergen and Ian Hacking. This chapter investigates the how ideas about groups are socially constructed entities and the way notions about groups form part of the dominant views of society. While these notions may not necessarily be “real” these ideas influence how groups engage with one another, and how issues of importance are constructed to serve wider national interests.

Chapter Three – Key thematics - race relations, the cultural authentic/cultural degenerate dichotomy, the Māori ethnic group and the State, and the arts
This chapter engages with the concept of race-relations, external influences on the construction of the Māori ethnic group, race-relations and national identity, the cultural authentic/cultural degenerate dichotomy, rural-urban divide, and the association of the State and the Arts in developing national identity. In order to draw the three strands of the social,
political and historical narrative of race-relations together, these key thematics underpin and
guide the arguments made in this thesis.

Chapter Four - The advent of biculturalism
This chapter engages with the dominant socio-political ideology of the last two decades in
New Zealand society namely, biculturalism and how the same informs current understandings
of Māori and race-relations. What is examined is the advent of biculturalism or the historical,
social and political context in the 1980s when the same was adopted as public social policy
by the State.

Chapter Five - The two world-view model of biculturalism
This chapter examines the shift of biculturalism into a two world-view model of race-
relations. While biculturalism was officially adopted and inculcated as State policy in the
1980s, it is proposed that in the 1990s there was a move toward a “two world-view” model of
New Zealand society that constructs Māori and Pākehā into binary opposition. The two
world-view model of biculturalism differs both in policy prescription, and application from
the biculturalism of the 1980s. The bicultural two world-view model has come to form the
dominant view of Māori-Pākehā interactions in New Zealand society, and as will be argued in
this work, the framework posits what the central concerns of the Māori population should be.
Furthermore, these key thematics are evident in films such as Once were warriors (1994) and
Whale Rider (2002) which reflect dominant and contemporary views of how to engage race-
relations and transform Māori society.

Chapters Four, Five and Six outline key events and influences in the social context when the
films Ngati (1987) and Mauri (1988) were produced. What will be shown in these chapters is
that Ngati and Mauri are still informed by the nationalised race-relations narrative, albeit
from a Māori point of view. Chapters 11 to 14, investigates how race-relations remain a key
influence in these works, as does the referencing of the cultural authentic/cultural degenerate
dichotomy that is evident in earlier films. Moreover, these works can be seen as responses to
earlier works of the constructions and depictions of Māori subjectivity, and form part of the
continuous dialogue of matters pertaining to race-relations.
Chapter Six - Māori cultural nationalism, the Māori renaissance and Māori women

This chapter engages with the subject of Māori cultural nationalism as a particularly dominant view of Māori society and subjectivity in contemporary times. Outlined in this chapter are the rise of Māori cultural nationalism as the authentic and legitimate position regarding the Māori social body, concerns and subjectivity, the theoretical underpinnings of the framework and its propositions in relation to the Māori population, and where Māori women are situated in that framework.

Chapter Seven – Rewi’s Last Stand (1925/1940)

This chapter presents an historical overview of the Māoriland period, popular ideas about Māori and social policy in the social context of the 1920s, and the situation of Māori in this era. The second part of this chapter investigates the changing attitudes toward Māori in the 1930s and 1940s, influenced by the socio-political ideology of “cultural nationalism”.

Chapter Eight – Broken Barrier (1952)

This chapter outlines an historical overview of New Zealand as a puritanical society, popular ideas about Māori and social policy in the social context of the 1950s, and the situation of Māori in this era. Subsequently, the work investigates the reframing of the cultural authentic/cultural degenerate dichotomy or the local variant of the fatal impact thesis into the rural/urban divide.

Chapter Nine – To Love a Maori (1972)

This chapter engages with ideas about Māori and racism and examines the nationalised narrative of race-relations in the film To Love a Maori. Key topics examined are the dominant views about race-relations in this period, the tensions at the international and national levels regarding societal change, the situation of Māori in New Zealand society and the portents of radicalism, and the local variant of the fatal impact thesis that is evident in the film.

Chapter Ten – Utu

This chapter outlines are key events in the social context that influenced the re-examination of race-relations in Utu including the Māori protest movements and the Springbok Tour. Subsequently, the chapter traces the ideological shift away from cultural nationalist views toward biculturalism using references to earlier works such as Rewi’s Last Stand (1925/1940)
and *Broken Barrier* (1952) to re-examine the history of settlement and race-relations in New Zealand at a time when attitudes toward the same were under scrutiny. Finally, there is a critical examination of the use of gender to represent particular social forces in order for the audience to draw an interpretation of the director’s point of view regarding race-relations.

**Chapters 11 and 12 – Ngati (1987) and Mauri (1988)**

In these chapters the films *Ngati* and *Mauri* are examined to show that there has been no clear “rupture” between the films from 1985 onwards and remain informed by the key thematic of a nationalised race-relations narrative. While *Ngati* and *Mauri* are significant films, what is evident is that both films are informed by key factors in the social context and a view of race-relations that has bicultural aspirations. Rather, post-1985 films remain informed by the key thematic of a nationalised race relations narrative.

**Chapters 13 and 14 – Once Were Warriors (1994) and Whale Rider (2002)**

These two chapters investigate the way in which the socio-political ideology of biculturalism has evolved into the “two world-view” model, which depicts Māori and Pākehā living in two separate worlds. Of particular importance in this chapter is the way in which Māori women are depicted in the bicultural-two world-view model and how the characters of Beth in *Once were warriors*, and Paikea in *Whale Rider*, can be seen as responses to current views on the notions of Māori women’s subjectivity.

**Chapter 15 – Conclusion**

The conclusion is a summary of the key arguments and findings made in this thesis, regarding the influence on Māori subjectivity of the nationalised race-relations narrative. The strengths and limitations of this thesis will also be outlined in this chapter and as will be discussed there is further work to be undertaken in this area. As this work is inter-disciplinary it is not complete in that some ideas need further investigation and development in their own right as separate projects.

**Reader’s notes**

Although this work is written in the third person, the author has refrained from using objective or possessive pronouns in denoting Māori as “them” or “their”. What will be used is the proper name of “Māori” and/or when necessary the object pronoun of “ancestors”. As the author is Māori by both descent and identification, the description of Māori in objective or
possessive terms posed somewhat of a grammatical dilemma. The author did not wish to lay claim to ethnic authority, nor objectify one’s own ethnic group. In this fashion the use of the group pronoun of Māori and replacement of the object pronoun of “them” with “ancestors” has provided a workable alternative. The writer has not provided a glossary of Māori terms as all working definitions are explained in the body of the work or endnotes.

**Appendix 1 – Terms and definitions**

The appendix provides an outline of the definitions of the terms used and applied in this work. Contained within this appendix are some of the foundational ideas in the literature that are drawn upon in this thesis and provide the frame of reference for both the writer and reader. The reason why these foundational ideas are placed in this appendix is that there are large volumes of work devoted to these concepts within and between academic disciplines. To analyse the strengths, limitations and differences between disciplines in the body of this thesis would have placed restrictions on the central arguments of the work itself. While these foundational concepts inform and ground this work, the writer thought it prudent to place the same in this appendix in order to show that there is familiarity with the literature, and arguments contained therein, but it is not the intention of this work to cover well-traversed (and well-argued) ground.
Chapter Two: Theory and Methodology – Social Constructionism and Griswold’s cultural diamond

This chapter engages with the theoretical framework of social constructionism, and with the work of Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann, Kenneth Gergen and Ian Hacking. What is examined is how ideas about groups such as Māori are largely constructed notions, but come to form part of the dominant views in society of how groups interact with one another. The methodological approach used for analysis throughout this work is Griswold’s typology or “cultural diamond” which incorporates the relationship between dynamics in the “social world” and in the production of films as cultural objects.

2.1 Social constructionism

In this thesis Māori subjectivity is not considered to be a fixed or essentialised concept, rather as a multi-faceted entity. Indeed notions of Māori subjectivity have been and continue to be so, a contested subject where particular representations and interpretations of Māori have been vigorously resisted (see Barclay 1992; Duff 1993; Edwards 1999; Greenland 1984; Hoskins, 2000; Irwin 1992; Johnston 2005; Kouka and McNaughton 1991; Kukutai 2004; Maaka and Fleras 2005; Marie, Forsyth and Miles 2004; Matahaere-Atariki 1991; McIntosh 2001; Meredith 1998; Mita 2010; Pihama 1994a; 1995; 1996; 2000; 2001a; 2001b; Poata-Smith 1996; 2001; Smith and Pihama 1993; Smith 1999; Somerville 2007; Te Awekotuku 1991; Vercoe 1998). When the term “Māori subjectivity” is used in this work, it is meant to describe the way in which dominant contextual views that frame (or framed) understandings of Māori social actors are depicted at the time when the works were produced. Subjectivity is often used to refer to how people, social actors and groups experience and perceive of particular phenomena in, and of the world around them (Solomon 2005). In terms of this thesis, however, the use of “Māori subjectivity” is to indicate how particular points of view about race-relations have been ascribed to Māori characters in film to be presented to the audience as legitimate perspectives of the Māori population.

This thesis is firmly located in the social constructionist school of thought that aims to investigate ideas about individuals and groups, and how the same participate in the creation of their social reality. Since this work focuses on the representation and interpretation of Māori in differing social contexts, within a race-relations narrative, the field of social constructionism offers key insights into how people make sense of their world.
Social constructionism is a sociological theory of knowledge that considers how social phenomena develop in particular social contexts. One of its major focuses is to identify and uncover the way in which individuals and groups participate in the creation of their social reality. Social construction is formally defined as a concept or practice which may appear “natural” or “legitimate”, but in reality, is an invention or artefact of a particular society (Berger and Luckmann 1996). It is important to note, however, that social constructionism is a broad field and there are debates as to how far “reality” is socially constructed (see Hacking 1999; Pinker 2002; Willard 1992). For example, the evolutionary psychologist, Steven Pinker (2002, p.202) argues that “some categories really are social constructions: they exist only because people tacitly agree to act as if they exist”.10

The degree to which reality is constructed is not the focus of this thesis. Rather, the position taken in this work is that there are real consequences to individuals and groups, through socially constructed categories. For example, the idea of “race” is a salient example of a category now accepted as “socially constructed” that has had “real consequences” for individuals and groups. Beliefs in the superiority of one “race” over another and notions of civilisation underpinned the colonial project where European powers reached a position of economic, military, political and cultural domination in the world (Stam and Spence 2004, p.878). Human populations were defined into racial groups with fixed traits that affected an individual’s life chances and freedoms. Moreover, interaction between human groups and populations was based upon these ideas, and upon beliefs which were reinforced through legislation and government policies.

In contemporary times, however, it is now widely accepted that the idea of race is, in fact, a socially constructed phenomenon. There are minimal biological differences between groups of people and the only “race” of people is the human one. Yet, the idea of race has had a large impact upon people’s understandings of “differences” between populations and how social actors engage with one another. To identify a category as “socially constructed” is to investigate its creation, validity and meaning to actors, rather than to dismiss its impact on peoples. Social constructionism enables analysts to explore the way in which particular beliefs are shaped by social forces. This is of particular significance to the idea of “race” and/or “race-relations” because, while it is widely accepted in the literature that neither are robust analytical categories or, in the constructionist sense, “real”, people act as if they are.
It may seem contradictory to refute the ideas of race and its concomitant, “race-relations”, in a thesis examining the influence of a nationalised race-relations narrative on Māori subjectivity. The term “race-relations” is, however, used in everyday speech and both perpetuates, and reproduces the notion that “races” must exist because there are tensions between groups of people categorised as “different races”. In New Zealand many media accounts and reviewers of films have discussed the importance of works for harmonious race-relations and “our” national identity. In this fashion, “race-relations” has been and still is used as an interpretative strategy to explore social relations and group interactions.

In the New Zealand context, “race-relations” has an added dimension, because the category has been granted heightened salience as our “essential drama” or “national dilemma” (Blythe 1994, p.34). The key thematic of race-relations is employed as an analytical framework to provide explanations as to how Māori and Pākehā can be brought together, or conversely why the two peoples are apart. Contradictorily, these notions reinforce the belief that national harmony and unity is based upon “race-relations”. The importance of bringing Māori and Pākehā together within a race-relations framework, reinforced by the law, can be found in the comments by William Fox, Minister of Native Affairs, to the House of Representatives in 1863:

> Our attempt will be to bring the two races under one law – to make them one community – and to let the Natives feel that they are no longer a separate people, looking to a head of its own, but that all are subject, the white man and the Māori alike, to one law and one system of government … Nothing can be so injurious, nothing so fatal, to the Natives as an attempt to drive them beyond a certain barrier – to separate them from civilisation. Rather than that, the attempt will be made to mix them with Europeans, in order that they may become civilised.

(quoted, in Campbell 1986, pp.4-15).

While the ideas of race and race-relations may no longer be held as robust analytical categories in academia, the above statement from Fox serves to remind readers that notions of the same were considered legitimate and “real”.

Concepts about Māori, race-relations and how to engage possible tensions between groups of people in New Zealand society, have been interwoven into social policy and are evident in film. From notions of extinction (*Rewi’s Last Stand*, 1925) to the justification of assimilation
and integration (Rewi’s Last Stand, 1940), challenging integrationist precepts (Broken Barrier, 1952), reinforcing assimilationist and integrationist policies, but addressing tensions relating to race-relations (To Love a Maori, 1972), re-evaluating the past in the aftermath of the protest movements (Utu, 1983) and the move toward biculturalism (Ngati, 1987 and Mauri, 1988), then latterly to framing Māori in a two-world view model, ideas about race-relations exist in films. These dominant views about race-relations construct Māori representation, and interpretation, into a framework that utilises contextually bound notions of race-relations as its starting point. Whether directors challenge or reinforce the status quo of race-relations, the argument made is that the framework itself provides key insights into the construction of Māori subjectivity, representation and interpretation in the films in order to elicit meaning.

The question of how people interpret their social reality or “everyday life” was the subject of Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann’s seminal work, The Social Construction of Reality (1966). In Berger and Luckmann’s view, the central concept of social constructionism was that actors, interacting together form, over time, typifications or representations of each other’s actions. As a result, these typifications eventually become habitualised into reciprocal roles played by actors in relation to one another. Primarily, Berger and Luckman were concerned with how interaction externalised “objectified” beliefs about groups of people. “Beliefs” such as notions of extinction, the justification for assimilation and integration, biculturalism and how to maintain social cohesion in a race-relations framework result in what Berger, and Luckmann described as “common-sense” understandings of everyday life.

Berger and Luckmann were concerned, however, that these “common sense” understandings were, in effect, maintained social interactions and institutions. Marvin Carlson (1996, p.4) termed these interactions as “… repeated socially sanctioned modes of behaviour” where particular conditions, and mechanisms underlay the same. Carlson’s views correspond with Althusser’s position (1971, p.162) regarding the systems of beliefs and assumptions that are often unconscious, and unexamined, which represents “… the imaginary relationship of individuals to their real conditions of existence”. Berger and Luckmann argued that “beliefs”, once externalised, and considered “natural” or “legitimate” were capable of justifying action in accordance with those beliefs (Jost and Major 2001, p.84). For example, if the importance of harmonious race-relations is granted heightened salience and is a national
priority in a society, then actions can be taken at the institutional level in order to maintain this belief.

The Māori population has been subject to many social policies that have been both detrimental and in opposition to views inside the Māori population of the same. These social policies have been predicated on the notion that they will maintain national cohesion, unity and harmony within a race-relations framework. A thorough evaluation of the hypotheses that notions of Māori subjectivity and race-relations are socially constructed allows for an investigation of the paths through which contextual views about Māori can influence both social relations and material processes. Thus, what may seem “legitimate” and “correct” ideas about Māori are, in themselves, products of time and place.

The continuous examination and, thus, belief in the importance of race-relations in New Zealand reinforces Berger and Luckman’s concern about how meaning, through categorical beliefs, and the reciprocal roles played by the actors is embedded into the institutional fabric or structure of society. It may be that the heightened salience granted to race-relations serves a multi-faceted purpose in that:

1. It emphasises and legitimises contextually bound ideas about how groups of people engage with one another;
2. It raises the belief that there is a potential threat to the relationship of Māori and Pākehā by both internal and external forces;
3. It serves to inculcate into the national consciousness that the harmonious relationship of Māori and Pākehā is central to national cohesion;
4. The idea or belief of a potential threat in the race-relations framework constructs Māori in a contradictory fashion, as at once crucial to national identity and harmony, but also possibly detrimental to the same in New Zealand society; and

Finally, historically and in contemporary times, it can be seen that the belief in the importance of race-relations and national cohesion has justified State actions toward Māori which have been, at times, both detrimental to Māori, and vigorously contested.

2.2 Griswold’s cultural diamond

The methodology used in this work is both qualitative and interpretive in that it focuses on the key thematic of a nationalised race-relations narrative in eight New Zealand films: Rewi’s Last Stand (1925/194), Broken Barrier (1952), To Love a Māori (1972), Utu (1983) Ngati
(1987), Mauri (1988), *Once Were Warriors* (1994) and *Whale Rider* (2002). Utilising Griswold’s cultural diamond, each film will be treated as both a “cultural object” and as a case study, where the work will be placed in its broader historical, social and political context, in order to investigate the continuous key thematic of race-relations. By employing Griswold’s typology what will be used to examine how films, as “cultural objects”, are bound by a number of interrelated factors that need to be considered by analysts when determining “meaning”.

Griswold’s (1994, pp.14-16) methodological framework explores the argument that an understanding of cultural objects from a sociological perspective entails an analysis of four interrelated factors:

(i) The intentions of creative agents, which refer to the social agent’s purpose in light of the constraints imposed upon him or her in the production and social incorporation of specific objects;

(ii) The reception of cultural objects over time and space, which refers to the social agent’s consumption, incorporation or rejection of cultural objects;

(iii) The comprehension of cultural objects in terms of intrinsic and heuristic genres is contingent upon the understanding of internal structures, patterns and symbolic carrying capacities of the cultural objects.

(iv) The explanation of the characteristics of cultural objects is referenced to the social and cultural experiences of social groups, and categories.
It is important to note that Griswold’s typology is not a theory of “culture”, but is an analytical approach to investigate the point at which individuals and groups interact with the cultural object.

Film is used in this thesis as a “cultural object” or as a “snapshot” into a society’s views, values and mores about race-relations at a particular time and place. The term “cultural object” refers to the embodiment of a work of art and its shared significance for human beings. In this fashion, representations reveal aspects of the societies in which they were produced, because they are intended for specific audiences. Wolff (1981, p.49) describes representations as, “… not closed, self-contained and transcendent entities, but … the products of specific historical practices on the part of identifiable social groups in given conditions, and therefore bear the imprint of the ideas, values and conditions of existence of those groups …”. As Wolff’s comments indicate, works of art or in this instance, cultural objects, are products of specific practices and are produced under specific conditions. Meanings and significance are ascribed to socially constructed categories, and further, shaped by issues of importance in the environments in which they are created.

Audiences, for example, have to receive, decipher and elicit meaning contained in the works. In essence, individuals have to have a shared form of significance or be familiar with the representations in films, in order to make sense of their intended meanings. As Griswold (1994, p.14) states, people have to “… hear, understand, think about, enact, participate in and remember them”. Thus, films do not float freely, but are anchored in a particular historical, social and political context which informs the representations, and interpretations contained therein.

Griswold’s diamond provides a useful tool for analysing relevant sociological factors that might explain various cultural phenomena. As Griswold (1994, pp.7-8) states:

_The cultural diamond is not a theory. It has nothing to say about how its points might be related, only that they must be related. Nor is it in itself a model, for it implies no causal direction. Any point or linkage may be specified as the dependent variable. Furthermore, each link is an arrow understood to have two heads … I am contending that cultural analysis demands the investigation of the four points and six connecting lines of this diamond; studies that neglect some points or connections are incomplete._
Griswold’s cultural diamond is employed to examine the hypothesis that films from 1985 onwards remain within a continuous race-relations narrative. The following factors in the case studies will be investigated:

a. The biographies of each director and film, including film reviews to highlight how the subject of race-relations was a key influence in the production of the film;
b. The dominant views of race-relations found in State policy prescriptions directed toward the Māori population in the social context when the works were produced and how the same are evident in the works;\(^\text{15}\)
c. An overview of the Māori population in each particular social context and examination of how national interests can, at times, conflict with Māori interests; and
d. The meta-narrative of the cultural authentic and cultural degenerate dichotomy by examining how archetypes, prototypes and stereotypes of characters (termed “encoded characters” or “transitional figures” in this thesis) are used as plot devices in the works to examine race-relations.\(^\text{16}\)

Moreover, by embedding the works in a socio-historical context, what is identified is how the race-relations narrative functions in the works in their relationship to the policies of the State. As indicated, the films form a socio-historical narrative of their own in their endorsement of or responses to the State’s view of race-relations in the public record. Moreover, the films exist in a linear-historical relationship to each other by referencing, responding and reworking key aspects about race-relations from contemporary standpoints. As a result, it is important to adopt a chronological approach to the films and draw the links between the works, the social world and also, to the political directives of the State.

**Conclusion**

The theoretical framework of social constructionism and Griswold’s typology form the basis of analysis of the concepts identified in this work and contextualising the films. By utilising social constructionism and Griswold’s typology films are treated as both “cultural object” and case study in order to examine the influence of the nationalised race-relations narrative on an understanding of Māori subjectivity. These key concepts underpin the hypotheses made in this thesis when drawing the three strands of the social, political and historical narrative of race-relations together to analyse notions of Māori subjectivity.
Chapter Three: Key thematics – race-relations, the cultural authentic/cultural degenerate dichotomy, the Māori ethnic group and the State and the arts

This chapter outlines the key thematics of the thesis namely, race-relations, an historical overview of external influences on the construction of the Māori ethnic group, the association of race-relations and national harmony, the cultural authentic/cultural degenerate dichotomy including the rural-urban divide, and the association of the State and the Arts in developing national identity. The key thematics contained within this chapter underpin and guide the hypotheses made in this work, namely, that Māori subjectivity is framed within a nationalised race-relations narrative. An historical overview of the Māori ethnic group is outlined in this chapter because the Māori population provides a salient example of how notions about groups can have real consequences upon a social body. While these ideas such as the differences between “races” may not necessarily be considered “real”, the notions have had some influence on how groups are constructed, represented and interpreted and also how the groups perceive or categorise themselves.

3.1 Race-relations

The definition of “race-relations” draws upon the works of Michael Banton, Colette Guillaumin and Robert Miles, who describe the framework as a way in which the law and the State have reified the idea of “races” inside a nation-state (Banton 1977). As Robert Miles (1993, p.6) argues:

*By incorporating into the law and the legal process the idea that there are “races” whose relations, one to another in a situation of inequality, must be regulated, the State validates the beliefs of the phenomenal world and orders social relations in such a way that they are structured and reproduced in a racialised form.*

What Banton, Guillaumin and Miles argue is that while it is widely held in academic circles that the idea of race has no scientific legitimacy, the continued use of the term “race-relations”, reinforces the belief that “races” do exist. In essence, Banton, Guillaumin and Miles’ arguments about race-relations reinforce Berger and Luckmann’s concern of how constructed ideas are maintained by social interactions and institutions. Ideas about race or race-relations in themselves do not have agency, but where they become problematic is when their legitimacy about the differences between “races” is granted salience, via State
mechanisms, at the structural level of society. In essence, State mechanisms, policy and legislation based upon ideas of “race” and the concomitant “race-relations” maintain the notion that “races” must still exist. Arguably, the use of a race-relations framework is utilised in a way in which to offer protection by the State to minority groups against racism and prejudice. This can, however, engender its own set of problems because it keeps alive the idea that “races”, as a way in which to distinguish different groups, is legitimate. The impact of the idea of “race” on individuals and groups is well established in the literature (see Banton 1977; 1983; 1994, pp. 1-18; 1998; Barkan 1992; Barzun 1937; Cornell and Hartmann 1998; Guillaumin 1972; Hannaford 1996; Miles 1989; 1993; Morning, 2008, S106-S137; Peterson 1995) and still evident today. The numerous academic sources that focus on the subject of racism in both historical and contemporary times that address the consequences of a belief, no longer held to be a robust analytical category, serves as a reminder of how ideas interwoven through State mechanisms, delivered as policy and legislation can have real world affects on peoples.

### 3.1.1 Race-relations and national identity

In the New Zealand context, race-relations hold particular importance as the framework has been fundamental to the country’s national and international profile. Until the 1970s, New Zealand confidently positioned itself on the international stage as having the best “race-relations” in the world (Sinclair 1971; 1987). In contemporary times, the reconciliation of Māori and Pākehā in settling historic breaches through the Treaty settlement process has also reinforced the notion that harmonious “race-relations” are crucial to social cohesion. From the earliest films in the 20th Century (*Rewi’s Last Stand*) to works in the 21st (*Whale Rider*), the use of a race-relations narrative has been used to convey ideas about national harmony from the settlement of the country to maintaining social cohesion. These ideas are presented as ways forward for Māori and Pākehā when examining the “national dilemma” of how to bring the two peoples together. In essence, the importance of maintaining harmonious “race-relations” between Māori and Pākehā has been constructed as part of the shared culture of New Zealand society.

In this context, the term “national identity” draws upon the works of Benedict Anderson (1983) and Ernest Gellner (1983). Anderson defines cultural nationalism in terms of the creation of an “imagined community” or the shared culture of the nation such that national identity is a socially-constructed phenomenon, not *sui generis*. Gellner emphasises the
importance of the “culture industry”, such as the arts, in the construction of nationhood. As Gellner (1983, p.55) states “It is nationalism which engenders nations, not the other way round”. In terms of nationbuilding and Anderson’s concept of an “imagined community”, nation-states are constructed around key factors such as national symbols, character, music, narratives, literature, folklore and mythology. In Anderson and Gellner’s view, nation states are based upon certain criteria, which might include: a shared language, culture, and/or values. As Joep Leerssen (2006) notes, there is “the tendency to attribute specific characteristics or even characters to different societies, races or ‘nations’ …”.

It is important to note, however, that what also makes the construction of Kiwi culture significant in New Zealand is the strong intersection between the State and the Arts. The idea of a shared national culture was largely developed through dominant cultural institutions, which were granted legitimacy by the State. In this fashion, the ideas about Māori conveyed and evident in the works are not politically or ideologically neutral and can be connected to the policies of the State at the time the films were produced.

3.2 The Māori ethnic group

The Māori population provides a clear and salient example of how ideas and beliefs that are now considered socially constructed have had a considerable influence on how groups are socially constructed in the popular imagination. Historically, subscription to the Māori category has not been a straightforward affair and since the 19th Century the Māori population has been regulated through numerous acts of parliament, government policies, actions and social institutions (Robson and Reid 2001). In the 20th Century, there were at least ten separate statutory definitions of Māori based upon two different frameworks. The first was based upon the biological distinction of “half or more Māori blood” and the second extended into a descendant category (Robson and Reid 2001).

Until 1981 Māori individuals were required to describe their biometric blood quantum in order to subscribe to the Māori “race” category (Marie 1999, p.95). For example, subscription to the Māori category was defined as: “… persons greater than half Māori blood and Māori-European half-castes, living as Māori or as members of tribes … (Statistics New Zealand 1998, pp.44-45). Terms such as “half-caste” or “quarter-caste” Māori became part of the lexicon in New Zealand society and it is not uncommon to hear people of a particular generation still describe themselves in these terms. Although the terminology of “half-caste” and “native” have largely passed out of contemporary use in academic circles to describe
Māori, the descriptors of “half-caste” and “savage” is evident in films such as *Rewi’s Last Stand* (1925/1940).

Moreover, classifying peoples in a biometric fashion was utilised as a marker of racial authenticity (Kukutai 2004, pp.86-108). The higher the individual’s percentage of “Māori blood”, the closer they were to being an “authentic” or “pure” Māori. It is important to note, however, that the reverse position applied whereby some individuals were excluded from the Māori racial category altogether through the “lack” of blood quantum. The racial categorisation of the Māori population had legal implications for members of the group. In particular, an individual’s ability to access Māori land-holdings and resources by familial rights depended on the ability to connect to the Māori racial category (Kukutai 2004, pp. 86-108). Under the racial categorisation, members of the group that were less than the arbitrary denotation of “blood” could be legally excluded in having interests in Māori land and access to resources from the State (Statistics New Zealand 1998, p.13; Robson and Reid 2001).

Since the 1990s, New Zealand has embraced the concept of “ethnicity” as an organising principle and steered away from the racial descriptors of “half-caste”, “quarter-caste” and so forth. The idea of “race” or differing “races” of people was widely discredited by the scientific community in the aftermath of World War II. In the New Zealand context, the move from race-based identification and classification was superseded in the 1970s by the shift toward the category of “ethnicity” (Pool 1991, p.117).

The change to ethnicity was advanced as a less rigid classification, which allowed individuals previously excluded by biometric factions of blood to identify with the Māori Ethnic Category (Murchie 1991, p. 27). In essence, this move by the State was seen as progressive in terms of opening “membership” to Māori individuals that had previously been excluded through its own policies and legislation. In contemporary times, the Māori ethnic category is one of “self-description”, whereby individuals can choose to subscribe to the group (see Callister 2004, pp. 109-140; Kukutai 2004, pp. 86-108). While there are separate categories for individuals to denote “descent” in the Māori category, it is no longer necessary for members of the group to have whakapapa to subscribe to the Māori ethnic group.

While the distinctions between ideas of race, racial categories and ethnicity are well acknowledged in academic circles, there is often general confusion of these differences in wider society. In the now famous speech on “nationhood” by the then leader of the National Party, Don Brash at Orewa in 2004, the credibility of the Māori population and the Treaty
settlement process, couched within the descriptors of “ethnicity” was questioned on racial grounds:

Our definition of ethnicity is now a matter of subjective self-definition: if you are part Māori and want to identify as Māori you can do so. The Māori ethnic group is a very loose one. There has always been considerable intermarriage between Māori and Pākehā. Anthropologists tell us that by 1900 there were no full-blooded Māori left in the South Island. By 2000, the same was true of the North Island. Today, nearly 70% of 24 to 34 year old New Zealanders who identify as Māori are married to someone who does not.

(quoted, in Scoop 2004).

Over the next two years, Brash would continue to question the authenticity of Māori ethnicity, identity, culture and rights to define as indigenous on the grounds of “racial purity”. Brash’s comments would receive both support (National’s popularity rose after the 2004 Orewa speech) and strong criticism from opponents for his views (Scoop 2006; Stokes 2006; Berry 2006; Crewdson and Spratt 2005).

Don Brash’s views, however, and the rise in fortunes of his political party when expressing those sentiments to a public audience indicate that a change in terminology often does not eradicate beliefs that underpin those notions. Markers of identity that are race-based such as blood quantum, colour, geographical location and cultural proficiency were utilised in a nationhood speech to, contradictorily, herald a new era of race-relations under the guise of “we are all New Zealanders”. Thomas Eriksen (1993) highlights the inter-connection between societies such as New Zealand where the idea of races were important by advocating that the category of “race” should be studied as part of the local discourses in understanding any alternative to “race”, such as ethnicity and/or culture, and race-relations.

3.3 The social construction of Māori or contextual understandings of Māori?

How the term “Māori” is conceptualised is formed through a complex set of layers produced under a specific set of conditions that are influenced and maintained, by broader historical, political and social factors. “Māori” has been used to variously describe and define a racial group, an ethnicity, a Treaty partner, a culture, an identity, a legal entity, subjectivity, a sense of nationhood and nationalism, protest, pan-tribal, iwi, and urban movements, ways of being
and social concerns that are attributed to the group as a homogeneous entity (Meredith 1998; Poata-Smith 2005, pp. 211-7). The limitations of conceptualising Māori as a “homogeneous entity” have been raised by a number of academics that advance the acknowledgement of a heterogeneous or plural approach to subject positions inside the Māori population. When discussing Māori protest politics, for example, Evan Poata-Smith (2005, p.214) states:

*Māori protest politics embraces a range of conflicting political ideologies, which are informed by radically different assumptions about the causes of racism and Māori inequality in wider society, and in turn, different sets of strategies for ameliorating and transcending that inequality.*

The different contextual understandings of “Māori” will be discussed throughout this thesis when the case studies are placed in their time and place for analysis, but it is important to be cognisant of the ongoing process of adding layers to what is meant by the term “Māori.” Meanings, definitions, understandings and analyses of “being Māori” are constantly in the process of being reconfigured and/or renegotiated. The traditional definition of “Māori”, for example, meant “ordinary or normal” which took on greater group significance with contact and the settlement of Europeans (Biggs 1995). Prior to European contact and settlement, identification by Māori individuals rested upon the connection of whakapapa, whānau, hapu, iwi in rohe (particular territories), and importantly, turangawaewae (place to stand), rather than as a nationalised group. Thus descriptors, definitions, meanings and their significance change over time.

It is important to note that the acknowledgement of the heterogeneity of the Māori population and the advancement of plural subject positions contained within the group are crucial to contemporary discussions about Māori subjectivity, race-relations and national identity. The subject of difference and contestation of competing points of view about Māori will be discussed further in later chapters.21 What is of particular interest is the notion of layering Māori identity with contextual meaning, whereby each generation places different ideas on what it means to be Māori that is framed by wider concerns about race-relations and national identity.

As Don Brash’s comments above serve to remind, socially constructed beliefs about individuals and groups are not easily dismissed in wider society. The descriptors of Māori may have changed over time, but remnants of earlier notions of racial categories, superiority, assimilation and where Māori are (or should be) situated in the national framework continue
to be raised, and reworked into the nationalised narrative of race-relations. It is argued that what influences analyses of Māori subjectivity and indeed, social roles, is the key thematic of race-relations.

Group beliefs and beliefs about groups are not only embedded in “common-sense understandings” of people, but also at the institutional level of society. In the aftermath of Don Brash’s 2004 speech, there was a change in public social policy and terminology by the Labour-led Government in how goods and services would be distributed to ameliorate inequalities in the New Zealand population. Labour’s “Closing the Gaps” policy that was based primarily on closing the economic gap measured on ethnic indices (between Māori and Pacific Islanders, and non-Māori) was shelved due to the public response to Don Brash’s political speech about race-relations and nationhood (see Te Puni Kokiri 1998; 1999).

3.4 Meta-narrative – cultural authenticity and cultural degeneracy

There is a long history of encapsulating Māori subjectivity within debates centring on cultural authenticity and cultural degeneracy. In 1924 the ethnographer George Pitt-Rivers published The white man’s task, based upon the dichotomy of a “pure traditional Māori” of the past and a “degenerate Māori” of the present. Pitt-Rivers (1924, pp.48-65) proposed a solution to “the evils we speak of as native unrest” and lamented that contemporary Māori “had inherited all the vices of their forefathers and none of the virtues”. It can be seen in the comments of Pitt-Rivers that there had developed a dichotomy between a “pure” Māori based upon a romantic, noble and traditional past, and conversely, notions of contemporary degenerate Māori in comparison to the ancient world of the forebears.

These themes originated in the Māoriland period on the misguided belief that Māori were doomed to extinction. At this time, the explanatory theories regarding Māori were based upon the notion of “extinction” (the fatal impact thesis), while at the same time utilised as a justification for the assimilation of Māori into the wider national framework.22 Traditional Māori were imbued with virtues and nobility, which Māori in the 1920s and 1930s were not afforded.23 By 1940, the popular belief Māori were dying had been refuted by empirical evidence, but there remained in some intellectual circles the unflattering comparison between Māori of the “past” and those in the present. The idea of Māori dying, falling from nature or being in a “state of decline” remained embedded within society.
As Steven Webster (1998, p.87) notes, these historical ideas about Māori “extinction” oscillated upon a “… conceptual ambiguity between racist and cultural arguments”. According to Webster (1998) the “cultural argument” centred upon the idea of preserving “cultural purity”, but through “racial purity”. When racial purity could be questioned, then cultural purity was challenged. This conflation of “racial purity” and “cultural purity” engendered the historical pattern of presenting Māori as conflicted and problematic. The racial categories and descriptions would indicate “traditional Māori” and “contemporary Māori” or “pure” and “mixed” bloods. In this fashion, Māori were no longer literally dying, but were posited as being in a state of “decline”.

The Māori population may have survived extinction, but contemporary Māori would be forever compared unfavourably to a romantic past of noble savages, warriors and maidens. By measuring Māori against a traditional, romantic, noble and heroic past, served to stigmatise contemporary Māori. In this fashion, the notions of racial “extinction” may have been put to rest, but questions regarding “cultural purity” and “authenticity” remained. Furthermore, the dichotomy justified State intervention under the rationale of “saving” Māori by way of integration and assimilation, and in ways that often caused dispute. The absence of critique on the contemporary situation of Māori in the cinematic record, which remained until John O’Shea’s film, Broken Barrier (1952) and the focus on the traditional aspects of Māori, allude to a subtle code based on the idea of cultural authenticity, and cultural degeneracy. This dichotomy would also offer the opportunity, which remains today, for those external to the group to decide who were “authentically” Māori, and who were not.

3.4.1 The rural-urban divide

The meta-narrative of the cultural authentic/cultural degenerate dichotomy is evident in the films for analysis through the depiction of encoded characters that are utilised to explore social concerns about race-relations. This dichotomy is reinforced, however, through the subscript of location or the “rural-urban divide”. Location and setting are employed as plot devices to signal to the audience certain traits about Māori characters that are situated in each of these environs. It is argued that where Māori characters are situated in the works has developed a local variant of the “fatal impact thesis” where rural Māori are portrayed as more “essential” or “pure” and urban Māori are characterised as “degenerate”. It is important to note that notions of Māori purity and essentialism are rejected in this thesis, since to engage
in such analysis continues the cultural authentic/cultural degenerate dichotomy, rather than challenging the same.

Each area is encoded with features that rely on stereotypical attributes to distinguish one from the other. The rural area, for example, is depicted as New Zealand’s “heartland”, whereas the urban centres are characterised as potentially dangerous, especially for Māori. What is set in place is the dichotomy of “good” Māori, which is located with authentic Māori from the rural areas and “bad” Māori, such as those in the urban centres. In this sense location is used as a parable for the potential corruption of Māori who have either a) moved from the rural areas to an urban environment or b) been raised in an urbanised environment and lost connection with their essential “Māoriness” and natural, rural environs.

In this fashion, the city is portrayed as a modern-day kai tangata (eater of humanity) which suggests the urban environment cannibalises Māori and turns Māori from being essentially good to potentially dangerous. This theme is evident and will be explored in depth in the filmic case studies, but clear examples of this subscript can be found in Broken Barrier (1952) where Tom and Rawi make comment on the degeneracy of urban Māori and return to the more pastoral heartland to live, To Love a Maori (1972) where Raki’s innocence as a “country Māori” is exploited in the city by criminals including an urbanised Māori, Ngati (1987) where Sally’s “city ways” are viewed with scepticism by her whānau, Mauri (1988) where Rewi/Paki has been corrupted and must make amends to both Māori and Pākehā law/lore and also Herb Rapana who is murdered in the city because of his involvement with gangs. Arguably the most extreme example of urban alienation and corruption is Once were warriors (1994) through the eyes of the Heke family and the redemptive factor, in the film, but not the novel, of returning to traditional roots. What is suggested is the allusion to the “dangers” of the urban centres for Māori, and how Māori, once located in the cities, become corrupted or “inauthentic”. Thus choice of “setting” is an active decision by directors to depict Māori characters in either a “pure” or “authentic” framework or in a state of decline with a potential fall from grace.

3.5 The State and the arts

Since the 1930s, there has been a strong intersection between the mutual interests of the State and the Arts in New Zealand (see New Zealand Film Commission 2006). Historically, the
State has been active in the creation of a “culture industry” and the construction of nationhood. The influential development in the cultural nationalist period was an interventionist Labour Government in 1935, which came to power with an agenda of social reform against the backdrop of the Great Depression and New Zealand’s Centennial Year looming in 1940 (Sinclair 1961). In this era, cultural institutions were established which shaped and modified literary productions toward a particular view of New Zealand identity (Murray 1998, p.9). In 1938, the New Zealand Centennial Act put in place an infrastructure for the celebration of 100 years of the country as a “modern” nation. This Act would establish a link between central and local government and the Arts through the construction of the National Centennial Council, chaired by the Minister for Internal Affairs, W.E. Parry.

Films such One Hundred Crowded Years made by HH Bridgman were produced by the Council to promote the celebration of New Zealand’s centenary as a modern and progressive nation.

The connection between the Arts and government was established during the cultural nationalist period in order to facilitate the invention of Kiwi culture. In effect the culture industry legitimised how New Zealand should be presented, not only to itself but also at the international level. The intersection between the State and the Arts would, however, not be without dissent. The legendary director, John O’Shea advocated for more State support in the film industry to put New Zealand stories on screen (O’Shea 1996), but came to resent the interference of the State.

O’Shea would be instrumental in the establishment of the New Zealand Film Commission (“NZFC”) in 1977, but would also be critical of what he perceived as political interference in the film industry. John O’Shea identified particular ideologies held by successive governments, such as socialism and neoliberalism, as constraints upon filmmakers. He described the Norman Kirk-led Labour Government, as a “scourge on creativity” and the Prime Minister as a “bullying Billy Bunter” (O’Shea 1996, p.33). O’Shea would also reserve a particular antipathy for Roger Douglas (Minister of Finance and Broadcasting in 1985 and a key architect of the neo-liberal reforms), 24 accrediting Douglas with precipitating events which “ran along what seemed to be an ordained path of destruction” (O’Shea 1996, p. 34).

The documentary maker Alister Barry has also focused on the neoliberal period in his works Someone else’s country (1996) and In a Land of Plenty (2002) which make explicit the pressure brought to bear on people to conform to the economic policy of the Government.
Barry implies in his work that those with dissenting views, toward the neoliberal reforms were in effect, sidelined by the Government. In a recent report by Sir Peter Jackson and David Court (2010, p.14) that was commissioned by the National Government to review the NZFC, the authors express similar views to O’Shea and Barry:

*New Zealand’s film makers clearly feel stymied and frustrated by the guidelines and rules, which seem to have multiplied during the past 10 years. These guidelines, which have very little flexibility, are the result of a bureaucratic template, inappropriately applied.*

This is an interesting point to consider in that it exemplifies Griswold’s cultural diamond of the pressures placed on artists when producing “cultural objects” (see also James 2000; 2002).

This intersection of the Arts and government is important in debates around national identity, which would culminate in the 1960s, 1970s and 1980s. When describing aspects of “modernism”, Roger Horrocks (1984, p.133) once argued that, “the strongest footing in New Zealand … are most readily assimilated by a governing nationalist realism”. As will be discussed further in this thesis, Horrocks’ comments can be extended to a number of prevailing ideologies and discursive frameworks which have been incorporated by the State to negotiate views on race-relations and the construction of national identity. For example, State policy regarding how Māori and Pākehā *should* interact within the national framework, has been based on extinction, cultural nationalist, assimilation-integrationist and bicultural themes, all of which are evident in the films.

In 1978, the NZFC was established and is regulated, authorised and has statutory responsibility by the New Zealand Government "to encourage and participate and assist in the making, promotion, distribution and exhibition of films made in New Zealand by New Zealanders on New Zealand subjects” (New Zealand Film Commission 2006). Similarly, Creative New Zealand (“CNZ”) was established as a Crown entity under the Arts Council of New Zealand Toi Aotearoa Act in 1994. CNZ is funded by the Government. The Ministry for Culture and Heritage monitors the performance of the entity in accordance with directions from the Minister of Arts, Culture and Heritage. The aim of CNZ is to fund creative projects which reflect New Zealand’s “cultural identity” and “promoting art as a mechanism for cultural understanding and tolerance” (New Zealand Film Commission 2006). Until 2008, the Prime Minister of New Zealand, Helen Clark was the official Patron of the Arts (New
Zealand Film Commission 2006). Presently, Chris Finlayson, the Minister for Treaty negotiations and Attorney General, is the Minister of Culture and Heritage. In essence, the State is the largest patron of the arts in New Zealand society through its regulatory bodies and has a vested interest in presenting the image of the country in a particular model (see James 2000; 2002).

Filmmakers are required to subscribe to particular criteria to secure funding and while one can debate as to how far these structural constraints affect filmmakers, it is important to note the same exist and is terrain that has to be negotiated by artists when bringing the work to an audience. For example, John O'Shea actively resisted both State interference and the legitimate views of race-relations in his work. Moreover and as Louis Althusser (1971, p.162) identified, various ideologies and ideological state apparatuses may appear to be disparate, but beneath them all is the ideology of the dominant ruling class and culture.

These broader factors in the production of film should be incorporated into analyses because there is a complex process before the work is brought to the screen that is influenced by ideas and beliefs in particular social contexts. As Lydia Wevers (2004, p.109) notes when discussing the political and cultural environment in contemporary New Zealand society:

> What is important to recognise about cultural policy and politics is that an articulation of “ourselves” forms part of the legislative and administrative framework that supports cultural activity in Aotearoa … before the artist or the work of art has been delivered into the interpretive community that receives it …

Wevers alludes to the mechanisms such as the legislative and administrative arms of the State that influence the creative community in how (or indeed, which) works are produced for consumption. Artists might resist, challenge, support or endorse particular views in their works but it is important to be cognisant that there is a whole process for artists and filmmakers to negotiate prior to the works being released to the interpretative community. Merata Mita’s experiences in producing Bastion Point: Day 507 and Patu! serve as reminders of the lengths to which the State will go in order to make artists conform to dominant State views about race-relations, couched within the rationale of law and order, and national interests.
It is important to note that Māori filmmakers are also bound by the same conventions, constraints and criteria set by the State. Historically, “Māori” arts and artists have been incorporated into the State mechanisms and have been answerable to successive Governments. For example, the magazine *Te Ao Hou* was established in 1952 and functioned under the auspices of the Māori Affairs Department and the Māori Purposes Fund Board (Wattie 1998). The Māori Affairs Department and the Māori Purposes Fund Board were branches of the State and as such, were required to endorse State policy. As has been described by others, *Te Ao Hou* was a conservative magazine, where much attention was devoted to safe ‘Māori’ topics, such as “wood carving and other crafts” (Wattie 1998, p.21). Indeed controversial subjects, works and artists were excluded from publication in *Te Ao Hou*. The poet Hone Tuwhare, had a poem rejected by *Te Ao Hou* for publication in the 1950s, which made him complain about the “sexlessness” of the magazine (Underhill 1998, p.1375; Evans 2004, p.77). What this suggests is censorship on certain subjects, works and artists that did not conform to the State’s view of Māori in that particular social context.

In contemporary times, NZFC and CNZ have a specific branch for Māori, which operates under the umbrella of Te Waka Toi. Te Waka Toi is responsible for examining the suitability of projects oriented toward Māori subjectivity into parameters set by the State (New Zealand Film Commission 2006). As will be discussed throughout this thesis, Māori subjectivity has been historically vulnerable to external and internal pressures, which form part of the “legitimate” views on how Māori are represented and interpreted. A clear example is the production of the film *Once were warriors* (1994) which was met with opposition due to its subject matter and where a number of key themes were changed between the novel and the film to reflect contemporary views.28

The production of film is, as Braudy and Cohen (2004, p.xvii) note “a web of financial, political and artistic decisions, where the filmmaker may seek to subvert or reinforce the prevailing norms”. Issues such as funding (or the way in which resources are distributed), the constraints upon artists when creating, and producing works, have been an ongoing source of tension between the artistic community and the Government (Jackson and Court 2010; Mita, M 2010; O’Shea 1996). In his tribute to Barry Barclay, Graham Tuckett (2008) writes, “I never actually heard Bazz say ‘Damn the Torpedoes’ (though I knew he loved the sentiment), but I definitely heard him mutter ‘bugger the producer/broadcaster/funder’ a few times”.

If film is, as Comolli and Narboni (2004, p.814) state “… part of the economic system it is also a part of the ideological system, for ‘cinema’ and “art” are branches of ideology”. It is suggested that social pressures and conventions, such as State policy prescriptions, economics and reception by the audience at the time the works take shape bind all filmmakers, including in contemporary times. As Chris Prentice (cited, in Wevers 2004, p. 113) has noted about the contemporary social climate:

… the politics of culture and of cultural difference … may be most threatened by, or at risk from, structures, practices and institutions which claim to support and promote them. In an era of political and cultural managerialism, politics is transformed into policy.

Given the association of the State and the arts, it is important for analysts to consider the specific structures and mechanisms which frame the representation and interpretation of Māori subjectivity in New Zealand films. While academics may differ on how far these structures and mechanisms influence artists and directors, it is important to adopt a theoretical and methodological approach that can incorporate these factors.

**Conclusion**

This chapter has outlined the key thematics of race-relations, an historical overview of external influences on the construction of the Māori ethnic group, the association of race-relations and national identity, the cultural authentic/cultural degenerate dichotomy, rural-urban divide, and the association of the State and the arts in developing national identity. The State has had a large influence on some of the key thematics examined in this thesis, namely, race-relations, the development of national identity and the arts, as well as in the construction of the Māori ethnic group itself. Māori have been influenced and vulnerable to external pressures to conform in a way that reflects Government policy regarding race-relations, and national cohesion. In contemporary times membership to the Māori group is now “self-identifying” which could be advanced as a form of “progress” in terms of race-relations and national identity. It is important to note, however, that membership to the group is still set by the State and now includes people who “feel” or identify with Māori, but do not have any ancestry. In this fashion, ideas about race-relations and national interests continue the historical trend of influencing the construction of the Māori ethnic group that is, in the main, set by politics occurring in the social context and borne out in State policy prescriptions.
The role of the State in the construction of the Māori ethnic group and a sense of national identity based on race-relations is an important key thematic in this work. The aim of examining the role of the State and connecting ideas about race-relations to the governing policy in the social context in which each film was produced is to identify how ideas about Māori have changed over time, but still remain within a nationalised race-relations narrative. Furthermore and as outlined in this chapter, race-relations and the Māori ethnic group continue to be influenced and/or defined by State mechanisms.
Chapter Four: The advent of biculturalism

This chapter examines the historical and social context in which the socio-ideology of biculturalism was adopted by the State in New Zealand as a way in which to negotiate race-relations. Biculturalism arose in the aftermath of the protest movements of the 1970s and 1980s and in particular, settling historic claims of Crown breaches to the Treaty of Waitangi with Māori claimant groups. This chapter provides a materialist and historical account of the reframing of New Zealand history and race-relations into a model framed by the bicultural lens. Outlined are key events that precipitated the shift from cultural national propositions regarding race-relations to the state-sanctioned socio-political ideology of biculturalism in order to explore contemporary understandings of race-relations and how the same have influenced films from the 1980s onwards. Historically, the social construction of the Māori population, social body, subjectivity and concerns, has been vulnerable and susceptible to external pressures through State policy and legislation. The adoption of biculturalism and its concomitant models of constructing Māori and Pākehā into two distinct ethnic and cultural groups, continued the pattern of adopting ideologies in which to engage with Māori and maintain national cohesion through race-relations. It is important to note that the State has often taken an active role in privileging one competing view from inside the Māori social group over another. A clear example can be found in the disputes in the 1990s between Iwi and Urban Māori Authorities (“UMA”) where the State endorsed “iwi” as the legitimate structure of the Māori population and tried to enforce this view at law.

The period from 1984-1990 in New Zealand society is characterised by social, political and economic reform. Contributing factors to the reforms were global and national protest movements regarding civil, and human rights, unrest in the aftermath of the Springbok Tour and the downturn of the economy. Throughout this period, successive governments implemented and inculcated into social policy a number of key reforms that centred on both race-relations and economics. Subsequently, the 1990s variant of biculturalism would exhibit a contemporary form of the cultural authentic/cultural degenerate dichotomy, but the adoption of the socio-political ideology was an attempt to re-examine race-relations in order to effect reconciliation between Māori and Pākehā. A key hypothesis of this thesis is that these contextual issues influence contemporary analyses of Māori subjectivity in films from 1985 onwards.
4.1 Social context – the advent of biculturalism

As outlined Chapters Nine and Ten, *To Love a Maori* and *Utu*, issues regarding Māori rights, race-relations and racism inside New Zealand had become fraught with tension. The period from 1975 to 1981 was characterised by significant protest movements at both the international and national level. In the New Zealand context, the influence of the anti-racist movement in opposition to the 1981 Springbok Tour set the platform for a re-examination of race-relations at the national level. This theme of re-examination is evident in *Utu* (1983), a work which was significant primarily since it was produced at a time when an ideological shift regarding race-relations was imminent, but New Zealand had not yet moved there.

Following the civil unrest of the Springbok Tour and the downturn in the global economy, the Fourth Labour Government was elected in 1984 and faced two crises in its tenure, namely political legitimacy on race-relations and economics (Kelsey 1984; 1990; 1991; 1996; Poata-Smith 2001). The Fourth Labour Government superseded the conservative and reactionary National Party led by Robert Muldoon, which had come to power in 1975. As discussed in the chapters *To Love a Maori* (1972) and *Utu* (1983), Muldoon’s government had been in office during a period of New Zealand history characterised by civil unrest and demonstrated a marked antipathy toward Māori demands. Muldoon’s reactionary conservatism would encourage rather than quash dissent. During Muldoon’s tenure are some of the most significant protests in New Zealand’s history such as The Māori Land March (1975), Bastion Point (1977-78), The Raglan Golf Course (1978) and the Springbok Tour (1981).

The growing socio-economic inequality and social polarisation that took place in the 1970s as a result of the collapse of the long economic boom had a disproportionate impact on Māori communities (Poata-Smith 2001). This was a product of continuing economic decline and fiscal instability, coupled with increasing unemployment, politicisation of ethnic and gender inequalities, and other signs of social unrest. Within this context, there was a politicisation of Māori identity and a dramatic upsurge in political activism. Landmark movements, such as Te Hokioi, Ngā Tamatoa, the Polynesian Panther Party and also the political turbulence created in the wake of the 1975 Land March on parliament, Bastion Point, the Raglan Golf Course, the regular protests at Waitangi, and the Springbok Tour engendered a crisis of political legitimacy for the Muldoon Government and its successor: the Fourth Labour Government.
4.2 Political legitimacy and economics

Upon taking the reins of power, the Fourth Labour Government implemented a reformist agenda to address the crises of race-relations and economics. The two key policies introduced were neo-liberalism (also known at the local level as “Rogernomics” after Minister of Finance, Roger Douglas) and biculturalism. From 1984 to 1996, New Zealand underwent a period of systematic reform now characterised as a “revolution”, which was initiated by the Fourth Labour Government and continued by the Fourth National Government (Kelsey 1996). These reforms would also have an influence upon the historical understandings of Māori and Pākehā interactions in New Zealand society.

It is important to note however, that the policy options of successive governments were constrained by the demands made by Māori groups for reparation. Māori demands were not specifically confined to land issues or grievances associated with the Treaty of Waitangi. A primary issue encompassed within the broader Māori protest movements was the question of “power-sharing” and the control of future resources (Greenland 1984; Kelsey 1996; Poata-Smith 2001). This notion of “power-sharing” was promised in the Treaty of Waitangi and based upon the principle of rangatiratanga, in Article 2 of the Māori version of the Treaty document itself.34

Due to the economic and fiscal crisis, the State faced considerable problems in terms of management. The State was severely limited in its capacity to defuse the growing crisis of political legitimacy and restore credibility to the tarnished authority of the Crown in the aftermath of the Springbok Tour. Since the early 1970s, economic recession and restructuring had resulted in growing unemployment, and gave rise to a greatly increased demand for social services. The cost of the welfare state for example, was increasingly incompatible with the need to restore levels of profitability in the economy that required curbing state expenditure and costs associated with state intervention in the market place (Cheyne, O'Brien and Belgrave 2001; Kelsey 1993; Poata-Smith 2001). Thus, the State faced the dilemma of having to embark on a process of reconciliation with Māori, while at the same simultaneously implementing an economic and fiscal agenda of reducing Government expenditure.

The process by which the State attempted to defuse and pacify Māori demands should be observed within this broader context. Arguably, the Fourth Labour Government’s Māori policy was motivated by the overriding objectives of establishing political legitimacy over
race-relations at a time of economic and fiscal crisis. In essence, the Fourth Labour Government’s official adoption of biculturalism can be interpreted as a form of “politics of appeasement”, which started with the granting of retrospective powers to the Waitangi Tribunal in 1985 to view claims as at 1840.

The official policy of “biculturalism” was adopted after 1984 and involved the incorporation of Māori personnel, Māori models of organisation and Māori social practices, and cultural symbolism within the institutions of the State. For example, the high-profile protestors Donna Awatere produced *Puao-Te-Ata-Tu* in 1986 which presented a “Māori view” in relation to the Department of Social Welfare. The findings of the report were encompassed in the Royal Commission on Social Policy (the April Report) in 1988 (Bartley and Spoonley 2005, p.138). These policies incorporated specific ways for the State to interact with Māori and can be seen as responses to the cultural nationalist or assimilationist-integrationist propositions contained within the Hunn Report (1961).

John Rangihau, a member of the Māori Battalion in World War II, was instrumental in providing advice to the State Service Sector on the Māori Perspective Advisory Committee, established in 1985 by the Department of Social Welfare. Rangihau had a long career with the State Service Sector until 1973 when he returned to University at Waikato and became a lecturer in the Centre for Māori Studies. In 1982 Rangihau became an advisor to the Māori Affairs Department and is credited as being a key figure in the Māori Renaissance. John Rangihau would construct the Māoritanga and Pākehātanga dichotomy that underpinned the “two world-view model” of biculturalism in the 1990s.

Notably, in terms of economic restructuring the Māori population bore the brunt of the neoliberal policies (Te Puni Kokiri 1992). Between March 1987 and March 1989 (under Labour), one fifth of the Māori population was made redundant (Te Puni Kokiri 1992, p.41). Thus at a time when Māori would make significant gains in recognising cultural and Treaty rights, there was a contemporaneous economic and social loss to a large proportion of the Māori population.

**4.3 The Treaty of Waitangi**

Through the bicultural reforms, the Treaty of Waitangi became a prominent feature in any discussions relating to: “race-relations”, national identity issues relating to how promises made in the Treaty would be enacted in the nation state and the negotiation of partnership
between Māori and Pākehā. As Bartley and Spoonley (2005, p.136) note, debates regarding the Treaty have significantly altered “… historical understandings, national identity debates, and the delivery of State services”. At the time Ngati (1987) and Mauri (1988) were in production these issues were highly topical, contested and still in a process of negotiation. A sense of optimism in Ngati (1987) and Mauri (1988) regarding re-examining race-relations, and some subtle codes about who can be trusted in the promise of partnership are evident in the works.

The granting of retrospective powers to the Waitangi Tribunal in 1985 set in motion the process of settling historical grievances and reconciling Māori and Pākehā inside the nation state. Groups such as Ngati Whatua, which had been forcibly removed from Bastion Point, were one of the first claimants to the Tribunal when the State had extended the scope to consider claims dating from 1840. Te Reo Māori would be recognised as an official language in 1987 with the Māori Language Act. The Māori Affairs Amendment Act 1974 promoted the retention of Māori language, culture and retention of lands, but it would take another decade for Te Reo Māori to become an official language. Events such as the Hui Taumata in 1984 focussed on Māori economic development and leadership. The State Owned Enterprises Act 1986 and the subsequent case between the New Zealand Māori Council and the Crown (1987) brought the Treaty of Waitangi in New Zealand society into the “present” as a “living document”. The settlement of historical grievances was a core function of the Waitangi Tribunal, but the precedent of the Treaty as a “living document” from the New Zealand Māori Council -v- the Crown brought the Treaty into the present in unprecedented ways.

This thesis considers the contradictory perception of the Treaty of Waitangi which has been used by supporters as a symbol of nationhood and, by detractors as a destabilising force in debates around racial and national harmony. Although the document was lost from the national consciousness for some 150 years, in less than two decades, the significance of the Treaty has gone from legal nullity to New Zealand’s magna carta (Belich 1996; McHugh 1991). The challenge by formally “conservative” organisations, such as the Māori Council, to the sale of State owned assets, and the Treaty of Waitangi settlement process became landmark legal decisions. Part of the neo-liberal economic agenda was the selling of State owned enterprises, which was subject to an act of Parliament; namely the State Owned Enterprises Act (1986). The Māori Council undertook Court proceedings against the State
because the Act did not recognise the Treaty of Waitangi. The Court of Appeal ruled in 1987 that the Crown should indeed recognise the Treaty of Waitangi.

In effect, the New Zealand Māori Council -v- the Crown (1987) sparked the Treaty settlement process and brought the document into the “present”. The Treaty was no longer just an historical document, but would subsequently have to be considered as evolving in contemporary times. It is important to note that the strongest clause regarding the Treaty of Waitangi is in Section 9 of the State Owned Enterprises Act 1986, which states, “Nothing in this Act shall permit the Crown to act in a manner that is inconsistent with the provisions of the Treaty of Waitangi”. The strength of the verb “permit” in section 9 of the State Owned Enterprises Act has not been repeated in subsequent legislation.

Arguably, one of the reasons for this is that during the period 1984-1990, the Treaty settlement process was in its experimental stages. Currently the Treaty of Waitangi holds an ambiguous place in New Zealand law. The Treaty has no basis in New Zealand’s constitution and Parliament has sovereignty over all Treaty issues, including settling claims (McDowall and Webb 2002, pp.207-212). The Treaty is referred to in Statutes, common law, aboriginal title and more importantly, the administrative arm of the State, such as Crown agencies. These agencies are however, bound to consider only the principles of the Treaty and are without constitutional “force”. The “principles” of the Treaty are essentialised versions of the key concepts contained within the document, of tino rangatiratanga (full chieftainship), kawanatanga (governance), taonga and ngā tikanga katoa (all Māori customs), but they are distinct from the articles. It is important to note that the State maintains that Māori acceded sovereignty to the Crown, yet the Crown has not provided a rationale for such a decision.

In the 1990s, the socio-political ideology of biculturalism shifted into a bifurcated view of Māori and non-Māori engagement. The means by which biculturalism is constructed into what is termed “the two world-view model” will be examined in Chapter Five, but it has its origins in the social context of the broader New Zealand politics of the 1990s. While biculturalism was officially adopted as State policy in the 1980s, it is argued that the 1990s version of the socio-political ideology produced a more rigid version, which was by extension, similarly stringent in its application to the Māori population. The 1990s’ version of biculturalism (or the two world-view model) would have a significant effect on the films Once were warriors (1994) and Whale Rider (2002) in presenting what the central concerns of the Māori population should be.
4.4 The bifurcation of biculturalism – the social context of the 1990s

In 1990, the Fourth National Government was elected on a platform that promised a return to a “decent society” (Russell 1996). It was led by James B. ("Jim") Bolger and held office from 1990 to 1999. A core part of National’s promise was to halt the neoliberal and bicultural reforms which the Fourth Labour Government had implemented in 1984. The victory to National in 1990 was a landslide, but the new government did not halt the reforms and, in fact, continued a similar agenda to its predecessor (Boston, Martin, Pallot and Walsh 1996, pp.141-59; Boston 1991).

National was highly critical of Labour’s economic reforms in the lead up to the election, but upon taking office implemented a harsh form of free market fiscal policy which would earn the epithet “Ruthanasia” which was a reference to the Minister of Finance, Ruth Richardson. This Government introduced major cuts to welfare spending resulting in economic and social conditions reminiscent of the Great Depression. For example, Charity organisations began operating “food banks” in order to support New Zealanders most profoundly affected by the Government’s economic policies (Russell 1996).

The Fourth National Government attempted to privatise universities, schools and hospitals, and introduced the Employment Contracts Act in 1991 which in effect, broke the power of the unions (Franks 1994, p.201). The weakening of the unions had a considerable effect on broader Māori political movements. Many pan-Māori groups had backgrounds in left-wing politics and the trade unions. High-profile individuals, such as the late Syd Jackson, had a union background and were politically active in the Māori protest movements. As Poata-Smith (1996, p.104) has noted, a number of Māori groups were allied with the workers, which can be seen in the Auckland Trades Council (“ATC”) support of the occupation of Bastion Point. The ATC declared a “green ban” on the area of Bastion Point and refused to begin work on the planned subdivision in support of the occupation.

A number of the groups involved in the broader Māori politics of the 1960s, 1970s and 1980s were to be found in pan-tribal groups. Historically, pan-tribal groups including the New Zealand Māori Council, Māori Women’s Welfare League, National Māori Congress, Kohanga Reo Trust and Churches, such as Ringatu and Ratana had significant involvement in Māori politics. The New Zealand Māori Council took the government to Court in 1986 regarding the State Owned Enterprises which, in effect, sparked the whole Treaty settlement process. Notably, the majority of these groups were urban-based, and lay outside traditional
tribal networks. When the Fourth National Government came to power, they preferred to work with Iwi or “traditionally”-centered groups, which subsequently influenced how Māori issues were analysed and Treaty settlements conducted.

The National Government oversaw key changes in New Zealand, including a reform of the electoral system. The largest political parties, National and Labour, shared similar positions in terms of economic and fiscal policy, and also, race-relations. As a result, there was a high level of dissatisfaction in New Zealand with the direction of the country, the reforms and the lack of choice between the two parties. This dissatisfaction culminated in the change from a First-past-the-post system (“FPP”) to Mixed Member Proportional Representation (“MMP”). MMP ensured parties would need a coalition with smaller parties in which to govern, whereas FPP was a “winner takes all” system. National was in coalition with the New Zealand First party from 1996 to 1999 and while the coalition, somewhat eased the neoliberal reforms they were not halted.

4.5 Māori in the 1990s

Under the National Government two of the largest Treaty claims were settled. In 1995 Tainui settled with the Crown through direct negotiation bypassing the Waitangi Tribunal. As part of the Deed of Settlement, the Crown formally apologised for the actions taken against Tainui and the Kingitanga in the 1860s (and also the legacies of war and land confiscations). This represented a formal apology for the events which had been the subject of Rewi’s Last Stand (1925/194). In 1998, Ngāi Tahu signed a Deed of Settlement with the Crown which had been under investigation by the Waitangi Tribunal. Ngāi Tahu’s Deed of Settlement provided compensation to the iwi and settled a claim which had first conveyed its dissatisfaction with breaches to the Treaty in 1849.

Although the National Government oversaw some of the larger settlements in the Treaty process, they also attempted to control and manipulate how restitution between Māori and the Crown would be manifested. The Government tried to implement a billion dollar cap on claims which became known as the “fiscal envelope”. This resulted in calls for a constitutional review on the status of the Treaty by Sir Hepi Te Heu Heu of Tuwharetoa in 1993 (Durie 1995, pp. 19-27; Cox 1993). As will be discussed further below, both Labour and National tried to legally determine Māori societal organisation, in order to define which group was the legitimate partner of the Crown with the Te Rūnanga o Iwi Act. Thus there was a high level of political interference in the Treaty settlement process, from legitimising
the partner of the Crown, the parameters in which settlement would take place and the
amount of compensation that would be paid to groups. It is important to note that in
contemporary times, the Government is defendant, researcher, arbiter and adjudicator, and
has final signatory powers in all Treaty claims which are, essentially, brought against itself.

The “promise” of partnership between Māori and Crown which was a key thematic in the
1980s and is evident in the films Ngati (1987) and Mauri (1988), began to be diluted in the
1990s under the Fourth National Government. In the 1990s, discussions on “who”
constituted the partner of the Crown would set in place a significant contest inside the Māori
population based upon “traditional” or “contemporary” versions of Māori structural
organisation. Primarily, contestation over “who” was the legitimate partner of the Crown
were framed by the Treaty settlement process and the distribution of proceeds from historic
breaches to the Treaty of Waitangi by the Crown. Ultimately, “who” was considered the
authentic group was for settlement was decided by the State.

The best example of the contestations between Māori structural organisation (or “who” was
the legitimate partner of the Crown) can be found in Claim Wai 424 which was the
Waipareira Trust’s challenge to the Treaty of Waitangi (Fisheries Claims) Settlement Act in
1992 allocation to Iwi (traditional), rather than urban-based Māori groups (modern). The
National Government sought to settle the Fisheries allocation with Iwi-based groups and
UMA contested the decision both in the High Court (1998) and the Court of Appeal (1999).
The dispute over the distribution of settlement monies went to the Privy Council in 2000,
where the earlier decisions of the High Court and Court of Appeal were upheld. In effect, the
legal decisions determined that “Iwi” were indeed the legitimate partner of the Crown, as at
1840. In 2004, Te Ohu Kai Moana was established under Section 31 of the Māori Fisheries
Act 2004, which states its aim is to “advance the interests of Iwi”.

4.6 The promise of partnership
As discussed, the “promise” of full partnership to Māori in the 1980s, a key thematic in Ngati
(1987) and Mauri (1988), was diverted in the 1990s. The social context in which Ngati
(1987) and Mauri (1988) were produced was framed against a backdrop of radical protest
where New Zealand was on the cusp of significant change in regard to “race-relations”. The
means by which “partnership” between Māori and the Crown was to be conducted was still in
negotiation when Ngati (1987) and Mauri (1988) were made. By contrast, the social context
in which Once were warriors (1994) and Whale Rider (2002) were produced discussions
about “who” was the legitimate partner of the Crown had been the subject of much publicity and several Court cases.

The concept of “partnership” is linked to the concept of *tino rangatiratanga* (full sovereignty and/or chieftainship) contained in Article II of the Treaty of Waitangi. In contemporary times, however, *tino rangatiratanga* is sometimes described in public social policy as Māori “self-development” (see Cheyne, O’Brien and Belgrave). As noted by Cheyne, O’Brien and Belgrave (2001, pp.140-162) the neo-liberal reforms of New Zealand provided opportunity for Māori social development under the auspices of a Treaty framework. In this fashion the implementation of the neo-liberal reforms were both a boon and a bane to the Māori population. On the one hand, the Māori population bore the brunt of the economic reforms, when a large proportion was made unemployed. On the other, the same reforms provided opportunities for Māori providers to deliver social services to those in need and arguably so as a result of the State’s economic policies.

Due to Treaty settlement proceeds, such as the Fisheries, a number of Māori groups became major stakeholders in New Zealand’s economy. It is important to note that both Labour and National have sponsored the development of Māori capitalism in both tribal and individual forms, but within the parameters of the free market. There are however, clear discrepancies in the description of *tino rangatiratanga* (full Māori sovereignty) and the notion of “self-development”. *Tino rangatiratanga* centers on the right of Māori sovereignty vested with chieftainship⁴⁰, whereas “self-development” extends to Māori groups accessing State resources and providing services to Māori clients in a particular set of policy requirements (Bartley and Spoonley 2005, p.136).

The “promise” of full partnership in the 1980s between Māori and the Crown began to appear illusory in the 1990s. “Partnership” was constructed within carefully defined parameters determined by the State. This is evident in the Te Rūnanga o Iwi Act (1990), mooted by the Fourth Labour Government and continued by the Fourth National Government. Primarily, the Act sought to legislate Māori structural organisation and identity in favour of Iwi. In particular, Part III of the Rūnanga Iwi Act aimed to allow Iwi to register any corporate body, including rūnanga as the exclusive “authorised voice of the Iwi” (O'Reilly and Wood 1991, p.325). The Act was repealed before it came into effect, but it is important to note both Labour and National attempted to legally define at law the legitimate voice of Māori was, even when the same remained under contest inside the Māori population.
In this fashion, the State’s official adoption of biculturalism and preference for iwi over other groupings, such as UMA, continued the historical trend of controlling potential dissent from the Māori population. The drawing up of the Te Rūnanga o Iwi Act (1990) is an indication that the State was prepared to legally determine Māori societal organisation and cultural identity in order to constrain disputes in New Zealand society. Thus, while the State’s official adoption of biculturalism was supposed to herald a new and better order of race-relations, in fact it continued overt State control of the Māori population.

**Conclusion**

The events from 1984-1996 will be further linked to the key thematics in the case studies of *Ngati* (1987), *Mauri* (1988), *Once were warriors* (1994) and *Whale Rider* (2002). These subsequent chapters examine how the contextual factors influenced the construction and understanding of race-relations, and Māori subjectivity in the films. While *Ngati* (1987) and *Mauri* (1988) differ in theme and tone to *Once were warriors* (1994) and *Whale Rider* (2002), and also earlier works, it is argued that the films continue the nationalised race-relations narrative from a more contemporary point of view. What will be examined in the next chapter are the theoretical propositions of biculturalism, how the same frames Māori and Pākehā into an unavoidable binary dichotomy and privileges a particularly dominant voice inside the Māori population as legitimate.
Chapter Five: The two world-view of biculturalism

This chapter examines the origins and theoretical propositions of the socio-political ideology of biculturalism. Outlined is how biculturalism constructs Māori and Pākehā into an unavoidable binary dichotomy using the markers of ethnicity and culture to demarcate difference between the two populations. While biculturalism has been the official policy of the State since the 1980s in which to analyse, discuss and negotiate race-relations, the framework evolved in the 1990s to “the two world-view model”. The two world-view model advances group boundaries between Māori and Pākehā under the auspices of ethnicity and culture in a somewhat rigid fashion which is at odds with the fluidity of those conceptual categories. The construction of Māori and Pākehā into the two world-model has created its own set of problematics and limitations which will be discussed further below.

5.1 The socio-political ideology of biculturalism

The concept of biculturalism was mooted by Eric Schwimmer (1968, p.11) in the 1950s as a response to multicultural policies touted by the State. The focus on “multiculturalism” rather than biculturalism served as a way to depoliticise the recognition of Māori groups as having a prior right of settlement. Since the 1970s, there had been calls for the recognition of biculturalism in response to public social policies incorporating multicultural proposals. Bicultural proposals emphasised the need for “… greater mutual understanding between Māori as the indigenous people of New Zealand and the Pākehā as colonising and now dominant majority immigrants” (Durie 1994b, p.99; Webster 1998, p.30). Multicultural policies were viewed as an attempt by the State to circumvent grievance by Māori and supporters into a less political pan-ethnic grouping of “Polynesian” (Poata-Smith 2001). The idea of a pan-ethnic grouping of Māori within the auspices of the term “Polynesian” was met with some resistance. For example, Donna Awatere in her Māori Sovereignty article (1984, p.25) made this position clear:

_In the early 1970s Polynesian Panthers, largely New Zealand-born Samoans, a few Tongans, Niueans and a scattering of Māori challenged Ngā Tamatoa for what it called “Māori Cultural Nationalism”. They represented the call for the Māori people to give up their identity as Māori in favour of a primary identification of Polynesians, as blacks. This call for the Māori to abandon our claims for sovereignty arose from the emergence of New Zealand-born pacific islanders and a very few Māori who joined together on civil rights issues. Māori sovereignty was seen as a diversion from_
the “real” issue which was seen as achieving civil rights and equal rights with whites. It was an illusion that civil rights could be achieved without Māori sovereignty, without an end to separate development policies.

In Awatere’s view, the clear distinction was made between Māori as First Nations people and Polynesian immigrants. The biculturalism that Schwimmer emphasised had a “cultural”, rather than political dimension and was characterised by two partners, namely Māori and Pākehā. Schwimmer argued that biculturalism was about the prior recognition of Māori, as indigenous peoples, rather than part of the pan-ethnic grouping, which was a view reminiscent of Awatere’s comments above.

These comments illustrate the shift away from cultural nationalist propositions when describing race-relations (“one nation-one people) to biculturalism (“two peoples-one nation”). Importantly, biculturalism was about developing a mutual understanding between Māori and Pākehā (or non-Māori) and the maintenance of national harmony through race-relations. In this fashion, the aims of biculturalism were identical to its ideological predecessor, cultural nationalism, in maintaining the structure of the nation state, but acknowledging there were two central cultures in New Zealand, rather than one.

5.2 Issues of race/ethnicity and class in the Treaty settlement process

While biculturalism was adopted and implemented into social policy as a way in which to examine race-relations since the Fourth Labour government came to power, its theme and tone would differ between the 1980s and 1990s. At the time Ngati (1987) and Mauri (1988) were in production, biculturalism was in its developmental stage. As Mason Durie (1994b, p.99) states, “despite incomplete understanding of the theory and practice of biculturalism, by 1985 it had become part of the New Zealand public service ethos and has been promoted within the health system as a desirable goal” (see also Webster 1998, p.100). Discussions on the Treaty of Waitangi, settling the past, acknowledging that there were two peoples on the landscape, foreshadowed by a recent period of protest are key thematics in these films. At the same time, such issues were still in negotiation between Māori and the Crown and the future relationship between Māori and the Crown was yet to be decided.

As a result, there are key thematics evident in both Ngati (1987) and Mauri (1988) of ways in which to reconcile the past and develop a bicultural partnership, but without the notion of “cultural distance”, which would emerge in Once were warriors (1994) and Whale Rider
(2002). One of the striking characteristics of Ngati (1987) and Mauri (1988) is that there are similar themes between the two films and Keri Hulme’s (1983) *the bone people*. For example, reconciling the past and building a different future as a nation between Māori and Pākehā are embedded codes in the works. In this fashion, works that were produced in the experimental or developmental stage of biculturalism exhibit an optimistic view of Māori as full partners in New Zealand society, foreshadowed by a time (cultural nationalism) that had as one of its primary aims to “civilise” Māori into brown Europeans. It is argued that Ngati (1987) and Mauri (1988) are responses to cultural nationalist assumptions about “civilising” Māori and the re-examination of core settlement myths.

Moreover, less evident in Ngati (1987) and Mauri (1988) are factors of race/ethnicity and class or “Māori solutions” to “Māori problems”. The largest impetus of the protest movements and the Māori Renaissance resulted from an alliance of groups fighting to eradicate all forms of oppression. Although there would be tensions involved in the alliance due to political differences, it has been suggested that the coalition of groups involved in the protest movements, set the platform for biculturalism. As Poata-Smith (1996, p.104) notes:

“From 1975 to 1978, the Māori land rights movement brought together a wide range of activists. Indeed, such diversity in a common cause was actively promoted by Te Roopu o te Matakite, the organising committee of the 1975 Land March on Parliament. In particular Matakite sought to consolidate with workers, both Māori and Pākehā, who were perceived as natural allies in the struggle”.

The theme of reconciliation between Māori and Pākehā, which Keri Hulme was criticised for in *the bone people*, is evident in the films Ngati (1987) and Mauri (1988). The view of developing a nation “together” and in partnership appears to have been a common theme when biculturalism was in its developmental phase.

### 5.3 Race-relations and the two world-view model

The premise of the two world-view model is based upon the notion that there are two distinct “worlds” in New Zealand society: one Māori and one Pākehā. The two world-view model has been built through the Treaty settlement process at a time when New Zealand society underwent significant social change. Since the 1980s, New Zealand has constructed itself in terms of propositions where the impact of the colonial project through the act of colonisation
has informed Māori-Pākehā interactions. Within this framework, Māori and Pākehā are constructed in binary opposition, whereby Māori are depicted as “colonised” and Pākehā as “coloniser”. As Fleras and Spoonley (1999, p.80) note there has been a “predominance of a binary set of politics (Māori/Pākehā, biculturalism)” in the cultural politics of “postcolonial” New Zealand. It is argued that through the broader politics of the bicultural two-world view lens a popular conception has arisen that Māori and Pākehā live in two different worlds. The two world-view model advances the notion that there are fundamental differences between the two largest populations in New Zealand based upon the analytical concepts of “ethnicity” and “culture”, and the impact of the colonial project. In this fashion, Māori, as colonised, are constructed as the victims and Pākehā (or non-Māori), as colonisers, and the active agents of colonisation. Explanations of difference and/or misunderstandings of the colonial project are centered upon the diverging views between the ethnic and cultural groups. While some of these terms have now receded into the less political terms of Māori and non-Māori, it is suggested that what underlies contemporary analyses of Māori are a number of dominant themes that have arisen through the reframing of race-relations into a two world-view model.

When analysing the dominant themes that frame Māori subjectivity in the bicultural literature, the following claims are made on behalf of the Māori group:

1. Māori and non-Māori are notably distinct ethnic and cultural groups.
2. There are fundamental differences between Māori and non-Māori, which are attributed to world-views, beliefs, values and social systems.
3. There is an overriding sense of commonality in the Māori population based upon a shared ethnicity and culture.
4. Colonisation has irrevocably changed Māori society.
5. Cultural survival and revitalisation is the core concern of the Māori population.
6. The restoration of Māori culture and identity and settling historic Treaty of Waitangi claims will go some way to mitigate the effects of the colonisation process.
7. Race-relations and national harmony will be maintained by acknowledging the fundamental differences between each population.

In this binary construction there has been a change in the perceptions of race-relations and national identity from propositions based on “one nation-one people” to notions of “two peoples – one nation”, but inside the nation-state (Marie and Haig 2006b, p.18). In the
current context, the assumptions of what it means to be “Māori” are now shared across a wide range of areas such as public social policy and have been legitimised as “the” dominant and authentic view of the Māori population. It is argued that bicultural propositions have been highly influential in New Zealand in the last two decades as a model for discussing and interpreting race-relations, cultural differences, social inequalities and the restoration of historical injustices.\textsuperscript{48}

Primarily the differences between the two groups are demarcated on ethnicity and culture, and commensurate with this view there are particular group identities attributed to both Māori and Pākehā (Marie, Forsyth and Miles 2004, pp.225-252). One of the earliest contributors to this discussion was the historian Michael King who wrote an ethnic autobiography in 1985 entitled, Being Pākehā. King’s work was largely in response to charges of “imperialism” that Pākehā academics (such as King) had raided Māori culture for their own particular interests (Milne 1999). It is important to note that Being Pākehā was also an attempt to define Pākehā as a legitimate ethnic and cultural group in New Zealand and as a counterpoint to Māori (Fleras and Spoonley 1999, p.87).

The differences in ethnicity and culture have been used as causal explanations for the over-representation of Māori in the negative social indices (see Ministry of Women’s Affairs 2001; Te Puni Kokiri 1992; Te Puni Kokiri 1999; The Department of Social Welfare 1986), as well as describing the confiscation of large tracts of Māori land by the Crown and breaches to the Treaty of Waitangi. For example, King (2004, p.167) commenting on the signing of the Treaty states “… and the face of New Zealand life would from that time on be a Janus one, representing at least two cultures and two heritages, very often looking in two different directions”.

As indicated by King’s comments, cultural differences or misunderstandings are posited as explanations for the historical actions of the Crown toward the Māori population. Such a view fundamentally trivialises and diminishes legitimate grievances by Māori and reframes pivotal aspects of New Zealand’s history into a model whereby, “cultural differences” or misunderstandings becomes a narrative for a wide range of issues such as racism and the dispossession of Māori land by the Crown. Further, these types of accounts ignore the historical role the Crown has played in shaping perceptions of the Māori population.
Importantly, this reframing constructs Māori and Pākehā in binary opposition to one another whereby explicit statements are made about the characteristics of each group. This is best identified in John Rangihau’s diagram of Māoritanga and Pākehātanga:

![Diagram of Māoritanga and Pākehātanga]


As indicated by Rangihau’s diagram, “Māoritanga” and “Pākehātanga” are constructed as opposites where sources of difference are derived and framed around cultural issues. The example of Rangihau’s diagram is not a point of censure or criticism, or to question the right of Rangihau to represent Māoritanga in the model on the grounds of authenticity. Rather it is to provide a clear example of how Māoritanga and Pākehātanga have been depicted in the bicultural framework as a way in which to discuss race-relations.

The construction of Māoritanga and Pākehātanga into binary opposites provides an example of how there are differences between the two groups primarily based upon ethnicity and “cultural differences”. The acknowledgement of “cultural differences” indicated in Rangihau’s diagram could be seen as an explanation as to why there were tensions between Māori and Pākehā about race-relations, and Treaty issues. In essence Rangihau’s diagram was an attempt to engage in a new form of dialogue to appease “racial” tensions based upon
cultural understandings (or misunderstandings as the case may be) within a bicultural framework. Commensurate with this view, the acknowledgement of “different outlooks” was supposed to offer a better understanding of each group and reconcile the fracture in race-relations in the aftermath of civil unrest. Whether biculturalism has, in fact, achieved its aims on race-relations is still open to debate.

The framework has, however, created its own set of dynamics that need consideration and analysis. The construction of Māoritanga and Pākehātanga into this model means that each group is interdependent on one another to constitute a point of difference and further, that in order to engage with Māori cultural identity or subjectivity (or “being Māori”), one must engage with notions of Pākehā identity (or “being Pākehā”). Māori have been ascribed attributes that are communal, holistic, unmaterialistic and spiritual, with a history and culture in New Zealand that predated European habitation. Conversely Pākehā culture has been invariably described as individualistic, materialist, technological and scientific, and a people without history in New Zealand – or in opposition to Māori culture. The director Jane Campion’s comments (quoted in Bilbrough, 1993, p.135) best reflects these themes of how Pākehā are constructed within the two world-view model “… as a Pākehā New Zealander … In contrast to … the Māori people, who have such an attachment to history, we seem to have no history”.

If, however, Māoritanga is described in opposition to Pākehātanga, Māoritanga must constantly justify its difference from wider mainstream society to continue its existence. Such a standpoint is not liberating for Māori, but constraining. Furthermore, the development of a bicultural identity in binary terms affects an acceptance of stereotypes which mean that Māori cultural identity can be questioned in terms of how the same “fits” with the categorisation of Māori in terms of a bicultural described “Māoritanga”. This is not to suggest that John Rangihau or other academics that have contributed to the area of bicultural or cross-cultural examinations have intended for such an outcome to occur.

In order to understand the way in which the bicultural two world-view model was constructed it is important to be familiar with the context in which it arose. In broader terms, the acknowledgement of Māori history and culture as separate, and distinct from Pākehā culture contrasted with the preceding ideology of “cultural nationalism” which focussed on assimilation-integration. Rather than New Zealand being founded on “one nation – one people”, the shift was made to “two peoples – one nation”.
The cultural nationalist framework (best identified in the Hunn Report) and referenced in the film, To Love a Maori (1972) sought to define the aspects of Māori culture most suitable for a modern New Zealand. In the new bicultural New Zealand, however, Māori culture could take its place as distinct, but part of the new two world-view model. Primarily, the re-examination of race-relations was intended to be a time of critical self-reflection for both Māori and Pākehā as full partners in New Zealand. As Augie Fleras and Paul Spoonley (2005, p.87) note:

*The bifurcation of Māori and Pākehā political and cultural interests had important effects for both groups. For some Pākehā, it speeded up a process of critical self-reflection. Being Pākehā was defined as a counterpoint to the new politics of Māori identity, and to the very different politics of others in the Pākehā community in the wake of national and populist authoritarianism from Hobson to Muldoon.*

In this fashion those seeking a liberal or progressive approach to the subject of reconciling the past and race-relations adopted “Pākehā identity” as a political position. The adoption of such a position by biculturalists created distance between themselves and cultural nationalists. It also signalled Pākehā New Zealanders as part of a new generation seeking a postcolonial identity located firmly in the South Pacific and away from Britain. Themes of commonality based on birthplace and in opposition to the Empire are evident in the film Utu (1983).

The development of a bicultural two world-view is a rigid application of a socio-political ideology of Māori-Pākehā relations. While the bicultural two-world view model constructs Māori and Pākehā in binary opposition, Māori and Pākehā have inhabited the same space for nearly two centuries. Māori have been subject to numerous legislative social policies in order to reflect contemporary views on how to maintain harmonious race-relations. There may be differences based on culture but Māori and Pākehā have been actively engaged in a relationship, framed by race-relations, that has been dependent on broader political issues occurring in the social context in which they are constructed. A race-relations narrative based upon cultural differences and misunderstandings attenuates the subjects of racism and racial tensions in New Zealand society. Furthermore, it reframes the role of the State and the Crown into a discourse based upon the tensions between the Māori and Pākehā ethnic groups, rather than the historical loss of Māori land and the continuous construction of the Māori population in ways that reflect the State’s directives on race-relations.
5.4 The bifurcation of Māori and Pākehā in the two world-view model

A key feature of biculturalism is based upon the notion that there are two distinct peoples in New Zealand namely Māori and Pākehā. Commensurate with this view, the “partnership” of Māori and Pākehā was symbolised at the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840 where both peoples agreed to become “one nation”. Contributors to the bicultural discourse, such as Anne Salmond, have played on this idea of two peoples, one nation in works entitled “Between two worlds” and “Two worlds”. It is important to note that a number of the core contributors to the bicultural framework are both Māori and Pākehā. Academics such as Mason Durie, Ranginui Walker, Donna Awatere, Joan Metge, Anne Salmond, Paul Spoonley and Michael King have been instrumental in the construction of a two world-view model.

The 1980s have been described as a “watershed” in New Zealand society, especially relating to how “Pākehā” academics came to view their role in the history of the country (Fleras and Spoonley 1999, p.87). Primarily, there was a shift from the focus on settler (or cultural) nationalism and the way in which Pākehā New Zealanders formerly viewed themselves as part of Great Britain, to being “colonisers” and exploring the relationship with Māori (ibid). This theme of re-examination between Māori and Pākehā is evident in the films *Utu* (1983), *Ngati* (1987) and *Mauri* (1988). The reconfiguring of the relationship between Māori and Pākehā was somewhat hastened by the broader Māori political movements, in particular, the discussions about racism, race-relations and reconciling the past between Māori and Pākehā.

The shift toward biculturalism and away from cultural nationalism was not without dissent and charges of revisionist history. As Poata-Smith (2005, p.12) notes:

*With the proliferation of revisionist histories in the 1980s, there were those who objected to the re-evaluation of New Zealand’s past on the basis of contemporary moral standards and political perspectives. These critical histories were depicted by some as “bullying books … in which the past [was] ransacked to provide illustrations in support of a position in our current debates about either racism or sexism”…* (Stead 1989, p.124; cited in Poata-Smith 2005, p.12).

In a similar vein it could be argued that cultural nationalist constructions of history were equally selective in their characterisations of settlement, race-relations and national identity issues. The ongoing contestation between advocates of cultural nationalism and biculturalism influenced the thematics in the films *Ngati* (1987), *Mauri* (1988), *Once were warriors* (1994) and *Whale Rider* (2002). In Alan Duff’s novel and syndicated columns in national media, the
author provided a stinging critique of bicultural propositions in relation to Māori, race-relations and the nation State. Duff described in somewhat colourful and disparaging language, a wide raft of people that held what he termed “academic”, “leftist”, “politically correct” or bicultural leanings (Heim 2007, p.3). As discussed in Film case study 7, Duff’s novel was a response to Witi Ihimaera’s work. Subsequently, the two novels, and resulting films can be interpreted as responses to one another about the concerns of the Māori social body and direction of race-relations in New Zealand society.

5.5 Cultural clashes and cultural differences
Importantly for this thesis, the bicultural or two world-view model framework posited “culture” as a central issue, as a way to reconcile the relationship between Māori and Pākehā. Commensurate with this view, some of the core contributors such as Michael King, Mason Durie, Ranginui Walker, Donna Awatere and Joan Metge have argued that an understanding of each group’s culture would reconcile the past. With the shift to focussing on “cultural differences” however, it may be argued that the subject of racism was depoliticised.

The subjects of racism and race-relations were key themes in the protest movements of the 1960s and 1970s. Indeed, in the 1980s, the notion of institutional racism engendered a governmental response by way of the Puao-Te-Ata-Tu report. A Ministerial Advisory Committee in 1986 found that racism was endemic in the social service sector. Importantly, the Ministerial inquiries in the State Service Sector found that land and cultural alienation were central issues in explaining the social position of Māori in New Zealand society. Thus the State, which had previously implemented successive policies and legislation to dispossess and alienate Māori from land and culture, now adopted the antithetical view. Furthermore, Māori culture and in particular protecting, returning and understanding Māori culture would become central to the race-relations framework.

By the mid-1980s, discussions on racism were characterised as meditations on “cultural differences”. The differences between Māori and Pākehā have been attributed in the literature to a “clash of cultures” or as Metge noted “talking past each other” (Metge 1964; 1984; 1995; 2001). Donna Awatere (1984) argued that Pākehā were committed to a status quo characterised by white supremacy and Māori subordination. According to Awatere and others, all whites shared the benefits of the marginalisation of Māori through the impact of colonisation, and the imposition of “white values”. Bruce Babington (2007, p.94) describes these views as falling into the binary categories of “Māori innocence/Pākehā exploitation:
Māori authenticity/Pākehā inauthenticity; indeed the very concept of pure authenticity …”. In this fashion, Awatere exploits the binary dichotomy of Māori/Pākehā and reframing examinations of good/bad into a black/white (or brown/white) argument. Thus, the focus became not about political leanings such as left or right, but a fundamental clash of colours and cultures (Poata-Smith 1996, p.107).

In contrast, biculturalists such as Metge and King advanced the theory that an open dialogue between Māori and Pākehā had the potential to reconcile the two largest ethnic groups in New Zealand. Importantly, the “open dialogue” was founded on the notion that there were fundamental cultural differences between Māori and Pākehā and that an understanding of “cultural” differences between Māori and Pākehā would foster harmonious race-relations. The way, however, that cultural differences have been characterised in the literature advances a rather rigid perception of culture. In effect what was established was a bifurcation of the Māori and Pākehā ethnic groups, based upon stereotypes.55

The social concerns of the Māori population were attributed to the impact of colonisation, redressing the past, cultural reclamation and survival of the Māori group. Historical injustices, such as land confiscation, institutional racism and the role of the State in manipulating the Māori population in policy prescriptions were abdicated in favour of an analysis commensurate with concerns centred on “culture”.56 While the depiction of New Zealand as a “post-colonial” or “bicultural country” was supposed to reflect a progressive shift from cultural nationalism, it can be argued that the framework has engendered its own problematics and national mythmaking.57 Within the two world-view model there would emerge the notion of “cultural distance”, which is evident in both Once were warriors (1994) and Whale Rider (2002). Commensurate with the two world-view model, is the notion that Māori and Pākehā live in separate worlds inside New Zealand society.58 Thus, the relationship which was once central to the construction of the country’s national identity, was now re-characterised as distant in the bicultural framework.

Importantly, there would be the opportunity for Māori to be referenced and measured against a standard or “authentic” view of Māori society, framed by an ancient past or actively seeking a return to a traditional pre-contact world. The social disparities of Māori were characterised as a result of alienation of land and culture. As discussed in Chapter Four, The advent of biculturalism, the more recent implementation of Rogermonics economic policies had a disproportionately profound effect on the Māori population. Thus, what was posited as a way
in which to alleviate the cause of Māori social disparities was Māori culture. In essence, Māori culture, which had once been seen as detrimental to modernising Māori under cultural nationalism, was now depicted as a “cure” for social ills in the bicultural framework.

5.6 Cultural deficit and cultural cures

Māori subjectivity has been informed by and had to engage with a number of ideologies including assimilationist-integrationist or cultural nationalist, notions of extinction and civilisation, as well as cultural authenticity and conversely, cultural degeneracy. Ideas such as the noble savage, the fatal impact thesis, racial superiority and the reconstituting of Māori to brown Britons have also informed Māori subjectivity (Hazelhurst 1993). It has been argued that these key thematics have, and continue to, influence understandings of Māori subjectivity in film and are framed by a nationalised race-relations narrative where issues of import in the social context form part of a critical dialogue about the Māori-Pākehā relationship. In this fashion, biculturalism forms part of the historical trend of adopting frameworks in which to maintain and analyse race-relations within a nationalist type model.

Elizabeth Rata (2003, p.2) has argued that biculturalism was posited as a way in which to serve the “… same purposes of political justice and social inclusion” by bringing Māori into “… an inclusive national culture”. Māori have, however, been included into the national culture of New Zealand, albeit in ways that have caused dispute. In this fashion, biculturalism is not a clean-break or rupture from its ideological predecessor, cultural nationalism and maintains the same ideological underpinnings in that national cohesion, through race-relations, is of central importance to the country.

Arguably one of the central issues of importance between cultural nationalism and biculturalism is how both frameworks viewed Māori inside the nation-state. For example, cultural nationalism attempted to dissuade Māori from “traditional” tribal values and retain certain parts of Māori culture to be incorporated as national symbols. As the Hunn Report evidences, the premise was an attempt to “modernise” the Māori population inside the nation state by relinquishing “traditional” Māori culture. Biculturalism, however, places Māori “culture” and “tradition” as a core part of both recognising and distinguishing “difference” between the two largest populations in New Zealand. In this fashion, Māori culture and tradition are advanced as key factors in reinforcing the state sanctioned two-world view of New Zealand society. It is important to note, however, that as noted by Nash (1983) Sissons, (1989) and Webster (1998) both positions are underpinned by a form of cultural deficit
theory. Whereas cultural nationalism viewed Māori as not “European” enough for “modern” New Zealand, biculturalism advances the inverse position: that Māori are not Māori enough (Nash 1983; Webster 1998).

**Conclusion**

This chapter examined the origins and theoretical propositions of the socio-political ideology of biculturalism and how the same constructs Māori and non-Māori into an unavoidable binary dichotomy when examining race-relations. Also outlined was how biculturalism uses “ethnicity” and “culture” in a rigid fashion to not only demarcate Māori and non-Māori, but attribute key events in New Zealand’s history and society as a fundamental “clash of cultures”. Arising from the two world-view model is a particular voice inside the Māori population namely, Māori cultural nationalism that has been privileged as the authentic view of the Māori population, social body, concerns and Māori subjectivity. It is argued that as a result of reframing Māori and Pākehā into a two world-view model in the broader politics of the 1980s and 1990s, Māori cultural nationalist propositions have come to frame contemporary understandings of Māori subjectivity. In Chapter Six, further examined are the origins and central arguments of Māori cultural nationalism, and how it applies to the Māori population, race-relations and importantly, Māori women inside that framework.
Chapter Six: Māori cultural nationalism, the Māori renaissance and Māori women

This chapter examines the origins and central arguments of Māori cultural nationalism, the Māori Renaissance and Māori women inside the Māori cultural nationalist framework. There are two aims in this chapter: an exploration of the contemporary construction and understanding of Māori subjectivity, and an examination of gender. In particular, how Māori women’s subjectivity is framed by Māori cultural nationalist propositions and the actual social living conditions of Māori women. What will be investigated is the gender stereotype of Māori women contained within the bicultural-Māori cultural nationalist framework of Māori-Pākehā race-relations that does not reflect the actual living conditions of Māori women.

6.1 Māori cultural nationalism

What is often ignored in discussions of the two world-view model of New Zealand society is the emergence of a particularly dominant position from inside the Māori population namely, Māori cultural nationalism. Māori and non-Māori have advanced the endorsement of the Māori cultural nationalist position during the bicultural reforms.61 The privileging of the Māori cultural nationalist view, in relation to Māori society, is not a simple exercise of inverting the good/bad or brown/white dichotomies, and presenting an argument that non-Māori have been subverted by Māori. Rather the aim is to examine the rise and influence of Māori cultural nationalist propositions on contemporary understandings of Māori subjectivity. Within the auspices of biculturalism Māori cultural national propositions are both shared and resisted across ethnic and cultural lines. Significantly, Māori cultural nationalism was given its greatest impetus when it was adopted as the legitimate and authentic “Māori” position in the bicultural-two world-view model by the State.

6.1.1 Māori cultural nationalist origins

This section examines the origins and common assumptions about the Māori population contained with the Māori cultural nationalist framework. The origins of Māori cultural nationalism were outlined in a seminal work Poata-Smith (1996; 2001). Nash (1983), Webster (1998) and Walker (2001) argue that the origins of Māori cultural nationalism are based upon the broader pan-national Māori movements of the 19th and early 20th Century. Arguably, the two most enduring movements of the 19th Century were Kotahitanga and the
Kingitanga which would have significant roles to play throughout New Zealand history, events of which are referenced in *Rewi’s Last Stand* (1925/194) and *Utu* (1983). As Nash and Webster argue, these broader pan-national movements can be seen as direct responses by Māori groups to the structures of the Crown, and encroachment upon land through policy and legislation (see also Cox 1993a). Ranginui Walker (1990; 2001; 2004) suggested that these broader movements and key figures, such as Tā Āpirana Ngata in the early 20th Century, evidence early notions of biculturalism. While these positions have been both advocated for and against, contemporary understandings of Māori cultural nationalism, however, can be found in the more recent protest movements of the 1970s, 1980s and particularly, 1990s (Poata-Smith 1996; Webster 1998).

The rise of Māori cultural nationalism, as a dominant and persuasive ideology can be found in, as Poata-Smith (1996, p.106) notes, “… the politics … [and] in the struggle to win Māori studies and language programmes in the education system”. The movement would, however, extend further than its initial goals when it was adopted as State policy in the 1980s in programmes advanced toward the Māori population to cure social inequalities and negotiate race-relations (Webster 1998). With its focus on “culture” and “cultural differences”, Māori cultural nationalism was less threatening as an ideology, than those questioning the legitimacy of the State to govern Māori (Poata-Smith 1996, pp.97-116).

As discussed in Chapters Four and Five, the Treaty settlement process, adoption of biculturalism as the official State policy of how to effect harmonious race-relations, reconciling the past through an understanding of Māori and Pākehā based on differences in ethnicity and culture, combined with a period of economic reform, would have a significant effect on theories regarding Māori society. Through the Treaty settlement and reconciliation process in the aftermath of the protest movements in the 1970s and 1980s, focus fell on the binary categories of Māori/Pākehā, coloniser/colonised, victim/perpetrator, radicals/conservatives, good/bad, Māori/New Zealanders and us/Them. The dynamics of these binary categories have been used as strategies by cultural nationalists in opposition to biculturalism, Māori sovereignty, Treaty settlement process and race relations in the “we are all New Zealanders” debates (Poata-Smith 2005, p.212).

The adoption of Māori cultural nationalist propositions has not been without tension or resistance from inside the Māori population as well. The broader Māori political movements
have always been heterogeneous, rather than homogeneous and based upon different positions *inside* the Māori groups on how to effect strategies on a wide raft of issues. Dun Mihaka (quoted in Webster 1998, p.48), who triggered the 1986 Te Reo Māori claim to the Waitangi Tribunal, was highly critical of the move toward Māori cultural nationalist and bicultural politics. Mihaka, responding to Donna Awatere’s Māori Sovereignty articles stated:

*There are of course other reasons why I disagree with our New Zealand situation being divided into a Pākehā world/Māori world dispute … If we were able to do this consistently, it would increase the chances that people would stop using such shallow definitions as ‘Pākehā law’, ‘Pākehā institution’, ‘Pākehā parliament’ etc, to make a point.*

A number of key figures in the protest movements of the 1970s, 1980s, 1990s and present are highly critical of the Maori cultural national framework, and the way in which the Treaty settlement process has been conducted (see Titewhai Harawira 2004, Rangi Kemara 2010; Dun Mihaka (quoted in Webster 1998); Merata Mita 2010, Eva Rickard 1996 and Annette Sykes 1994; 2010).

### 6.1.2 The Māori cultural national propositions

Māori cultural nationalist propositions make explicit statements about a Māori worldview, collective identity, cultural values and spirituality and Māori subjectivity (Marie and Haig 2006b, pp. 17-21). Furthermore the Māori cultural nationalist position reframes the broader Māori protest movements (from the signing of the Treaty to the present date) as involved in an on-going process toward biculturalism and/or resolution.62 New Zealand’s history is significantly more complex and fluid than the characterisation of two distinct ethnic and cultural groups locked in perpetual conflict with one another in an attempt to meet at the common destination of biculturalism. For example, Māori fought on both sides of the New Zealand wars, a theme that is highlighted and utilised with great effect in Chapter Ten, *Utu* (1983).

The reframing of New Zealand into the bicultural two world-view model has not been without controversy. The historian, WH Oliver (2001, pp.28-29) argues that through the Waitangi Tribunal’s interpretation of history a form of ahistorical “presentism” has become evident in works which advance a quest for “retrospective utopia” type analyses of New
Zealand society and race-relations (see also Sharp and McHugh 2001; Poata-Smith 2005, pp. 211-217). It is important to note, however, that the Waitangi Tribunal process is adversarial whereby agents for both the Crown and the claimants must present their case of historical interpretation.

For ease of reference, the tenets of Māori cultural nationalism are that:

1. Māori are organised within a whānau, hapu and iwi model;
2. Colonisation is the causal explanation as to why Māori are over-represented in all negative social indices. Commensurate with this view, over-turning the colonial process and returning to pre-contact or “traditional” Māori society is necessary to cure contemporary societal problems;
3. There are two world-views in New Zealand society, one Māori and one Pākehā, which are constructed in binary opposition to one another. Membership to each group is defined by “ethnicity” and “culture”;
4. Within the Māori world-view, the core concerns of the Māori population are the reclamation and revitalisation of culture and tradition; and
5. Due to differences in world-views, Māori and non-Māori hold fundamentally conflicting attitudes.
6. A secure Māori cultural identity will ensure that the adverse affects of colonisation will be overcome.63

Within the Māori Cultural Nationalist discourse, the social position of Māori has been attributed to the impact of colonisation and the cure posited to alleviate Māori social disparities was a return to the “traditional” world of Māori society.64 The recently released flagship policy of the Māori Party, Whānau Ora (2010) is a clear example of public social policy that is underpinned by Māori cultural nationalist tenets of how best to alleviate the disproportionate inequalities affecting the Māori population (Boulton, Gifford and Potaka-Osborne 2010). It is important to note that in a different social context, Māori over-representation in negative social indices was attributed to a lack of civilisation and integration which is made explicit in the Hunn Report.65 In essence, it is the same problem, but with different explanations and informed by different ideologies in different social contexts.
The notion of decolonising Māori from the effects of colonisation is a core part of the Māori cultural nationalist narrative. What has been advanced is that the social concerns of the Māori population, as well as the over-representation of Māori in the negative social indices, is as a result of the colonial project. Commensurate with this view, the social disparities of Māori are attributed to the loss of land, resources and culture. In this fashion, the Māori group would be constructed in a contradictory fashion as first, the victims of colonisation who as a result had lost their land, resources and culture and second, as in a perpetual state of trying to return to a pre-contact Māori world through the reclamation of culture. Thus, what underpins Māori cultural nationalism is the notion of a “rescue and reunite mission” (Marie and Haig 2006b, pp. 17-21) to return alienated Māori to their “traditional” roots or alternatively, advance the idea that “culture” is the central issue for the Māori population.

This rescue or reunite thematic is strongly reflected in both Once were warriors (1994) and Whale Rider (2002) in promoting the thesis that the Māori population can overcome societal problems by either returning or maintaining traditional Māori culture as the focal point of Māori society. It is important to note, that the loss of Māori culture and alienation of land and resources was a result of successive Government policies that sought to integrate Māori into wider New Zealand society. The reclamation of culture, land and resources are worthy and just endeavours in their own-right. What is at issue is how robust the Māori cultural nationalist and bicultural premise of culture as a cure for societal ills in the Māori population is. For example, one of the central premises of Māori cultural nationalism is that “culture” and a secure Māori cultural “identity” would lead to the political and economic freedom of the Māori population (Webster 1998, pp.107-108). Currently as at 2010, however, and some two decades after the period known as the Māori Renaissance, the Māori ethnic group remains disproportionately impoverished in comparison to non-Māori (Ministry of Women’s Affairs 2001; Collins 2010).

6.2 The Māori renaissance

Since the inception of the Waitangi Tribunal in 1975, the international and national profile of New Zealand has been that of a bicultural nation. New Zealand’s official adoption of biculturalism instigated a period widely acclaimed as the Māori Renaissance, which motivated such projects as the revitalisation of Te Reo Māori (Māori language), tikanga (custom) and recognition of cultural rights. It is widely accepted in the literature that the Māori Renaissance was a direct result of the political activism of the 1970s (Cox 1993a;
Webster 1998). The term “Māori Renaissance” is usually associated with what is described as a “remarkable flowering of Māori expression in the arts in the period since 1970” (Williams n.d., p.2; Heim 1998; 2007, pp.2-17; Knudsen 2004), but it is argued that it is a description applied in retrospect. Key artists, for example, writing in the 1970s, such as Witi Ihimaera (who is now considered one of the fulcrums of the Māori Renaissance) were writing what is often described as “happy families nostalgia” (Heim 1998; Knudsen 2004). In 2006, Ihimaera re-wrote his earlier works from the 1970s period to reflect more contemporary Māori cultural nationalist views in his collection The Rope of Man (2006). According to Ihimaera, when he wrote Pounamu, Pounamu (1972), Tangi (1973) and Whānau (1974) he was a “colonised person” (Watkin 2004, pp. 19-21).

Similarly to biculturalism, it has been proposed (Williams n.d., p.2) that the Māori Renaissance was a movement started in the 1920s by Tā Āpirana Ngata and a continuation of a Māori cultural nationalist movement from the 19th and early 20th centuries (see Nash 1983; Sissons 1989; Webster 1998). In this thesis, by contrast, when the term Māori Renaissance is used, it is in direct reference to the proliferation of works by Māori artists from the 1970s onwards. The Māori Renaissance is often used as the demarcation point where Māori artists began to write in an “emphatically Māori” way. As John Braddock (2004) argues, the film Whale Rider, adapted from Witi Ihimaera’s novel, rests on this body of work which “…purport to tell the stories of the oppressed and disenfranchised Māori people through their own voice”.

The term “emphatically Māori” has also been used to describe films dating from 1985, particularly Ngati (1987) and Mauri (1988). It is proposed that this term is used to signpost or indicate Māori cultural national and bicultural views about Māori society and Māori subjectivity. Such “emphatically Māori” indicators are also utilised to authenticate or validate certain Māori artists as “essentially Māori” and to also stigmatise other artists who may be ambiguous or suspect. Notions of Māori authenticity will be discussed in the next section, but it is important to note that Ihimaera and Patricia Grace have been described as central figures of the Māori Renaissance, while artists such as Keri Hulme, the most acclaimed Māori author in New Zealand history, has not been afforded a similar descriptor. Arguably, Keri Hulme set the platform for other Māori authors to write beyond the “happy families nostalgia” that characterised Ihimaera’s earlier works. Similarly, Alan Duff, whose
novel *Once were warriors* (1990) was made into one of the most commercially successful films in New Zealand history, is not considered a part of the Māori Renaissance movement. Duff’s position is understandable in that he has been a core reactionary figure against Māori cultural national and bicultural explanations of social concerns in New Zealand society. In saying that, however, Duff has always identified himself as “Māori”.

What is suggested is that the Māori Renaissance has been utilised to confer a political position on Māori artists whereby those considered “authentic” are included as part of the movement, and other artists are either excluded or at least characterised as potentially problematic. Mark Williams (2005, p.1) makes this point explicit when he writes:

> In this understanding a contemporary Māori writer may write in the English language, in a form derived from Europe such as the novel, without compromising or diluting the Māori character of his or her work, so long as the work speaks for Māori people and rests on a profound and sympathetic knowledge of the Māori sense of the world. Being Māori is a matter of one's sense of belonging, one's knowledge of the past, and one's bearing towards the future as well as a matter of ancestry.

Williams’ statement needs some analysis in relation to Māori subjectivity and identity. While he does indicate that there are competing views inside the Māori population, the caveat appears somewhat at odds with the earlier ascription and reveals a political position for one particular representative voice over others. Terms such as “diluting”, “compromising”, “speaks for Māori people” and “rests on a profound sympathetic knowledge of the Māori world” suggests that there is an authoritative, legitimate and definitive, not to mention “essentialist” view of the same. If, however, there is an “undiluted”, “uncompromised” artist that speaks authentically for the Māori world, then questions have to be asked as to what is used as the reference point and how the same is theorised.

### 6.3 Notions of authenticity and an unacknowledged index of exemplar Māori

The notion of “authenticity” or conversely “inauthenticity” to determine who speaks or is representative of Māori has been a central concern in analyses. Satya Mohanty (1993, p.202) notes:

> The two dominant alternative views on cultural identity – the view associated with identity politics and characterised as essentialism and the position of postmodernism –
are in fact seen as providing conflicting definitions of identity because they understand the relation between the experiences of social actors and the theoretical construct we call “their identity” very differently …

It is important to note the two dominant views that Mohanty indicates above in fact, have more in common than in difference. Both make implicit assumptions about representation and “authenticity” and engage in discussions around the validity of “who” can speak on behalf of a group. Both positions engage in notions of authenticity and conversely inauthenticity, but miss the central question: are notions of cultural authenticity a robust analytical category in which to frame arguments?

Arguably, the clearest example of discussions on Māori “authenticity” centres on the author, Keri Hulme. With her debut novel, the bone people, Hulme won the Booker McConnell Prize for Literature in 1985. To date, Hulme’s work has been the only New Zealand novel to secure this prize and the bone people is still in publication some twenty years after it was first published. Keri Hulme’s work became embroiled in Māori cultural identity politics, particularly whether the author was an “authentic” Māori (During 1989, pp.759-66; Evans 2004; Stead 1986; Strongman 1988). Hulme’s experience serves as a reminder that there are caveats as to who are often considered to be “real” Māori and who are not.

What this suggests is the operation of an unacknowledged index of exemplar, where Māori individuals can be measured and deemed worthy or by extension wanting. In contemporary times, as evidenced by descriptors of “fulcrums of the Māori Renaissance” there is a preference for those individuals who signal bicultural-Māori cultural national views over those who do not. Moreover, within the two world-view model there has been the tendency to produce an “otherising” discourse where Māori authenticity is measured against a pre-contact, ancient, heroic, idealised, romantic and traditional past. This otherising discourse presents Māori as conflicted as, firstly the victims of colonisation and, secondly, as potentially corrupted as a result. Simon During (1993, p.458/p.449) makes the pre-contact theme explicit in his claim that the Other must not speak in the language of the colonists “for the postcolonial to speak or write in the imperial tongues is to call forth a problem of identity, to be thrown into mimicry and ambivalence. [As] “… the Other can never speak for itself as the Other”. In essence, if the Other speaks in a language which is not their native tongue,
then questions of “identity” and also “authenticity” can be raised. What this means is that the Other is interpreted in a predetermined narrative, which is not teleological, but tautological.

In order to be deemed “authentic” in this framework, Māori must exhibit a commitment to retaining cultural customs, traditions and ancient practices or an attempt to overturn the colonial past, by addressing the impacts of colonisation and seek a return to a more ‘traditional’ Māori lifestyle. This theme is evident in Merata Mita’s comments when she described Māori cinema as driven by the qualities of cultural “identity, resolution and survival” (Babington 2007, pp.21-22; Mita 1992, p.17). There are a number of problematics associated with such a rigid position in regard to Māori subjectivity, the Māori population and Māori social body. A framework that references Māori against an idealised traditional past presents a group in stasis and ignores nearly 200 years of cultural, intellectual and technological exchange between peoples. Further, it provides the opportunity for people outside the Māori population to query Māori artists on the grounds of an “authenticity” based on stereotypes.

6.4 Te Ao Māori – traditional Māori as authentic

What underpins the index of exemplar for Māori is the notion of Te Ao Māori or the ancient world of Māori to determine authenticity. Contradictorily, interpretations of Māori subjectivity must engage with the impact of the colonial project on Te Ao Māori and reflect views that seek a return to an uncorrupted Māori world free of Western influence. For example Mark Williams (1990, p.10) queried the portrayal of Māori spirituality in Keri Hulme’s the bone people (1984) on the grounds of “cultural authenticity”, but an “authenticity” that is presupposed only by the ancient world of Māori:

As the pre-European Māori had no concept of New Zealand/Aotearoa as a unified entity … it is highly improbable that they would have held that there was a special god for the whole country … that there was a mauri for Aotearoa. Who would have guarded it? Where would it have been placed? The notion involves a transcending of tribal affiliations that was not possible till the arrival of the colonists made the Māori aware of their unity as well as their differences as a people …

This description ignores the carefully signposted reference to waka group affiliations outlined in the bone people by the author. As an aside, Ngāi Tahu, the people to whom Hulme draws
kinship links have never questioned her authenticity as a Māori or member of the iwi. Importantly for this thesis, the above comments highlight the referent to pre-contact Māori society as the exemplar for the authenticity of Māori.

Commensurate with this view, those deemed authentic must draw on the roots of authenticity through connection to the ancient world of Māori or be deemed “inauthentic”. Kathie Irwin (1992, p.3) describes these discussions on authenticity as the way in which:

> There is still destructive debate taking place in some quarters over who are “real” and, heaven forbid, “acceptable” Māori women. The discussions that go on about who is not a real Māori, or not Māori enough, or only a weekend Māori, best serve interests of those who wish to see us kept off the record and out of control. Precious time is wasted debating amongst ourselves, who is and who isn’t an “acceptable” Māori. Trying to identify the “ideologically correct, real Māori woman” has already proven futile.

The argument made is that such discussion is a rigid interpretation of ethnicity and culture played out at the inter-personal level in terms of an individual’s identity under the guise of “authenticity”. Irwin’s comments give weight to Berger and Luckmann’s concerns about how dominant views or norms, once externalised and applied to categorical beliefs, affected an acceptance of stereotypes of peoples (Berger and Luckmann 1966; Berger, Ridgeway, Fisek and Norman, 1998, pp. 379-40). Moreover, the Māori ethnic and cultural categories are at the group level, but applied at the individual level to determine a “good” (authentic) Māori from a “bad” (degenerate) one. Such views are borne out in the films analysed in this thesis, but the “goodness” or “badness” or, indeed, the worthiness, of Māori characters in the works is dependent on serving wider national interests and cohesion through harmonious race-relations.

The way in which Māori are constructed is conflicted and based upon the conceptual ambiguity that Steven Webster (1998, p.87) terms “cultural-racist” arguments fashioned around discussions of “cultural authenticity” and “cultural degeneracy”. Accordingly Webster argues that these historical ideas about Māori “extinction” oscillated upon a “…conceptual ambiguity between racist and cultural arguments”. Primarily the “cultural argument” centred upon the idea of preserving “cultural purity” through “racial purity”. Conversely, when “racial purity” could be questioned, then “cultural purity” was also
challenged, and coupled with the idea of Māori “degeneracy”. It may be proposed that when adherents advance the index of exemplar under the auspices of “authenticity” in such a rigid fashion, such views come dangerously close to the cultural-racist themes outlined above.

The dichotomy between “true” and “false” or cultural authentic/cultural degenerate is a key thematic contained within the race-relations narrative that remains in place today. These notions are clearly evident in the unacknowledged index of exemplar utilised to determine Māori “authenticity”. What is problematic with the idea of “authenticity” or “who” is representative of the Māori population is that historically the notion has been contextually bound. Clear examples of this is Witi Ihimaera’s writings in the 1970s which underwent a dramatic change in theme and tone after the publication of Keri Hulme’s bicultural novel, and the broader protest movements of the 1980s.

It is argued that what is couched within contemporary views of authentic representation as referenced to the ancient world of Māori are long debunked ideas about race, ethnicity and culture. Moreover, such analyses on “ethnicity”, “culture” and “identity” are applied in a fashion which is at odds with the fluid and dynamic approaches of those concepts. The idea of “cultural change” or new innovations in Māori culture is an obvious omission in the discourse based on notions of “authenticity. With the focus on the “ancient” as code for “authentic”, Māori culture is in danger of being frozen like a museum artefact in an uncorrupted essentialised pre-contact past. It is important to note that parts of Māori culture are in turn ancient, recent, and yet to be constructed. Cultural traditions are, as Sissons (2005, p.15) states “… not just simply about preserving traditions and meanings”, but also about owning them and having the ability and space to “transform” the same (Martens 2007, pp.130-133).

In current analyses on “what” or “who” is an authentic Māori, the Māori social body, concerns and subjectivity have become synonymous with Māori culture, tradition, cultural identity, resolution and survival. In essence, the very comments Merata Mita made about Māori cinema. It is argued that a discourse that presupposes Māori subjectivity based on meditations of ‘traditional’ Māori cultural identity is not liberating, but limiting and constraining. Some of these constraints are evidenced in the comments made by Barry Barclay and Taika Waititi when faced with questions about authenticity. When asked “what” constitutes a Māori film, Barclay replied with the statement of “Māori have always just said we make it as Māori and if you are in the Māori world act within the Māori world” (1992,
Similarly, when asked what is a Māori filmmaker, Waititi responded with “Let’s just say I’m a filmmaker who is Māori and some of my films are going to have a lot of Māori content and some aren’t. Why can’t I be a tall filmmaker? Or a black-haired filmmaker”?

(quoted in White 2005, pp. 72-6).

It is important to note that Barclay and Waititi were not denying connection to being Māori, rather their comments reflect some of the problems in the way current definitions of Māori subjectivity can be constraining. The inference implicit in the questions posed to the directors is what makes a “Māori” film distinct from a non-Māori work. It also places responsibility on the directors’ to distinguish difference between Māori and non-Māori works, and also, allows the querent to determine “authenticity” based upon stereotypes.

6.5 Gender – Mana wahine/Mana tane

A dominant view of Māori women in contemporary New Zealand society is that Māori women are subordinate in Māori cultural traditions and that culture takes precedence over issues of gender. This thematic can be found in Donna Awatere’s Māori Sovereignty articles that explicitly argued that ethnicity and culture took priority over feminism. Commensurate with this perception is that Māori women were, and are, actively excluded from leadership roles because Māori society is patriarchal (see Ka'ai, Moorfield, Reilly and Mosley 2004; Walker 1992). The justification for the place of Māori women is largely rationalised under culture, tradition and spirituality of male and female roles in marae practices. There have been broad discussions in the literature about the limitations of this view regarding the status of Māori women from both inside and outside the Māori population.

The position of Māori women’s role in traditional Māori culture had been the subject of critique by Māori women in the feminist movements of the 1960s and 1970s. Mira Szasy (the second President of the Māori Women’s Welfare League) had openly criticised the patriarchal nature of gender roles in Māori society (Te Awekotuku 1991). Ngahuia Te Awekotuku (1991, pp.45-47) stated:

*Māori society is basically patriarchal – the male dominates every positive aspect of a heavily structured, largely horticultural culture … people were governed by tapu, and upon this premise of superstitious fear rested the belief that women were the negative and destructive element, the inferior, the passive …*
What is evident in Te Awekotuku’s comment is that the assumed position of Māori women as subordinate in traditional Māori society was a strong sex stereotype that needed resistance. Part of Te Awekotuku’s motivation in addressing the situation of Māori women in traditional Māori society can be found in the activism of Māori women in the protest movements, and the re-traditionalising of Māori society through culture and ethnicity in the adoption of biculturalism. Issues of cultural reclamation and survival have been at the forefront of the reframing of New Zealand’s race-relations into a two world-view model, which sought to address and reconcile the past between the populations. Notions of “two worlds” made explicit in John Rangihau’s diagram have been advanced in the literature by numerous commentator show an acknowledgement of the same will reconcile race-relations.

It is argued that the place of Māori women has largely been submerged within broader examinations of the relationship between the “two worlds” or framed within Māori cultural nationalist terms. While many feminist approaches to Māori women’s issues are discussed within a Māori cultural nationalist narrative whereby importance is granted to ethnicity, culture, tradition, cultural reclamation, cultural sensitivity, survival and identity, this does not correlate to an absence of criticism regarding the situation of Māori women. Rather, many commentators argue that restitution between Māori men and Māori women (Mana tane/Mana waihine) must take place after the impacts of the colonial project have been addressed. This factor is made explicit by Ani Mikaere (1994, p.149):

The challenge for Māori, women and men, is to rediscover and reassert tikanga Māori within our own whānau, to understand that an existence where men have power and authority over women and children is not in accordance with tikanga Māori. Such an existence stems instead from an ancient common law tradition which has been imposed upon us, a tradition with which we have no affinity and which we have every reason to object.

The absence of Māori women in the Treaty settlement process, negotiations with the Crown and consultation was the basis of a claim lodged with the Waitangi Tribunal in 1993 to acknowledge the rangatira status of Māori women. As Tuhiwai-Smith (1999, p.46) argues the Māori women were compelled to:

… prove that Māori women were as much rangatira (chiefs) as Māori men. At a very simple level the ‘problem’ is a problem of translation. Rangatiratanga has generally
been interpreted in English as meaning chieftainship and sovereignty, which in colonialism was a ‘male thing’.

According to Johnston (2005, p.22) when the Minister of Māori Affairs at the time, Doug Kidd was informed of the claim, his response was to argue that the lack of status for Māori women was between Māori women and Māori men, and not the Crown. Ultimately, the claim was unsuccessful, but one of the most significant aspects of the case was that Māori women were pursuing redress in relation to gender issues from inside the Māori population and under the auspices of tradition. In particular, the group were advocating a return to a pre-contact model of tradition where the rangatira status of Māori women inside the cultural domain was acknowledged. A number of these themes are explicitly referenced in Whale Rider (2002).

6.5.1 Māori women in culture

The popular view of Māori women as subordinate in Māori cultural practices is well-entrenched in the sociological imagination and has been the subject of dispute in Employment Courts, speeches by Governor Generals when addressing the nation on Waitangi Day (Cartwright, Dame Sylvia 2005), feminist approaches to Māori women’s subjectivity (Irwin, 1992; Seuffert 2002, pp. 599-612; Te Awekotuku 1991) and Māori women’s responses to the same. The main symbol used for the subordination of Māori women is the issue of speaking rights or whaikorero on the marae which is performed by men in the rituals and protocols of Māori culture. Historically and similarly to the wider shaping of Māori identity, Māori women have been framed through legislation and ethnographic accounts. The first-hand ethnographic accounts of Elsdon Best and Percy Smith have contributed to the depiction of Māori women in “traditional” Māori society as similar to other ‘stone-age cultures’ (Ballara 1993, p.129). Subsequent studies of Māori society well into the 20th Century refer to the work of Best and Smith as authoritative sources on traditional Māori society. As Leonie Pihama (2001, p.192) argues, some accounts derived from the works of Smith and Best are still utilised today by analysts, including Māori academics such as Ranginui Walker. These themes are also evident in works such as Ki Te Whaiao (2004), that advance the argument that ‘active political leadership’ in traditional Māori society was the domain of men.

Some of the key features of Māori women’s roles inside the Māori cultural nationalist model are:
1. Māori women were not active political leaders in traditional Māori society;
2. Māori women perform supportive roles for men, which extend across the social and political spectrum into everyday life; and
3. Māori women are Te Whare Tangata (the house of humanity) and, as such, the central roles of Māori women revolve around whānau, hapu and iwi.

In 1972 Api Mahuika challenged the view of Māori women as wholly subordinate to men in terms of leadership and disproved the claim based upon examining his own tribal history, namely that of Ngāti Porou. Mahuika found that women in his tribal area were active political leaders in traditional times. Significantly, the tradition of “Paikea”, which Whale Rider draws upon, is from Ngāti Porou, the tribal area of Mahuika.

Similarly to Ngāti Porou, Angela Ballara (1993, pp.127-129) cites a number of examples of Māori women who were active political leaders in traditional Māori society. The examples include: Waimirirangi (Muriwhenua from whom all iwi North of Auckland trace descent), Hinemoa (Te Arawa whose union with Tutanakei united the tribes of Te Arawa), Muriwai (Mataatua and sometimes described as a tohunga), Rongomaiwahine (principal tipuna of Rongomaiwahine), Hamo Te Rangi (married two brothers who were the founding tipuna of Ngāti Porou and Ngāi Tahu), Rangitopeora (principal figure in Ngāti Toa, chief negotiator in both war and peace mediations of Ngāti Toa and signatory to the Treaty of Waitangi), Turikatuku (Ngapuhi, Hongi Hika’s wife and military tactician), Heneipaketia (principal figure of Heretaunga in the Hawkes Bay) and Wairupe (Te Rarawa, military tactician and active warrior).  

6.5.2 The sexual dualist model of traditional Māori society

At the centre of understanding the Māori world-view, commensurate with Māori cultural nationalist and bicultural propositions, is the importance of Māori cultural beliefs and values or tikanga Māori. Tikanga Māori is appended to Māori concepts, such as tapu, noa and mana (Marsden 1992, pp. 118-38). Tapu and noa are characterized as apposite concepts where tapu is associated with the sacred and masculine, and noa is correlated with the feminine, common or profane (Best 1974; Heuer 1972; Hanson and Hanson 1983, pp.335-382; Smith 1978; Walker, 1991). There are a number of intricate rules to these concepts, whereby men and women can both be in a state of tapu and need to be made noa, or have the tapu lifted. Within
this model, Māori society is constructed into a sexual dualist model, whereby men were active (the warrior trope) and women were passive. Commensurate with this view all action based activities, such as war, leadership and politics were the domain of men and women’s roles were associated with land, fertility and family. This view of women as potential contaminants or profane in Māori cultural custom and/or practices has created tensions within, and between the populations and is well traversed in the literature.

Where genderised debates collide is in the association of ritual practices in the cultural context of the marae. Marae have long been used as key demarcation points to differentiate Māori and non-Māori cultures, as foci on the landscape to symbolize bicultural New Zealand (Walker 1992, p.26). Professor Ranginui Walker (1992, p.20) when writing on marae protocol and speaking rights stated:

_The paepae was tapu to men … Some tribes, such as those of the Arawa confederation, do not permit women to speak on the marae. Although most tribes do not specifically prohibit women from speaking on the marae, the right to speak is rarely exercised by women. Only the most powerful and charismatic women have availed themselves of that right._

The issue of ‘speaking rights’ however, needs to be clarified in this situation. Walker refers specifically to the ritual protocol of whaikorero at the ceremonial part of the gathering. It could be interpreted from Walker’s comments that Māori women are not allowed to speak on the marae at all. Furthermore, these comments stigmatise contemporary Māori women who are primarily, urban based (Ministry of Women’s Affairs 2001) by proffering the statement only the most powerful women spoke in the ritual speeches. Currently Māori women do not speak on the marae as to do so, a Māori woman would be claiming more than ‘rank and status’, but politicising herself by claiming a particular ‘rank and status’ associated with traditional times.

As evidenced by Walker’s comments, Māori men do not have to negotiate the same sorts of processes Māori women do in order to be considered of ‘rank’ and neither do non-Māori men. As Kathie Irwin (1999, p.17) stated:

_Pākehā men speak on the marae atea, some fluent in Māori, some in English only, some using speech notes. What feminists might call the bonds of patriarchy are_
Irwin’s views are somewhat similar to Titewhai Harawira’s who stood her ground over non-Māori women being afforded speaking rights before Māori women.\textsuperscript{76}

Although Māori cultural nationalist explanations for the gender imbalance between men and women are attributed to the corruption of Christianity, Western influences and legislation on Māori society, these accounts do not explain the place of Māori women in contemporary times. Through the Treaty settlement process, there was the opportunity from inside the Māori population to restore the mana of Māori women by acknowledging rangatira status, which has not been forthcoming.

The role of gender in cultural contexts has extended across the social and political spectrum where there is a general perception that Māori women are subordinate in both cultural and social contexts.\textsuperscript{77} As Hoskins (2004, p.42) notes Māori cultural practices have become interwoven in State institutions as part of biculturalising the nation and in Māori and non-Māori fora which extends the place of Māori women in culture to society at large. A clear example of this was in 2001 when Dover Samuels, the Member for Te Tai Tokerau, was sacked from his portfolio of Māori Affairs. When a replacement was sought, Sandra Lee, a long-serving and experienced politician, was suggested. On a number of occasions, Ms Lee had expressed an interest in the Māori Affairs portfolio. Prime Minister Helen Clark, however, dismissed Ms Lee’s candidacy on the grounds that “women couldn’t speak on the marae” and a man was needed to perform those functions.\textsuperscript{78} An argument could be made that Clark was unaware of varied tikanga amongst Māori. If Clark was unfamiliar, however, with different tikanga, it is a view shared by the authors of \textit{Ki Te Whaiao}, an introductory text to first year university students on Māori custom and protocol (Ka’ai, Moorfield, Reilly and Mosley 2004, p.93).

It is important to note, that the issue of Māori women’s speaking rights has begun to gain further prominence in New Zealand society. In 2005 Pita Sharples (quoted in Berry 2005), co-leader of the Māori Party, commented that Māori women should be able to speak in powhiri, but he would leave it up to individual marae to make those decisions. In September 2010 a Wahine Tu: Weekend Wananga for Māori women to speak on marae is scheduled at Te Ore Ore marae, Masterton.\textsuperscript{79}
6.5.3 Māori women in society

While biculturalism was advanced as a way in which to facilitate partnership between Māori and Pākehā, it is argued that not all have benefited from the two world-view model. In the bifurcation of Māori and Pākehā, what is often left behind is what is occurring inside the Māori population. Since the Fourth National government’s term in office, the State and its agents, engages with Iwi as opposed to pan-Māori groups. Until the 1980s, many Māori women involved in the protest groups were involved in pan-Māori groupings and notably, some members of the Māori Women’s Welfare League were influenced by feminist theories in relation to the oppression of Māori women in Māori culture (Poata-Smith 1996, p.100). There were however, tensions within the movements, especially in relation to the struggles, regarding “ethnicity” and “gender”, and the rise of Māori cultural nationalism. Feminist critiques of Māori women’s position became somewhat politicised in the aftermath of the Springbok Tour and the rise of Māori cultural nationalism. In Donna Awatere’s seminal articles in *Broadsheet* (1984) explicit criticisms were made in relation to “white” feminists, trade unionists and Pākehā anti-racist movements. Awatere’s article would posit that Māori women had more in common with Māori men, than they did with Pākehā women. In a stinging critique of “white women”, Awatere (1984, p.27) argued that, “we are Māori before anything”.

Awatere’s articles regarding feminist critiques of Māori women’s place in culture have been highly influential. Some of Awatere’s arguments can be found in publications over a decade after the release of the *Broadsheet* articles. For example Leah Whiu (1994, p.232) writes:

> Donna Awatere succinctly states the focus of identity politics for many Māori women. We simply cannot conceive of women’s issues, sexuality issues or any issues outside the context that we live in everyday in Aotearoa. To do so would, as Awatere says, render these issues utterly “meaningless”…

While a number of Māori women feminists such as Ngahuia Te Awekotuku supported the aspirations of Māori in the struggles for land and culture, she was aware that the role of Māori women might, in fact, become restricted within a re-traditionalised framework. This theme was made explicit in Te Awekotuku’s (1991, p.47) statement that “Māori females can only hope that they [Māori male leaders] recognise the need and merit of our energy in this fight … and not deny access to half our people …”.

In contemporary times, Māori women inhabit the most vulnerable sector of New Zealand society without designated agencies and the assumption that iwi will provide support for Māori women’s issues. In a report prepared for the Ministry of Women’s Affairs, *Māori Women: Mapping Inequalities and Pointing Ways Forward* (2001), one of the primary objectives stated was for the document to provide:

_A resource for whānau, hapu and iwi to assist them in identifying their own priorities for development. The findings also indicate that government agencies need to engage with Māori women and in partnership with them, build on the rich diverse experience and insights Māori women themselves have had to devise programmes and enterprises, which affirm, celebrate and enhance their success and advance their progress. Fundamental in this work is observance of the Crown’s Treaty of Waitangi principles of partnership, participation and protection …_

This report is based upon a number of related assumptions, including:
1. Māori society is organised collectively within a whānau, hapu and iwi;
2. Governmental agencies are charged with the responsibility of addressing the societal needs of Māori women; and
3. The Crown’s obligations, under the Treaty of Waitangi, will address Māori women’s social living conditions.

Some of the key facts regarding Māori women, and included in the report are:
1. Four out of five Māori women do not live in the collective model of a whānau, hapu and iwi;
2. In 1996, 41 per cent of Māori women were raising children alone;
3. One third of Māori women and children were part of the lowest socio-economic group where the average income was below $20,000;
4. Māori women and children were over-represented in all negative social indices;
5. There is no single Government agency charged with addressing the societal needs of Māori women;
6. The Crown’s obligations, under the Treaty of Waitangi, are to settle historic breaches to the Treaty and currently, settlement takes place between Crown and Iwi; and
7. Māori women are not protected as a sub-set of the Māori population in their own-right in a Treaty framework.
Recognising the current status of Māori women in society, there is clearly an urgent need for a critical feminist approach to Māori women’s subjectivity. The position and status of Māori women falls into ambiguous territory between both internal and external mechanisms of priority or protection. For this reason it is urged that analysts incorporate issues of class, gender and differing political positions inside the Māori population, and make clear distinctions between cultural and societal issues affecting the Māori social body.

According to empirical evidence, the construction of the Māori social body within the Māori cultural national and two world-view model of New Zealand society, reflects a minority view of the Māori population. A clear example of this is how the majority of the Māori population are urbanised and have been so for a number of decades. It is not however, the intention of this thesis to construct new mythologies in relation to the Māori social body. While the majority of the Māori population live outside their traditional tribal networks, this does not indicate a particular position for or against Māori cultural nationalism or iwi –v- urban (the traditional and the modern). The only way to determine the actual political positions and/or core concerns of the Māori population would be to source views from inside the group.

What is clear, however, is that Māori cultural nationalist and State policy in terms of redress through the Treaty settlement process actively excludes a number of Māori groups. For example, urban Māori groups, pan Māori groups (such as the Māori Women’s Welfare League) and women (Claim W381) as subsets of the Māori population are not considered beneficiaries to the Treaty settlement process in their own-right. In order to be considered part of the process, Māori have to be members of iwi groupings.

Since the neoliberal and bicultural reforms from 1985 to 1999, Māori society has undergone what Dannette Marie (2010, p.286) describes as a “structural collapse” which is evident in the actual social living conditions of Māori women and children. The widening gap between the rich and poor inside Māori society has, as Poata-Smith (2004, p.215) notes:

*arisen within and between iwi, hapu and urban Māori communities over the allocation and distribution of the benefits of the Treaty of Waitangi settlement process, a process that has resulted in a substantial shift in resources and compensation to those sections of Māori society already wealthy and powerful.*

State policies, based on ideology and political agendas, that are unsupported by empirical evidence and exclude the vast majority of members from representation in its framework,
need further consideration. Moreover, throughout a period of economic reform, where Māori bore the brunt of the policies and at a time when the over-representation of the Māori population in all negative social indices increased, it is argued that these ideological and politically-based policies evidence a benign form of neglect. Annette Sykes (2010, p.5) draws a stronger association with the State directives and Māori cultural nationalists when she states “Māori elites are complicit in perpetuating this [Māori] poverty without remorse”. As indicated by Poata-Smith’s comments there are cleavages, groups and growing inequalities inside the Māori population. Terms such as “neo-tribal capitalists”, “tribal elites”, “the brown table”, “Māori elites, “iwi elite caste system”, “Māori middle management” and “Māori cultural nationalists” have begun to enter the lexicon as ways in which to differentiate groups inside the Māori population based on class and political agendas (Kemara 2010, pp.21-36; Poata-Smith 2005, pp. 211-7; Rata 2000; Sykes 2010). Given the growth of inequalities and tensions it is difficult to maintain the central Māori cultural nationalist and bicultural premise that social cohesion and difference is based primarily on “ethnicity and culture”.

**Conclusion**

This chapter examined the origins and central arguments of Māori cultural nationalism and how the same has come to be viewed as the authentic position in regard to the Māori social body through the adoption of biculturalism. Also outlined have been the unacknowledged index of exemplar inside the Māori cultural nationalist and bicultural narrative of race-relations, the Māori Renaissance, Māori women in culture and the actual social living conditions of Māori women. It is argued that these key thematics frame understandings of Māori subjectivity in contemporary analyses and are evident in films such as *Once were warriors* (1994) and *Whale Rider* (2002). As will be discussed in the filmic chapters, it is argued that the two world-view model of biculturalism, which differs from the version of biculturalism that influenced *Ngati* (1987) and *Mauri* (1988) are referenced in *Once were warriors* (1994) and *Whale Rider* (2002) in order to make social comment upon the same. It is argued however, that this is an example of contemporary mythmaking about race-relations and national harmony. By taking a longitudinal approach in examining the films, what becomes evident is how social concerns about race-relations, in differing social contexts, continue to be a primary influence on an understanding of Māori subjectivity in the works. As a result, it is urged that any understanding of Māori subjectivity must be considered in
conjunction with the dominant or legitimate views of race-relations occurring at the time the works were produced, including contemporary times.
Chapter Seven: Rewi’s Last Stand/The Last Stand (1925/194)

“E hoa, ka whawhai tonu matou, Āke! Āke! Āke!”
(“Friend, we shall fight on forever, ever and ever”).
(Rewi Maniapoto, 1864)

Introduction

What are examined in this chapter are the influences on Māori subjectivity of the nationalised race-relations narrative in the two filmic versions of Rudall Hayward’s Rewi’s Last Stand (1925 and 1940 respectively). While both versions are set in New Zealand in the 1860s and are based around the Battle of Orakau Pa (1864) or Rewi Maniapoto’s “last stand”, the differences between the films are marked. The director’s rationale for remaking the 1925 version in 1940 was to “correct” the mistakes of the first work, but Hayward’s explanation does not account for the marked differences between the two films. The argument made is that the works differ, in part, because of the two different social contexts and the changes in attitudes towards race-relations from the 1920s to the 1940s. Rewi’s Last Stand (1925) was informed by the period known as Māoriland and while the 1940 remake is often erroneously cited as an example of the work from Māoriland, it is in fact, a product of the “cultural nationalist” period. Between the Māoriland and cultural nationalist periods, the official policy regarding Māori and race-relations changed from one of extinction to assimilation. Ultimately, the changing views of Māori are reflected in these two works and provide explanations as to the significant differences between the two accounts. The differences between the two versions are important because they provide a clear example of how ideas about Māori subjectivity and race-relations can change the theme and tone of a film.

The main narrative of Rewi’s Last Stand (1925) is depicted through the eyes of Ken Gordon, a recently arrived settler from England, who encounters both savages (Rewi Maniapoto) and a damsel in distress in the form of a Māori bush maiden named Takiri. Ken Gordon is first introduced to Takiri when she jumps from a waterfall to prove her bravery and as it transpires, she is lost in the bush after escaping from Rewi Maniapoto and needs assistance from Gordon. It is not explained in the film, however, why Gordon, a recent arrival from England, would be more familiar with the New Zealand bush than the native-born Takiri. Although Ken Gordon develops a relationship with Takiri, the “high-born Māori woman”, it is chaste and the central love-story focuses on Ken Gordon and his fiancé, Cecily (to whom Ken is trying to return) in Auckland. The platonic friendship between Takari and Ken
Gordon contrasts with the passionate and ultimately tragic love affair that exists between Bob and Ariana in the 1940 version.

In the 1940 account, the narrative focuses on the inter-ethnic love affair of Bob Beaumont, a settler and Ariana, the mission raised child of a Kawhia chief’s daughter and a Pākehā sea captain. The relationship is set against the 1860s war in the Waikato. Bob and Ariana are separated when Ariana is kidnapped by Tama Te Heu Heu on the orders of her grandfather, Rewi Maniapoto. This action places Bob and Ariana on opposite sides of the war. The events of Orakau Pa are seen through the first hand accounts of Bob and Ariana, who wish to be reunited, but as events transpire in the final resolution, are destined to remain apart.

Outlined below are: an historical overview of the Māoriland period; popular ideas about Māori and social policy in the social context of the 1920s; and the changing attitudes toward Māori in the 1930s and 1940s that were influenced by “cultural nationalism. There is a separate section devoted to gender analysis which examines the ways in which Māori-Pākehā relations are used as an allegory for broader societal issues. In particular what will be examined is how the interaction between genders is used to provide a social commentary function to the audience on ways forward for national unity through racial harmony.

7.1 Social context – constructing the nation through Māoriland

The term Māoriland refers to the literature of late colonial New Zealand society from 1880-1915 (see Stafford and Williams 2006). It is also a concept used by historians to describe a movement toward the socio-political ideology of cultural nationalism between 1890 and the 1920s. In the Māoriland period from 1890 to 1920, contrary to popular belief, New Zealand was not isolated or insulated from world events and had a reputation on the world stage of being a progressive country. The view of New Zealand as an empty, isolated and barren landscape was popularised by Samuel Butler (following his colonial experience of 1860s New Zealand) in his work Erewhon (or nowhere) (Butler 2002, Original publication 1872). This work was based upon Butler’s experiences in 1860s colonial New Zealand. New Zealand, however, was widely considered a “social laboratory” for the world in terms of progressive ideas (see Reeves 1969; Le Rossignal, Stewart and Downie 1910; Cheyne, O’Brien and Belgrave 2001b; Dalley and Tennant 2004) and had passed legislation providing
universal male suffrage to Māori men from age 21 (Sinclair 1991, pp.86-87; Sorrenson 1986), granting women the vote in 1893 and providing universal education.

The actual term Māoriland was first used in the Sydney Bulletin as a way of distinguishing New Zealand nationalism and identity in the South Pacific from that of Australia. As the name suggests, Māori were a key distinguishing feature. To some extent, Māoriland describes New Zealand’s frontier period when, according to numerous accounts, a sense of settler-national identity was established through the arts. In particular, the era refers to the construction of settler identity in terms of breaking in recalcitrant land and its “native” people (Cowan 1983) something Pat Moloney (2001, pp.153-176) describes as taking New Zealand from “savagery to civilisation”.

7.2 Criticisms of Māoriland

The Māoriland period has been subject to controversial interpretation in which artists and writers have been the subject of criticism by successive generations (see McCormack 1959; Phillips 1983, pp. 520-35; Sinclair 1987). Many cultural nationalists claimed the works from the Māoriland era were not sophisticated in terms of artistic merit and the postcolonial theorists argue that there is an underlying sentimental racism of settler culture toward Māori.

Writing in 1940 of the first years of the twentieth century, cultural nationalist JC Reid (1946, p.19) wrote of “the hideous name “Māoriland” …” and described this period as “a synthetic culture without a core”.

Barring Katherine Mansfield, who produced her work from abroad, artists contributing to the Māoriland period have been widely criticised by the likes of Keith Sinclair and EH McCormick. In 1987, authoritative literary and cultural historian Keith Sinclair (1987a, p.54) wrote “It has been suggested that no major writer appeared until the 1920s, and no modern student of nineteenth and early twentieth century New Zealand literature has disagreed with this judgment …”. It is, however, these sorts of claims which have shaped contemporary interpretations of the Māoriland era. While academics are entitled to question the artistic merits of the works from this period, it needs to be acknowledged that there was a proliferation of artistic production, which was not replicated until the 1980s. 86

There is a tension in the literature as to the “quality” of the artistic endeavours from the Māoriland period. Historians often refer to the Māoriland period in connection with the “self-
conscious attempt” by colonists to identify New Zealand origins by utilizing Māori symbols. The term “self-conscious” has been applied in retrospect (Reid 1946), but there appear to have been no particular discomfort from artists of that era. Arguably, this is part of the problem when analysing Māoriland in that the artists themselves were not self-conscious, but successive generations have thought they should be (see McCormack 1959; Phillips 1983, pp. 520-35; Reid 1946; Sinclair, 1987).

In recent times, contemporary theorists have added their own layer of criticism in terms of how Māori were portrayed in this era. Martin Blythe (1994, p.17) has observed that Māoriland referred to not only the sentimental racism of settler culture but also “to those many Māori attempts at reaching a conciliation with the expanding British-Pākehā nation”. Images of Māori in this period have also been presented as part of a transition from “mature” colony to independent nation in which Māori were used as a way to distinguish the country within the Empire (Bell 1991, p.1). Depending on one’s theoretical commitments, however, the Māoriland period is characterised as one where colonists either appropriated Māori symbols in order to claim an indigenous connection (Blythe 1994; Gibbon 2002, pp. 5-17; Sinclair 1987; Webster 1998) or as one where pioneers fashioned a national identity by using the established tropes in the popular culture of settlement.

7.3 **Rewi’s Last Stand (1925)**

Both versions of Rewi’s Last Stand have elements of the frontier, and depict New Zealand as a colony of the Empire on the outskirts of Western Civilisation (Blythe 1994, p.32).

Historians such as James Cowan, saw, in this process, settlers creating both a new country and a new identity, which they could proudly claim as their own (Perkins 1996, pp. 17-27). Rewi’s Last Stand (1925) appears, essentially, as a colonial settler story, where the historical Māori characters such as Rewi Maniapoto are portrayed as an obstacle to colonial settlement upon the land (Campbell 1986, pp.4-15). In the 1925 account, the titular character, Rewi Maniapoto is depicted as aggressive and savage, in stark contrast to the 1940 version where Maniapoto is refashioned as a noble, but reluctant opponent to British forces. Maniapoto’s aggression is evident when he becomes “enraged” at the sight of Ken Gordon the “Pākehā”, whom he orders thrown into a dugout. In contrast to the 1940 film, the 1925 version depicts little personal connection between Rewi Maniapoto and the central characters of the film, excepting antagonism. Maniapoto is depicted as a one-dimensional enemy, opposed to
European settlement and cruel to other Māori characters, such as Takiri. As it transpires the central characters of Ken Gordon and Takiri are both victims of the aggressive actions of Rewi Maniapoto.

The construction of Maniapoto in the 1925 account is reminiscent of the themes identified by Pat Moloney as the dichotomy of “savagery and civilisation” utilised as an affirmation of British superiority, justification and establishment of settler legitimacy in the new territories (Moloney 2001; Campbell 1986). Through the first-hand account of Ken Gordon, the audience is made aware that he is the model for civilisation. The competent, capable and rational Gordon is contrasted with characters such as Rewi Maniapoto and Takiri. Maniapoto and Takiri are utilised in support roles as respectively, aggressor and victim to highlight the juxtaposition between savages and civilised. In this fashion Māori characters are portrayed as detractors to progress and necessary foils for the process of civilisation.

It is argued, however, that the deeper thematic between Gordon and Takiri is in the final resolution, when Takiri dies in Gordon’s arms. Symbolically, Gordon buries Takiri, the Māori maiden, in the bush and gives her back to nature. Following Takiri’s death, Gordon returns to the arms of his fiancé, Cecily. What is evident in the final encounter is the popular notion that Māori were a ‘dying race’. Takiri’s fate is a metaphor for the vanishing race of Māori, where the landscape will be emptied for European settlement. The prediction of Māori extinction was a popular sentiment held in the Māoriland period and it is argued that this key thematic provides an explanation as to why there are marked differences between the two films.

7.3.1 Popular perceptions of Māori extinction in Māoriland

The popular perceptions of Māori in the Māoriland period reveal a significant contradiction. On the one hand, Māori subject matter helped to distinguish New Zealand from Australia and Great Britain in the construction of a national identity. On the other, the situation of Māori from the 1890s to the 1920s reveals a population rendered vulnerable as a result of land alienation and confiscations, epidemics, legislation and social policy. Epidemics such as smallpox in 1913, termed the “Māori Malady” and Spanish Influenza in 1918, caused a sharp decline in the Māori population (see Day 1998, pp.31-4). The vulnerability of the Māori population from the 1890s to the 1920s engendered the popular belief, which circulated in many forms, that Māori were a “dying race” or in a permanent state of decline. The famous comment by Isaac Featherstone, a British colonial administrator, that the State should
“smooth the pillow of a dying race”, which spurred protest action in the 1990s, indicates that
the extinction of Māori was regarded as inevitable.\textsuperscript{91}

There is a modicum of criticism of the benign neglect by colonial-settler society toward the
Māori population because of this assumption, but the idea had strong currency in the
\textit{Māoriland} period. This popular belief has had enormous influence across the spectrum
regarding the Māori population even when the idea was debunked as a myth. Ethnographic
accounts by Percy Smith, Elsdon Best, Sir Apirana Ngata and Te Rangi Hiroa, attempted to
record the history of Māori, including cultural beliefs and customs because it was accepted
the Māori “race” was doomed (Best 1972, originally printed 1907; 1974; Smith 1978; White,
2001). A settler custom of giving their children Māori names in order to preserve Māori in
the cultural memory of New Zealand was founded upon this belief. Member of Parliament,
Sir Heaton Rhodes, for example, included the names Maire and Tahu into the family tree, as a
way of safekeeping the memory of Māori (Rice 2001, pp.204-220).

Yet the notion of extinction was an idea formed in response to selective information and
continued to be promulgated in academic circles even when the empirical evidence exposed
the view as a myth. Ethnographer, Elsdon Best, for example, in his \textit{Children of the Mist}
(1907, republished in 1925) continued the myth of Māori as a dying race, which by 1925,
when Best’s work was republished, and \textit{Rewi’s Last Stand} (1925) was released, was already
known to be empirically inaccurate (Webster 1998, p.87). The idea was granted further
Ministerial legitimacy by William Herries, the Minister of Native Affairs (1912-1921), who
stated “I look forward for the next hundred years or so, to a time when we shall have no
Māoris at all, but a white race with a slight dash of the finest coloured race in the world”
(quoted in Belich 2000, p.190).

The rise and fall of the Māori population through this period may go some way in explaining
the marked differences between the two versions of the film. In the first version, Māori are
detractors to progress in the frontier period and inevitably characterised as “aggressors”
toward “Pākehā” characters or doomed companions, such as Takiri. In the 1940 account,
however, Hayward depicts a noble but conquered Māori foe that should be included and
embraced as part of the nation.
7.3.2 Māori in the 1920s, State policy and race-relations

The recovery of the Māori population from notions of “extinction” meant that Māori, as a group, would have to be engaged in terms of nation-building and incorporated into the national framework. During the Māoriland period (1890-1920), there would be a systematic process of incorporation of Māori into the national framework, a process first expressed by William Fox, Minister of Native Affairs, to the House of Representatives in 1863. James Belich (2000, p.248) describes this period of amalgamation as “a climactic assault on Māori independence, identity and importance”. The situation of Māori in the 1920s was one of incorporation into the national framework, juxtaposed with strongholds of resistance. By the 1920s, Māori leaders such as Apirana Ngata and Te Rangi Hiroa were members of parliament and incorporated into the nation-state. Both Ngata and Te Rangi Hiroa were strongly focused on Māori development, and the acceptance of Māori into the national framework as “equal” to the Europeans. Ngata, for example, championed land development schemes to incorporate Māori into the nation’s economy and was a key proponent of including Māori in the war effort during World War I.  

In contrast to those who engaged with the State, other Māori groups would seek to maintain independence, identity, and autonomy from the national framework. There was lingering resentment in relation to Crown actions in the Land Wars, which would affect race-relations and the amalgamation of Māori into the 20th Century (Belich 1986; 1988; 1993; 1996, 2000; Parsonson in Oliver 1984, pp.140-167; Sharp and McHugh 2001; Sorrenson, 1963, pp.33-55; 1965, pp.21-46; Webster, 1998). Throughout the 1920s, there were Royal Commissions regarding land confiscations, where tribes such as Taranaki received compensation for Crown actions in the 19th Century.

The Māori leaders who sought independence from amalgamation into the national framework, included Princess Te Puea Herangi, T.W. Ratana and Rua Kenana. T.W. Ratana, founder of the Ratana religious movement, would establish an alliance with Labour in 1936 (Ballara 1996), which continued until the 2005 elections when the Māori Party won four of the once strong Labour held Māori seats. Māori groups that sought to maintain independence, such as the Tuhoe prophet, Rua Kenana, were characterised as enemies of progress and the nation-state (Walker 1986a, p.186).
In the 1920s, however, and before the Labour-Ratana alliance, Ratana’s influence amongst Māori would rival Ngata’s. Unlike Ngata, the Ratana religious movement maintained a form of autonomy from the State. Similarly to Ratana, Princess Te Puea Herangi would have a changing relationship with the State in the 1930s and 1940s. In the 1920s, Te Puea used her influence to address outstanding issues of grievance in relation to the Battle at Orakau Pa, battle featured in *Rewi’s Last Stand*. At the outbreak of World War I, Te Puea played an active role in resisting the conscription of Māori into the armed services. The Crown responded to this resistance with a general conscription order, which applied only to the King Country and Maniapoto (King 1977). In this way, Māori were viewed as “obstacles” to progress and potentially threatening to the nation. This theme is evident in the depiction of Rewi Maniapoto in the 1925 version of *Rewi’s Last Stand* as antagonistic toward “Pākehā” encroachment (symbolised by the recently arrived settler, Gordon) and the inevitable fate of defeat at Orakau Pa by the superior British forces.

While Māori had “recovered” from (the popular myth of) extinction, the focus in *Rewi’s Last Stand* (1940) would be on the assimilation of Māori into the national framework with the reminder to audiences that Rewi had made his last stand in the 19th Century. As indicated by Minister Fox’s comments about race-relations in Chapter Three, the incorporation of Māori into the national framework was seen as imperative. Indeed, New Zealand’s form of race-relations would become central to the country’s national identity and “traditional” values. Thus, the way forward for Māori, once extinction had proved a fallacy, was incorporation into the national framework via assimilation, whether this was desired or not.

### 7.3.3 Better Britons and race-relations

From the 1880s to the 1960s, New Zealand’s national identity was posited on the notion of being “Better Britons” (Sinclair 1987, p.10). While this timeframe blurs some of the popular beliefs about Māori (such as expected “extinction”), the policy was built upon distinguishing the country from Great Britain, while acknowledging it as part of the Empire. A core point of difference was built around social policies which were progressive, in terms of race-relations and equality, in comparison to the “old” country. Similarly, to other colonies, such as Canada and Australia, New Zealand’s international profile would follow the “Better Britons” direction with a focus on an engineered discourse centring on race-relations. Historians, such as James Cowan, would advance this view where New Zealand would tout itself at the
international level as a model for “racial” harmony, a view reiterated by the likes of Keith Sinclair in the 1960s and 1970s when the protest movements were at their height.\textsuperscript{94}

The harmonious notion of race-relations, however, depended on the amalgamation of Māori into the national framework and was underpinned by intolerance of the notion of Māori independence or states within states (Belich 2000, p.190). In a complex mixture of engagement and resistance, Māori leaders both collaborated with and resisted the State to advance Māori issues. These themes of resistance and collaboration would, however, continue the cultural authentic/cultural degenerate dichotomy by depicting Māori who engaged with the nation building exercise as “good Māori” and those who resisted inclusion as “bad Māori”. Modern Māori who engaged with the State were characterised as “Brown Britons” and key figures such as Apirana Ngata were instrumental in building the concept of Māori “Brown Britons” as part of the nation, and the Empire (Hill 2004).\textsuperscript{95} As discussed throughout this thesis, this meta-narrative has been used as a referent point for audiences in the films to signal those who are a potential threat to national harmony. More often than not, the detractors are sacrificed in the cinematic accounts for the good of the nation, in order to maintain the equilibrium of both racial and national harmony inside the nation-state.

7.4 On the cusp of cultural nationalism – Rewi’s Last Stand (1940)

The term “cultural nationalism” refers to the historical and artistic period spanning the 1930s and 1940s in New Zealand, but its influence has extended beyond that timeframe. In the New Zealand context, cultural nationalism refers to the literary and artistic movement of creating or inventing a sense of national identity. The cultural nationalist period has been influential in the development of New Zealand’s national identity for two main reasons: creating a sense of national identity and acting as an official point of intersection between the State and the arts.\textsuperscript{96} The 1930s was the decade in which New Zealanders developed a sense of nationalism and is borne out in the literature produced during that period (Murray 1998, p.9). A number of the key literary figures, such as Frank Sargeson, John A Lee, Robin Hyde, Eileen Duggan, Charles Brash, John Mulgan, Denis Glover, Allen Curnow, RAK Mason and ARD Fairburn were first, second, third and fourth generation New Zealanders.

Curnow, Fairburn, Glover and Mason would be influential in shaping New Zealand’s literary direction of New Zealand through the magazines *Phoenix* and *Tomorrow* and the Caxton
Press, which is still in operation today. These literary figures created a distinctive national character in their works and wrote from the position that New Zealand, rather than Britain, was “Home”.

As Peter Gibbons (Gibbon 2003, pp. 38-40) notes:

*Cultural nationalism seemed then to be a vital element in the country’s political and cultural maturation, in making progress beyond colonial origins and imperial apron strings and such terms as “New Zealand” and “New Zealand national identity” were used without any sense of strain or difficulty …*

The cultural nationalist movement in New Zealand has been termed “settler nationalism”, “New Zealand settler nationalism”, “critical nationalism” and “Pākehā nationalism” (see Calder 1998, pp.169-72; Newton 2003, 90-101). The central characteristic of cultural nationalism has involved the reframing of New Zealand’s national identity away from the contestation of Māori and Pākehā toward affirming and celebrating the settlement of the country by Europeans. Issues such as the struggle with the land and the elements or what John Newton (2003, pp. 23-39) describes as the “staging of settler cultural legitimacy” in New Zealand displaced and eventually replaced the contestation between Māori and Pākehā in the construction of national identity.

Within the cultural nationalist narrative and the settlement of New Zealand, new mythologies about the character of the country would be established. Cultural nationalists such as Keith Sinclair (1963) argued that through the settlement of New Zealand, the country’s characteristics were based upon “Three of our traditional ideals: racial equality, social equality and social welfare”. While Māori would form a “core part” of these national ideals, it would be as objects rather than participants. Grant Duncan (2004, p.277) argued that the cultural nationalist view of the nation was “created in the image primarily of the white male of settler stock, with white women as supporting cast, and Māori a fondly remembered, but defeated, warrior race”. Thus, the “excellent race-relations mythology” centred, importantly, upon a relationship with a conquered and defeated “warrior race” which is evident in *Rewi’s Last Stand*.

The first commemoration of Waitangi Day was held in 1934 and was supposed to, as it is today, symbolise the joining of the two peoples into “one nation”. In New Zealand’s Centennial Year of 1940, the year the second version of *Rewi’s Last Stand* was released, Māori inclusion into the national framework was expected by the State, whether such a
position was desired by Māori or not. While the nation was celebrating the joining of the two peoples symbolised by the Treaty of Waitangi, Māori groups were still seeking redress for issues arising from the 19th Century and the non-recognition of the Treaty of Waitangi. A number of Māori groups would attempt to advance recognition of the Treaty from inside, as well as outside, the State. T.W. Ratana gathered 30,128 signatures on a petition to ratify the Treaty of Waitangi which was tabled in Parliament in 1932 (Walker 1990a, p.195). The resolution of the petition was held over in Parliament for 13 years, with significant events, such as World War Two, delaying the matter. The petition was finally delegated to the Māori Affairs Department for resolution in 1945, which acknowledged the symbolic significance of the Treaty in the nation’s building, without the protections afforded Māori within the document (Walker 1990a, p.195). Thus, in 1940 – the Centennial Year of New Zealand - the status of the Treaty of Waitangi, which symbolised the forging of the nation, was yet to be resolved in Parliament.

7.5 Race-relations in Rewi’s Last Stand – cultural nationalism-settler nationalism

The characteristics of cultural nationalism or settler nationalism are evident in Rewi’s Last Stand (1940) where issues such as life on the frontier and the conquering a recalcitrant land and its people, as well as the establishment of settler legitimacy, are themes of the film. This is best reflected in the discussions between Bob Beaumont and Reverend Morgan at the Mission Station. The Reverend Morgan, when leaving his Mission Station for Auckland because war is imminent, looks out at his planted crops and expresses his concern to Beaumont about having “all his good work undone” by the upcoming war. Reverend Morgan reminds Bob (and thus the audience) that “20 years ago, when all this was virgin country, the Māoris were cannibals”. Bob Beaumont reinforces the cultural nationalist view by reassuring Reverend Morgan by stating that, “It’s going to take more than a war to destroy what you’ve done. The seed is too widespread. The roots go too deep”. Thus, the cultural nationalist view of taming a recalcitrant land and bringing civilisation to the country are reinforced in the characters’ discussion.

Arguments can also be made to support Martin Blythe’s (1994, p.17) comments in terms of “the sentimental racism of settler-culture”. When leaving the Mission, Reverend Morgan addresses his flock, (which primarily includes adult Māori) thus “now my children, we must leave you”. Bob Beaumont refers to Reverend Morgan as Governor Grey’s “watchman of the
Waikato”. Throughout these interactions Reverend Morgan is portrayed as an example of the Good Samaritan, where his actions would be construed as “just” in relation to the social mores of the time. The character of the Reverend is not distinguishable from his position as a member of the clergy and thus, he represents a heuristic for honesty for the intended audience.  

7.6 Two peoples - one nation

Two of the significant differences between the two versions of Rewi’s Last Stand is the inter-ethnic love affair of Bob Beaumont and Ariana, and the depiction of Rewi Maniapoto. In the 1940 version Maniapoto is transformed from the enraged savage (1925 account) to the reluctant rebel. This theme is evident in Maniapoto’s interactions with Ariana, as both her grandfather and tribal leader. The audience is made aware that the Chief is fighting because he is concerned for his people’s welfare, which is made explicit when Maniapoto says to Ariana “In a time of war, a tribe must gather its people”. Even Maniapoto’s “kidnapping” of Ariana is characterised by the best of intentions because, as Maniapoto states, it was “the wishes of your mother” to have Ariana returned to her people.

The 1940 account is seen from the point of view of Bob and Ariana. The audience is made aware, especially in relation to Ariana, of the compromised loyalties of those involved in the war. The Māori-Pākehā relationship in the film is one of complexity in that the conflict cannot be so easily divided into “friends” and “foes”. It appears that external forces and miscommunications between the two peoples have resulted in warfare.

The subject of compromised loyalties, or a new people forged by mixing the new with the old, is portrayed through the character of Ariana who, upon her mother’s death in an epidemic, was abandoned at the Mission Station and raised with the Morgans. As events transpire, Ariana is taken against her will on her way to the Morgans in Auckland and forced to return to the Maniapoto. This theme suggests a directive code in the film, that Ariana is forced into taking a backward step by returning to her people. Ariana’s wish is to reunite with the Morkenas (Morgans) because, as Bob Beaumont states, “she is one of us”. Bob’s statement centres upon the rationale of descent, as Ariana is a half-caste and has been raised in “our [Pākehā] ways”.

Once Ariana is returned to the Maniapoto she is reminded by her Grandfather that she was sent to the Mission to “learn the wisdom of the Pākehā, but not to give them your heart”.
The symbolic inter-ethnic love affair between Ariana and Bob Beaumont serves as a metaphor, or Martin Blythe (1994, p.34) describes as an allegory that “work[s] out the national dilemma [of] how can Māori and Pākehā be brought together” and also as an explanation as to why the two peoples are apart. Ultimately, Ariana pays for her compromised loyalties and return, by dying as a result of the war in the Waikato.

What is evident is that the character of Ariana symbolises the promise of progress and amalgamation through marriage. Ariana, who offers the promise of peaceful unity and integration through marriage with a settler is eventually sacrificed in the film because she makes the wrong decision and remains with her tribe. By returning to the Maniapoto, who are characterised as resistant to inclusion, Ariana symbolises the loss of “promise” through peaceful amalgamation by way of inter-marriage. As will be discussed throughout this work, the onus and responsibility for the amalgamation of the two peoples (and harmonious race-relations) is placed on Māori.

7.7 Cultural authentic/cultural degenerate; “Māorified” Pākehā with a civilised core

One of the core criticisms of the Māoriland and cultural nationalist eras has been the subject of “cultural appropriation” in order to forge a new national identity distinct from Britain. There are elements in Rewi’s Last Stand which could be interpreted this way represented by the character of Bob Beaumont. It is important to note however, that the idea of the settler-native has been a stock character in the frontier genre. In the New Zealand context the character of Bob Beaumont takes on different connotations with the underpinning of the cultural authentic and cultural degenerate dichotomy inside the race-relations narrative.

There are two issues offered for consideration: the first is the idea of Māori “decline” from the noble past to the degenerate contemporary; the second, that the inheritors of Māori custom and culture would be the new settlers. In this fashion settler-natives were portrayed as equal to Māori in relation to Māori custom and culture, and determinants of Māori authenticity.

These views can be seen in the character of Bob Beaumont who is portrayed as a “Māorified” Pākehā. Bob Beaumont, also known as Ropata by Ariana, is a “blood brother” with the Ngapuhi, speaks the Māori language and is expert with the taiaha (Perkins 1996, pp. 17-27). Beaumont displays his knowledge of Māori culture and customs when faced with Tama Te Heu Heu in order to assert his claim as an equal in stature to Te Heu Heu. The character of
Bob Beaumont typifies many in frontier stories of the time, fashioned on a dual connection with the “native” and the “settler”, but ultimately working on behalf of the Crown for progress. What this suggests is that Bob Beaumont, as a Māori-Pākehā, has gone “native”, but retains a civilised core.

There are glimpses of these theoretical underpinnings in the film, where Bob Beaumont questions Tama Te Heu Heu’s tikanga in terms of warrior etiquette. Bob dares Tama to “strike an unarmed man”, which would make Tama lose his mana and be viewed as a “common fella” amongst his people. It is suggested that Bob Beaumont is asserting his own authenticity as a native, by questioning Tama Te Heu Heu’s mana. Once the challenge has been made, a taiaha battle ensues between Beaumont and Te Heu Heu, where Tama is the victor. In this fashion, Bob Beaumont, the “Māorified-Pākehā”, challenges Tama’s cultural authenticity and credentials in order to precipitate the fight. This interaction is interesting in that it illustrates Bob Beaumont’s confidence in articulating his cultural authority and knowledge to Tama Te Heu Heu. In order to question Tama’s mana, Bob Beaumont is stating his own sense of mana and importance. It is, however, Tama Te Heu Heu, as a character, who is actively involved in resisting the forced amalgamation by the settler Government on the grounds of cultural integrity.

While much has been written about the cultural appropriation of Māori by settlers in contemporary accounts, the encounter between Bob and Tama reveals an interesting thematic that even in the subject of Māori tikanga, Tama Te Heu Heu should bow to Bob Beaumont’s superior knowledge. These interactions can be seen as a metaphor for Māori-Pākehā relations; that those with a civilised core (or Māorified Pākehā) know, in actuality, what is in the best interests of Māori. As will be shown throughout this work, that which is often thought to be in the “best interests” of Māori is socially, contextually, politically and importantly, ideologically dependent. More often than not, what is couched within the rationale of “best interests” has caused considerable contestation inside the Māori population.

In the Māoriland and cultural nationalist periods, amalgamation or assimilation-integration views superseded notions of extinction, although the two attitudes reinforced one another. Given the descendents of Rewi Maniapoto were still resisting incorporation into the national framework, it is argued that Rewi’s Last Stand (1940) reveals a deeper thematic; that of amalgamation combined with the threat of extinction. The myth of the noble, but conquered Māori warrior was crucial in the settlement and construction of New Zealand as a nation.
There was however, a significant contradiction in portraying romantic Māori figures as belonging to the past, while at the same time ensuring that contemporary Māori were incorporated into the national framework, regardless of opposition by some Māori groups to the same.

7.7.1 Good Māori and bad Māori in the 1930s and 1940s

The 1940 version of Rewi’s Last Stand was made in the years leading up to World War II and would be released to audiences in war-time New Zealand. Although Waikato Māori resisted conscription in the World War 1, by the time the second version of Rewi’s Last Stand appeared, Māori from other parts of New Zealand had fought for the Empire. In this fashion, Māori had arguably become truly “global” and would be called to arms, once again, for “King and Country” in World War II. The image of Māori constructed through the Māoriland period would give way to another perception of the noble warrior, which was incorporated into the armed services of New Zealand. In contemporary times, there continues to be a direct association with the New Zealand Army and Māori military prowess. The New Zealand Army, for example is named Ngāti Tumatauenga, after the Māori God of War.

The inclusion of Māori in the Empire, or at least arguments for acceptance in military terms, can be found in the comments made by Ben Horton, at the Battle of Orakau Pa. While Rewi Maniapoto is depicted in a contradictory fashion in that he is portrayed in the 1940s account as the reluctant “rebel” fighting against Crown encroachment, the film focuses on Maniapoto and his people in a noble, but ultimately doomed quest. In this fashion Rewi Maniapoto’s last stand is used as an exemplar of the warrior qualities of Māori in battle, but in an historical event where the audience is aware of the final outcome. When Maniapoto delivers his famous statement of “Friend, I shall fight against you forever”, after he is offered the chance to surrender, Ben Horton responds to Bob Beaumont with “What do we know about courage”? Further, the Colonel, who is leading his troops against Orakau Pa, reiterates the focus on the bravery and courage of Māori warriors with “This country is a grave of glory. What glory can there be in killing men like these?”. Thus, between military opponents, there is a measure of respect for Māori military prowess and Māori are portrayed as worthy entrants as part of New Zealand’s contribution to the Empire.

It is important to note, however that Māori military deeds could be admired in popular culture, so long as Māori were characterised as “friends”, allies, or vanquished, but not as “foes”. What this alludes to is the subtle distinction in the cultural degenerate/cultural
authentic dichotomy where “good Māori” used their military prowess for the nation and were readily assimilated into New Zealand society. Conversely, “foes”, or those resisting amalgamation, were punished and defeated for the “good of the nation”.

While the event of Rewi’s Last Stand has been depicted in the cinematic account as a gallant and courageous affair, in actuality, the Crown actions were, in fact, less than honourable. The 1700 colonial troops amassed against a group consisting of 300 men, women and children was a one-sided military affair. Given the involvement of women and children, the Battle of Orakau Pa was not a noble victory by colonial troops, but has been constructed that way in historical and cinematic accounts (see Cowan 1983, reprint of edition first published 1922-23; Sinclair 1957). The active role of women in this encounter is often ignored as evidenced by the Colonel’s statement above which characterises the struggle as a contest between respective masculinities. This is a significant oversight because famously, Māori women declined surrender at Orakau Pa through the famous declaration of Ahumai Te Paerata with “If men are to die the women and children can die also” (Cowan 1983, reprint 1922-23, p.403).99 The phrase is coined in the publicity material for the film to underscore the apocalyptic nature of this encounter. Women such as Ariana are depicted as being “caught up” in the Battle, as opposed to making a military contribution.

Although Hayward and Cowan depict vanquished foes in their narratives, what was problematic is that events arising from Orakau Pa were far from settled. The actions of the Crown in relation to the Waikato, Tainui and Kingitanga would have an influence well into the 20th Century. In 1995 the Crown would formally settle with Tainui by offering an apology and compensation. It is argued that the way in which events in Rewi’s Last Stand are portrayed reinforces the conquest of a noble warrior and his people and gives strong directive codes about progress commensurate with cultural nationalist terms about one nation.

Given that the events depicted in Rewi’s Last Stand still had an impact on “race-relations” throughout the 1920s, 1930s and beyond, the focus on the construction of a “new nation” in the film needs consideration. The dissent and resistance occurring in New Zealand society around race-relations and national identity suggest a disjunction which the cinematic account ignores. What appears in the cinematic account is the overt focus on unity between Māori and Pākehā for the “good of the nation”. In this fashion, Hayward was presenting an idealised view of Māori and race-relations with an appeal to Māori to embrace civilisation
and be part of the nation. These themes are also evident in Rudall Hayward’s last film, To Love a Maori (1972) where the onus is placed on Māori to forgo protest action and remain inside the national framework.

7.8 Gender - contested masculinities and inter-ethnic love affairs
Throughout the cinematic accounts there are two recurring patterns which are used as allegories for Māori-Pākehā relations. The first is the notion of “contested masculinities”, whereby men are constructed as antagonists or competitors for women, land, resources and ideas of progress. The second is the use of inter-ethnic love affairs which are presented as ways to bring the two peoples together or provide rationales as to why they are apart. Thus, Māori and Pākehā characters often represent particular “social forces”, attitudes or positions on broader subjects about race-relations.

7.8.1 Contested masculinities
The representation of the Māori male as “warrior” in Rewi’s Last Stand is a stock feature in the cinematic accounts and is used as a plot device to explore the national dilemma of race-relations. In Rewi’s Last Stand the Māori male as “warrior” functions as a metaphor for the potential corruption (or interruption) of the quest for progress, civilisation and national harmony. Tama Te Heu Heu plays the competitor to the heroic Bob Beaumont, complete with a soundtrack to indicate “danger”. It is Tama Te Heu Heu, for example, who fights with Bob Beaumont and captures Ariana, forcing her to return to the Maniapoto against her wishes. Although Tama Te Heu Heu is portrayed as brave in his last stand with Rewi Maniapoto, it is the antagonism between Bob and Tama which fuels the contestation between Māori and Pākehā in the film.

There is a deeper thematic, however, in the antagonism between Beaumont and Te Heu Heu, which centres on the sexual possession and objectification of Ariana. The contest over Ariana symbolises the antagonism between the respective masculinities of Māori and Pākehā men over the control of Māori women and land. What this suggests is that Ariana represents virgin territory for both land and reproduction. Thus, the fight for possession and control over Ariana has wider implications for the future of New Zealand as a nation.

Although Rewi’s Last Stand (1940) would portray a noble, but conquered people in what James Belich (1996, pp.241-242) describes ironically as a “… good clean fight, dotted with incidents of courage and chivalry, after which the two peoples shook hands and made up”, the
Māori male as codified “aggressor” in the film references the warrior trope where savagery is vanquished and gives way to civilisation. In this fashion, the construction of “contested masculinities” in historical works such as Rewi’s Last Stand is to reinforce the superiority of the settlers and ultimately, to portray the contestation between Māori and Pākehā as a lost cause.

The Māori male codified as “aggressor” in the film references what Christina Thompson (1997, pp. 109-19) describes as “the acceptance of violence in Māori society” and raises a number of theoretical propositions in the representation of Māori women. It is argued that the notions of “contested masculinities” and “inter-ethnic love affairs” are different sides of the same view in that they construct Māori men and women into a sexual-dualist model, in which Māori men are active and Māori women passive. In essence, both representations serve a wider purpose in the nation-building exercise as antagonists or collaborators in settlement.

7.8.2 The sexual-dualist model - active Māori men and passive Māori women

If the warrior is the symbol of active male aggression, then Māori women have been characterised as the passive object. Sam Edwards (1989, p.19) writes “Māori women carry the myth of sexuality, both for themselves and for the men”. The interaction between Māori women and Pākehā men goes somewhat further than Edwards accounts for. This portrayal of Māori women has more to do with the construction of women within the warrior trope where Māori women are depicted inside this narrative as objects of desire, reproductive vessels and available to men.

As discussed, the 19th-century ethnographers Elsdon Best and Percy Smith ascribed the domains of leadership, war, trade and sacred knowledge to Māori men in accounts of Māori society. The accounts by Best and Smith on Māori society, informed the works of historians, such as James Cowan, who in turn, influenced Rudall Hayward. This intersection between ethnography, history, and art has helped to construct a pervasive stereotype of Māori women, which is borne out in cinematic accounts. The subservience of women was a prevalent stereotype of “stone age” cultures articulated by first-hand observers, such as Richard Taylor (1974, reprint of 1855, p.116), who described Māori women as “pitiful creatures”. Some of these ideas in relation to Māori women’s roles can be seen in the
representation of the character of Ariana. Invariably, the role of Ariana is characterised in her relationship with strong men, whether Rewi Maniapoto, Reverend Morgan, Bob Beaumont, Tama Te Heu Heu or her absent father, Ben Horton. For example, Bob Beaumont and Tama Te Heu Heu duel over Ariana, and Bob is defeated. When Ariana offers to return with Tama to spare Bob’s life, a korowai is placed over her as a symbolic act of ownership. Lastly, Ariana loses her life as a forced participant in the war between colonial troops and the Kingitanga because her grandfather has ordered her to be present.

The character of Ariana, however, crosses two important traditions in historical romances: the warrior trope and gender roles in the late 19th Century. Gender roles, (or more importantly, the place of women), were clearly defined:

*Civilised women were womanly – delicate, spiritual, dedicated to home. And civilised white men were the most manly ever evolved – firm of character; self-controlled; protectors of women and children. In contrast gender differences among savages seemed to be blurred. Savage women were aggressive, carried heavy burdens and did all sorts of masculine hard labour. Savage men were emotional and lacked a man’s ability to restrain their passions…*  

*(Bederman 1995, p.25).*

The dichotomy between native and civilised women can be seen in their location in the films. In the 1925 account Takiri, for example, is roaming unaccompanied in a war zone, whereas Cecily, the English settler, is situated at the “hearth and home”, away from potential conflict at the Mission.  

In this fashion, “war” is characterised as the domain of men and depicted as an event conducted between respective masculinities. When examining gender roles, although there is a certain ambiguity in the depiction of Takiri and Ariana, both women play primarily feminine characters with some masculine traits. Symbolically, both women die as a result of their involvement in the masculine domain of warfare.

### 7.8.3 Inter-ethnic love affairs - Māori women as mothers of the nation

The primary female role in the second version of *Rewi’s Last Stand* centres upon the “high-born” Ariana. Ariana plays the role of a “half-caste” Māori woman and is the product of an encounter between European, and Māori. Whereas Takiri was a victim of circumstances in
the encounter of Māori and Pākehā warfare, Ariana is a sacrifice. Ariana sacrifices herself throughout the second version of *Rewi’s Last Stand*, first in order to save Bob Beaumont’s life from Tama Te Heu Heu and lastly, at Orakau Pa.

There are a number of factors which need consideration in the depiction of Ariana that need consideration. Ariana is, for example, a product of encounter between Europe and Māori, raised at the Mission School, and is, as Bob Beaumont states “one of us”. What underpins the representation of Ariana, as a half-caste, is that she has the potential to be civilised if located with the Morgans, but not the Maniapoto. In the interactions between Bob and Ariana, she is portrayed as a Victorian lady with an exotic heritage. It is argued, however, that the character of Ariana offers the promise of progress or as William Herries alluded, to provide “[a] slight dash of the finest coloured race in the world” to future New Zealanders.

In relation to the portrayal of Māori women and coupled with the notions of where Māori women were situated in the “myth” of Māori society, there are a number of recurrent themes. There is, as suggested above, a certain ambiguity in the masculine and feminine roles regarding both Takiri and Ariana. The first is the message drawn from the fate of both Takiri and Ariana. It can be seen in the fate of the Māori women, that Māori warriors are characterised as somewhat irresponsible in the care and protection of women, due to the “passion” and a propensity to warfare. In comparing the portrayals of Takiri and Ariana, with their counterparts Cecily and the Morgan women, both Māori women are placed in danger due to their involvement with Māori men. It is the settler men, Gordon, Bob Beaumont, the Morgan men-folk and even Sir George Grey, who offer better protection to Māori women, than do Māori men.

There are a number of conclusions which can be drawn from these accounts, but highlighted here is the importance of the relationship between Māori women and Pākehā men in the formation of the nation. In the New Zealand context, the relationship between Māori women and Pākehā men has been as integral to shaping the nation as the conflict between the men. From the earliest points of contact, Māori women and Pākehā men have been engaged in encounters which have shaped New Zealand society. The trade for guns in Northland for example, which forms a core part of the settlement narrative, was invariably paid for by Māori women in the sex industry (Belich 1996, p.251). It is suggested that these interactions between Māori women and Pākehā men should not be overlooked because they have been as crucial to the settlement narrative as the accounts of warfare.
In the cinematic account of both versions of *Rewi’s Last Stand*, however, it can also be seen, that there is a social demarcation between Māori women and Pākehā men. Hayward followed the trend in films which positioned Māori women at the high-end of the social spectrum in Māori society marrying into the lower social order of settler society. In both films, the encounters are conducted between “high-born” Māori women and settler men where Māori women are exemplars of the notion of “exceptionalism”.

Takiri is denoted as being “high-born” and similarly, Ariana is described as the granddaughter of a “chief”. Ariana’s mother is also denoted in the film as the daughter of a “Kawhia Chief”, while her father is a rogue Sea Captain named Ben Horton.

In these depictions of the relationships between “high-born” Māori women and settler men, there is a social code embedded in the film. These depictions centre on the notion of “marrying-up” for Māori women and “marrying-down” for settler men, whereby the exceptionalism of the native women provides the rationale for the interest of non-Māori men. This thematic is evident in novels, such as John Mulgan’s novel *Man Alone* where the character of “Rua” who had married an elderly farmer and is depicted as having risen above her social station. While it was acceptable in the cinematic accounts of the settlement of New Zealand for settler men to have liaisons with Māori women, the reverse did not apply even when such relationships took place in the “real” world. The relationship between Māori men and Pākehā women was one of the last social taboos to be broken in the cinematic record, and was achieved by Rudall Hayward in 1972.

**Conclusion**

This chapter has examined the differences in the representation of Māori and provided an overview of the Māori population and the ideological influences on race-relations in the two versions of *Rewi’s Last Stand*. As argued, there are marked differences between the two accounts, differences which reflect the changing attitudes toward Māori in the *Māoriland* and cultural nationalist periods. In the 1925 version of *Rewi’s Last Stand* Māori subjectivity was constructed on the premise that the population was ultimately doomed to extinction. By 1940 this assumption had been replaced by the official policy of assimilation-integration. While the second version of *Rewi’s Last Stand* has been viewed in a sympathetic light in its favourable treatment of Māori, it can be seen that the director used the work to impart strong directive codes to both Māori and Pākehā audiences as to how to interact within the nation-state. It is important to note that this analysis is not a criticism of Hayward and his work in
terms of his views on race-relations or Māori subjectivity. Rather it is to identify how influences inside a social context about race-relations, underpinned by official state policy are evident in films and presented as legitimate ways to maintain national unity. As will be shown in the next chapter on *Broken Barrier* (1952), the framing of Māori subjectivity into a race-relations narrative has been an ongoing process where each social context has added an extra layer to New Zealand’s national dilemma.
Chapter Eight: Broken Barrier (1952)

Introduction

This chapter engages with ideas about Māori and the nationalised narrative of race-relations in Broken Barrier. Broken Barrier was produced in the social context of 1950s cultural nationalism and in a society commonly characterised as “puritanical”.

This work is significant because it was the first feature film to depict contemporary Māori, as opposed to presenting Māori in stasis, as in the 19th century. In this fashion the work portrays Māori characters inside the social context, rather than outside the influences of 1950s New Zealand.

Furthermore, Broken Barrier addresses the subject of racial discrimination overtly in its account. The main narrative focuses on the relationship between Tom and Rawi. This relationship is used to reflect the contradiction in the myth of New Zealand’s international profile of ostensibly “harmonious race-relations” at the personal level in order to examine what Rawi describes as the impact of “the fine edge of racial discrimination” on an individual. Through the trials and tribulations that Tom and Rawi encounter in the course of their inter-ethnic love affair, Tom is awakened to racism in New Zealand society. In this fashion, Tom Sullivan stands as representative of the “every-day” Pākehā man and is positioned as a transitional figure in his realisation of the disjuncture between racial equality in theory, and racial discrimination in practice.

In this fashion, Broken Barrier stands both inside and outside the cultural nationalist tradition. On the one hand, the film reinforces the nation-building exercise by accentuating New Zealand as a progressive and modern nation. On the other, the work challenges racial discrimination inside a country, which had as one of its core ideals the notion of “equality”.

Outlined below is an historical overview of New Zealand in the 1950s, popular ideas about Māori, an account of the Māori population at this time, the emergence of the local variant of the fatal impact thesis and race-relations. A separate section is devoted to an analysis of gender in order to investigate the ways in which the relationships between Māori and Pākehā characters are used as an allegory to examine broader societal issues about race relations. In this fashion, the interpersonal is used to present directorial points of view in order to provide a social commentary for the audience suggesting ways forward for national unity through racial harmony and the end of racial discrimination.
8.1 The progressive and puritanical society

The social context that informs Broken Barrier was influenced by the socio-political ideology of cultural nationalism. Broken Barrier was made some 12 years after the second version of Rewi’s Last Stand (1940) and there had been a fundamental shift toward a more “puritanical society”. The 1930s to the 1960s in New Zealand has been characterised as an era of general dourness, crushing conformity with a strong theme of intolerance to dissent and difference (Belich 2000; Philips, 1996). Throughout the 1950s to the late 1960s New Zealand would experience an economic affluence unprecedented in its history, which would see groups such as Māori and women enter the workforce in greater numbers than ever before. New Zealand’s participation in World War II would open the nation to the influence of American culture, which motivated John O’Shea to produce films, offering a local perspective on screen in an attempt to balance the influx of Hollywood productions. Throughout the cultural nationalist period, the tensions between the local and global influences upon New Zealand society would have a significant effect in terms of the construction of national identity.

The literary historian Keith Sinclair was instrumental in challenging the pervasive myths regarding New Zealand as an outpost of the Empire (see Gibbon 2003, pp. 38-49; Sinclair 1969; 1987). In the cultural nationalist period, academics such as Sinclair sought to portray New Zealand as a progressive and modern nation in a global context by advocating that the country shed its colonial skin and cultivate an independent identity away from Great Britain (Gibbon 2003, pp. 38-49; Sinclair 1969; 1987). New Zealand had been a social laboratory for the world since the 19th Century with a reputation for being more progressive than Great Britain, especially in terms of equality (Reeves 1969; Belich 2001). It is significant that a film such as Broken Barrier (1952) focused on racial discrimination and social inequalities in New Zealand society at the height of cultural nationalism. Primarily, O’Shea’s film contradicted two of the three “traditional ideals” that Sinclair posited as central to New Zealand’s distinctiveness from Great Britain.

Since World War II, for example, government policy regarding the Māori population had focussed on integration, which reinforced the perception that New Zealand was a country without racial discrimination. It is important to note, however, that through the veneer of integrationist policies, the Māori population would lose land and language and be encouraged to “modernise” via relocation programmes to the urban centres. Māori who did not engage in
modernisation and integration were categorised as “primitives” and legislative measures were put in place to alienate “unused” Māori land.\textsuperscript{109}

Although the ideals Sinclair posited about New Zealand society reinforced the progressive and egalitarian attitudes of the country, the reality of the cultural nationalist period reveals a different outlook. As outlined, Māori who resisted the modernisation process were compelled to do so by means of legislation and policies implemented to enforce conformity. For example, there was a near success in the prohibition movement on alcohol with six o’clock closing, as well as strict censorship and controls on activities such as gambling and sex (Belich 2001; Phillips 1996). The prohibition of such activities went against one of the central cultural nationalist or settler nationalist myths, namely the “man alone” character, which will be discussed below.

Moreover, in 1951, the year before \textit{Broken Barrier} was released the working class was subjected to the power of the State. In order to quell dissent, the National Government used wartime emergency powers on union members in peacetime. The Waterfront Lockout was one of the largest outbreaks of civil disobedience seen in New Zealand since the Great Strike of 1913 (Bassett 1972, p.170; Gustafson 1986, p.60). This level of civil disobedience would not be witnessed again until the protests against the Springbok Tour of 1981.

\textbf{8.2 Cultural/settler nationalist myth: man alone}

In terms of nation building and Anderson’s (1983) concept of an “imagined community”, nation-states are constructed around key factors such as national symbols, character, music, literature, folklore and mythology. During the cultural nationalist period, there were already strong New Zealand stereotypes, which had been built through the 19\textsuperscript{th} century. Primarily, these myths and characters were constructed around the socio-centricity of men. The historian, Jock Phillips identified in his work \textit{A Man’s Country} the importance of the male settler stereotype embedded in the national character of New Zealand.

The central features of the man alone stereotype were to be single, alienated from respectable society, laconic, rurally-based, adaptable, a survivor, skilful and loyal to “mates” (Phillips 1996). This mythological character, based on the pioneer, broke in the land of New Zealand and was proud of his physical prowess, competent but quiet, would be a central feature in the development of Kiwi national identity. The man alone character would serve two purposes: he would be placed in opposition to his English counterparts, which reinforced the notion of
New Zealanders as Better Britons and he would be lauded as having created the modern New Zealand from an untamed wilderness (Jensen 1996).

One of the key differences between New Zealand and Australia’s sense of “mateship” are the enduring myths that developed, regarding the indigenous peoples. In New Zealand, Māori were both included and excluded in the nation building exercise (Mein-Smith 2003, pp.6-7; Sinclair 1987b). The Australian Aborigines however, were dismissed and excluded on the grounds that they were an inferior type of people. As Philippa Mein-Smith (2003, pp.6-7) notes, New Zealand’s central myth of being “Better Britons” or superior to their Australian counterparts centred on the idea that “New Zealanders lacked the taint of convictism; they were moulded by a vigorous, cooler climate; and they enjoyed relations with a superior type of native”.

The male stereotype would feature in literary works produced by authors such as John Mulgan, Frank Sargeson and Barry Crump (Mulgan 1990, Original publication 1939; Sargeson 1982, Original publications 1935-1960; Crump 2003). There is, for example, an element of the man alone character in Broken Barrier’s Tom Sullivan, who roams the New Zealand countryside on foot in search of fanciful tales from the South Pacific for an international audience. Throughout the film, Sullivan turns his hand to farming and forestry, as well as having a professional career as a journalist. In this fashion, Tom Sullivan is the New Zealander who is not far from his pioneering roots but who is also a citizen of a modern nation.

Although the man alone character has been central to New Zealand’s national identity, it was adapted from the legends of the Australian bushman (see Ward 1977). There is in the character of Tom Sullivan an oscillation between the modern, progressive and sophisticated New Zealander and the self-sufficient pioneer, who is at home in both urban and rural settings. What is suggested is that the debates in terms of how New Zealand’s national identity would be constructed created a rupture in the masculine stereotype, where New Zealand men, such as Tom Sullivan, had to contradictorily exhibit characteristics of both the modern and progressive, and the rural pioneer. This “rupture” engenders a dichotomy between the urban and rural locations, where each setting is used as a metaphor for certain foundational/critical characteristics. The urban centres are portrayed as environments where New Zealand’s core ideals, such as racial and social equality, are potentially corrupted.
This factor is best illustrated in the interactions between Tom and Rawi in the city. When Tom and Rawi return to the city from the rural areas, they encounter both racism and “classism”. In comparison, the rural areas are closely associated with New Zealand’s heartland, where people are portrayed as more authentic and upholders of the national spirit of egalitarianism.

It is argued that O’Shea vests his national ideals in New Zealand’s heartland in rural people and marginalised groups, such as Māori and the working-class. Ultimately, this was a romantic view of New Zealand society, which constructed a rural and urban dichotomy in order to make comment on some of the internal contradictions in the cultural nationalist framework. This would have a significant impact on understandings of Māori subjectivity as it would result in the local variant of the fatal-impact thesis underpinned by the cultural authentic/cultural degenerate dichotomy and reworked throughout New Zealand’s cinematic accounts.110

As argued by academics, the man alone character largely constructed a New Zealand national identity around the exploits of men, which ignored the history of women in the country and groups such as Māori (Blythe 1994; Phillips 1996). Women within the man alone stereotype were depicted as helpmates, femme fatales or obstacles to the notion of “mateship” which centred real relationships in the narrative as those between men. Moreover, Māori were characterised as either contestants for female attention or native sidekicks to the real protagonists. As will be discussed in Chapter 13, *Once were warriors* (1994) there is a reworking of the man alone stereotype, fashioned around Jake “the muss” and his pub family. The central elements of the man alone character can be found in *Broken Barrier*, especially in the relationship between Tom and Johnny, the Māori timber worker. Tom, for example, seeks the advice of Johnny in relation to the tensions between Tom and Rawi regarding racial discrimination (discussed later in the section on gender). As evidenced, the “real” or crucial relationship in Tom’s acceptance of racial discrimination in New Zealand society centres upon the socio-centricity of men, which in the case of Tom and Johnny extends across the ethnic divide.

### 8.3 Perceptions of Māori and race relations in the 1950s

Until the 1950s Māori were largely a rurally based population, but following World War II, there would be an urban drift by Māori to the city centres. In the 1950s New Zealand experienced an economic period, known as the “long boom”, following World War II that
brought groups, such as Māori to the urban centres in order to fill labour shortages. The shift of the Māori population from rural to urban-based, set in place a number of social and political factors that would have marked consequences for race-relations in the years to come. It is important to note that Māori were encouraged by agents of the State to come to the cities and fill the work shortages created by the long boom. The Department of Māori Affairs, for example, established programmes which actively encouraged Māori to move from the rural areas, and seek employment in the cities (Walker 1990a, p.197). One of the most important phenomena that resulted from the “urban” drift, was the rise of pan-Māori organisations to cope with the influx of Māori to the city centres. In 1951 the Māori Women’s Welfare League was established and its first President, Whina Cooper, would lead the Land March in 1975 to stop the Crown from taking “one more acre of Māori land”. The Māori Council, which grew out of the Māori Social and Economic Act 1945, gained both statutory recognition and influence through the urbanisation of the Māori population (Walker 1990a, pp.203-204). Although, the Māori Council would be characterised as a “conservative” organisation, the group would be instrumental in opposing the alienation of Māori land and achieving recognition of the Treaty of Waitangi in Section 9 of the State Owned Enterprises Act in 1986.

Importantly, O’Shea locates Māori within these types of localised images from the perspective of Rawi and her family, and Tom Sullivan. In the opening sequence of the film, Rawi’s mother Kiri addresses the audience directly and introduces key members of the group, including her daughter Rawi. Kiri and her family are gathering kai moana (seafood) at the beach in the rural East Coast of New Zealand. Through Kiri’s narration the audience learns that her people are farmers and have remained in their tribal areas, unlike those Māori in the 1950s who have migrated to the cities for work. It is suggested that Kiri and her family, as rural Māori, are set in opposition to those in the urban centres of New Zealand later on in the film.

Kiri and her family are depicted as part of Tā Āpirana Ngata’s land schemes, which were designed to encourage Māori participation in the nation’s economy using remaining Māori land. Kiri’s husband Alex is described as “one of the few Māoris who has held onto his land and he’s proud of it”. Thus, the issues of land, redress and the situation of Māori inside the cultural nationalist discourse are identified as central themes in Broken Barrier.
Through Kiri’s exposition, the audience is made aware that her daughter, Rawi, has returned home from the city where she has been working as a nurse and is “ambitious and wants to do something for her people”. In the context of the 1950s, there were a number of schemes that encouraged Māori participation in the professions and Rawi’s character references the integration of Māori into the national framework through these programmes. Kiri is, however, concerned with the effect the city is having on Rawi, which is made explicit in her statement “Living and working in the city has changed her”.

Kiri also takes a pragmatic and philosophical approach to the current situation of Māori in cultural nationalist influenced New Zealand when she observes that “… many Māori were caught like fish out of water … It’s a white man’s world. You must learn to live in it”. Thus, there is a quiet acceptance of the situation of Māori that ‘modernisation’ through assimilationist-integrationist policies was a fact-of-life. This is not to say, however, that acceptance equates with agreement, because the themes of urbanisation and alienation of Māori would form a core part of the demand for redress in the decades to come. What Kiri’s statement alludes to is that the State-directed modernisation of Māori was an integral part of the Māori social experience in cultural nationalist New Zealand.

8.3.1 Cultural authentic-cultural degenerate - the rural-urban divide

As indicated above in Kiri’s comments about the effects of the city on Rawi suggests that the urban environment is portrayed as a corrupting influence on people. Kiri’s comments about Māori being caught “like a fish out of water” references the notion of Māori as being caught between the progressive and primordial, traditional and modern, authentic and degenerate. This is a theme that authors such as Patricia Grace would highlight in the following decades and would be depicted in an extreme fashion in Once were warriors (1994). In Broken Barrier the idea of the city as a corrupting influence is, however, extended to New Zealanders in general. For example, Tom is described as a “cynical” journalist in search of romantic and idyllic tales from the South Seas about “rural life”. Tom arrives at Rawi’s home and tribal area to work and observe Māori people. It is revealed that Tom has a secret, which involves writing about rural Māori life for an international magazine, where he takes liberties with the “truth”. In other words, Tom is a covert ethnographer who has tricked his way into the lives of Rawi and her family in order to exploit their uncorrupted “Māori way of life”.

It is argued that one of the codes embedded in the film is that urban life taints people and that “real” New Zealand can only be found in the rural areas. The city people Tom and Rawi
encounter are morally questionable, racist and classist. Upon return to the city, for example, Tom arrives in the early hours of the morning to observe people going home from a late night of entertainment. The city is filled with empty bottles and litter, and there are men and women walking home who are exhibiting the effects of alcohol.

While in the rural area with Rawi’s family, it is Tom who drinks too much at a dance and misbehaves, which incurs Rawi’s disapproval. Tom comments on the alcohol consumption at a dance with Rawi and her family “I’m pleased they enjoy the benefits of civilisation”. Yet, Tom’s actions when under the influence of alcohol are far from civilised. It is suggested, however, that O’Shea is commenting on the hypocrisy of those upholding notions of civilisation when they themselves exhibit contrary behaviour.

What John O’Shea is depicting in his film is the notion of two worlds, which would become a popular concept from the 1980s onwards. In Broken Barrier, there are the “two worlds” of the rural and urban, plus the dyadic and problematic interrelationship between Māori and European. Significantly, a key thematic in Broken Barrier is that Māori and European can co-exist more easily in the rural heartland of New Zealand, where there are fewer racist and classist attitudes than in the urban centres. This is best illustrated in the film’s final resolution with the return of Tom and Rawi to the East Coast of New Zealand to settle.

Bruce Babington (2007, p.90) describes the return of Tom to Rawi as a showing of solidarity with Rawi’s Māori people. While it is agreed that elements of this are evident in Broken Barrier, the eventual location of the couple reveals a deeper form of identification with uncorrupted “rural” Māori. As will be discussed further below, Tom’s identification with Rawi’s family is significant because they are constructed as the epitome of the Brown Britons who are civilised, productive and have an “essential” Māori core. Thus, the argument is that Tom does not hold an unequivocal form of solidarity with Māori, but with a particular type of Māori framed by State policy and held as the 1950s exemplar of how Māori should be.

8.3.2 Authentic Māori as “Brown Britons”

The official position of New Zealand in terms of race-relations centred on the ideology of “one nation – one people”, which was drawn from Hobson’s comments of “he iwi tahi tatou” at the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi. In the cultural nationalist period the notion of “one nation – one people” was founded upon assimilationist-integrationist views, whereby Māori would become “Europeanised”. The ideology of “one nation – one people” highlighted the
significance of “race-relations” as a core part of the nation’s mythology, but how meaningful the slogan was would be tested by the rural to urban drift of Māori.

During the 1940s and 1950s in particular, the relationship between Māori and Pākehā could be characterised as “distant”. The relationship of Rawi and Tom symbolises the cultural distance between Māori and Europeans in the 1950s. This is evident in the film with the use of a narrator to explain Māori culture, customs and lifestyle to the audience and through the character of Tom Sullivan. While assimilation-integration was the official race-relations state policy, the process was rather one-sided in that all the concessions were made by Māori to embrace a more “European” or modern life-style.

In terms of the cultural authentic-cultural degenerate dichotomy, however, what this meant is that “real” or “authentic” Māori in the 1950s were those who exhibited the characteristics of Brown Britons and were heirs of Tā Āpirana Ngata’s famous *whakatauki*:

_E tipu e rea, mō ngā rā o tō ao,_

_Ko tō ringaringa ki ngā rakau a te Pākehā hei oranga mō tō tinana._

_Ko tō ngākau ki ngā taonga o ō ō tipuna Māori hei tikitiki mō tō māhunga_  

_Ko tō wairua kite Atua nana nei ngā mea katoa_  

[Grow tender shoot for the days of your world.  
Turn your hand to the tools of the Pākehā for the wellbeing of your body.  
Turn your heart to the treasures of your ancestors as a crown for your head.  
Give your soul unto God the author of all things]  

(Walker 2001, p.397)

Tā Āpirana Ngata has been an influential figure in New Zealand’s history, especially pertaining to Māori. Ngata who was the first Māori to obtain a university degree, entered parliament in 1905 and remained there until 1943 (Belich 2000, p.201). As James Belich (2001, p.201) notes “the peak of his [Ngata’s] official power was in 1928-34, when he was Minister of Native Affairs, but his influence spanned the whole period of the 1890s-1940s”. Ngata and his contemporaries, Te Rangi Hiroa (Sir Peter Buck) James Carroll and Maui Pomare dominated Māori politics setting the template for Māori to be included in the nation-building exercise. In 1949 Te Rangi Hiroa MD, MP and Scholar produced his seminal work *The Coming of the Māori*, on the settlement of New Zealand by the Polynesians. Ngata and his contemporaries drove key initiatives such as establishing the Māori Battalion as part
of New Zealand’s contribution to the Empire in the World Wars; implementing Māori farming and developing the notion of “Māoritanga” (“Māoriness”). The notion of “Māoritanga” sought to maintain certain aspects of Māori cultural custom and protocol at a time when assimilation was advanced as key to the nation (Webster 1998, p.73).

There are two ways in which Māori characters are depicted in Broken Barrier that reference Tā Āpiriana Ngata’s view of Māori as Brown Britons. Throughout the film O’Shea signals his own solidarity with “real” rural-based Māori and writes back to Hayward’s depiction of Māori as potential detractors to progress in the modernisation of the nation. It is important to note, however, that Hayward also invited Māori to be part of “modern” New Zealand society through the armed services and by giving up notions of resistance to amalgamation.

In the rural areas a number of Māori were involved in Tā Āpirana Ngata’s land schemes, which were developed in the 1920s to foster Māori farming on tribal lands as a way to include Māori in the nation’s economy (Walker 1990a). Rawi’s family are farmers, who form part of the mythology of New Zealand’s national identity as “the backbone of the country”. Farmers in 1950s New Zealand were the backbone of the economy, but it is suggested that the rural landholders are also depicted in the construction of national identity as the legitimate “heirs of the pioneer” trope. O’Shea’s inclusion of Māori in as farmers blends two central themes: the farmer and Māori participation toward progress in a modern New Zealand.

Further, Rawi is a professional nurse, a factor which Kiri states “I’m proud. People think of her [Rawi] as a nurse and not as a Māori girl”. In this fashion, Rawi is portrayed as a Brown Briton or a legitimate heir to Ngata’s view of Māori in the cultural nationalist framework. In this fashion, rural Māori are portrayed as a core part of the nation, rather than detractors to progress. Kiri and Rawi, for example, are actively engaged in the modernisation of Māori, best illustrated by Kiri’s comments “All of us have come a long way”, which is then reinforced by a shot of Māori farming. Thus, O’Shea is advancing that Māori are part of the nation’s economy and modern world, and are not detractors to progress.

8.3.3 “Real” Māori and international Māori in a showcase
The international profile of New Zealand as a remote and exotic tourist destination is a code which Broken Barrier seeks to address in two ways. Firstly, the film contradicts the core
ideals espoused by cultural nationalists and, secondly, it addresses the international image of New Zealand as a romanticised Māoriland. As identified above, Tom works for an international magazine, which trades on images of a pre-contact/uncontaminated Māoriland. The pressure on Tom having to maintain this image of New Zealand and Māori for an international audience creates tension between himself and Rawi. In a pivotal scene, Rawi reads a letter from the magazine which endorses Tom’s covert stories about Rawi’s family but asks him to write on the subject of ritual “cannibalism”. Rawi interprets this letter as “Tom making them [Māori] look like primitive savages just to give overseas readers some romantic, Polynesian colour”.

In Broken Barrier it appers that John O’Shea was engaging with the tensions between New Zealand at the local level and the country’s international profile. Tom describes this view as “Māoris in a showcase … [which] the Yanks lap up” or “tourist Māori” who bear little resemblance to Rawi and her family. Similarly to Rudall Hawyard, O’Shea is addressing notions of “authenticity” in relation to Māori. Whereas Hayward portrayed “real” Māori as traditional or historical Māori, who were ultimately consigned to the past, O’Shea is advocating that “true” Māori are modern and actively engaged in nation building.

The tensions between the national and international representation of Māori are best illustrated in Tom’s comment, “One day, I’ll write a true story of these people”, which suggests there is a disjunction between the actual realities of Māori life and the tourist images. What is problematic, however, is the position from which Tom claims to write a “true” story. It appears that Tom has evolved from a culturally naïve, covert ethnographer to an expert on rural-based Māori life during the course of the film.

The detractors to progress, civilisation and national harmony in the film are urban-based Māori who are depicted as corrupted by the city. This categorical distinction is articulated by Rawi with “All they [Pākehā] see of my people is the men outside the pubs”. Rawi’s statement provides an explanation as to why Tom’s family disapproves of her and Māori, but illustrates the intra-class distinctions within the Māori population. In Broken Barrier, urban Māori are juxtaposed with rural Māori in order to identify the real authentic Māori in cultural nationalist terms.
8.4 The intersection of “race” and class

The intersection of race and class has been the subject of considerable attention in the literature. Academic consensus acknowledges that both “race” and “class” are socially constructed categories, where analyses fall between “reductionist” and “relational” approaches (Williams 2000, p.215). As Williams’ (2000, pp.215-228) argues, race and class are often utilised to sustain and reinforce each other in terms of structural privilege and power. It is argued that one of the codes embedded in Broken Barrier is an underlying leftist antipathy toward class snobbery. There are two issues that need addressing in terms of the encounters faced by Tom and Rawi’s inter-ethnic relationship. The first, as will be discussed in the section on gender, is that an individual’s class or social position was often determined by categorical beliefs about the superiority or conversely, inferiority of race. Secondly, until the 1980s, New Zealand’s social policy was based upon notions of “universalism”, egalitarianism and the proviso of “equality” for all. Arguably, the clearest example of public social policy based upon notions of “universalism” can be seen in the genesis and construction of New Zealand’s revolutionary Welfare State (see Dalley and Tennant 2004).

The relationship between Tom and Rawi, however, crosses both class and racial barriers. Throughout the film, the interactions of the couple with the Sullivans and Tom’s city friends give a clear insight into how this intersection operated in 1950s New Zealand. It is argued that the censure of characters based on superior classist distinctions is because New Zealand’s notion of “equality” and “egalitarianism” was founded upon the idea that the country was an almost classless society (Sinclair 1969, p.285). New Zealand as a “classless society” was placed in direct contrast with the class-conscious view of Great Britain. Great Britain’s class-consciousness would be highlighted in the film Utu (1983) to draw the distinction between the old world and the new.

It is important to note that comments in relation to O’Shea’s class-based antipathy are not meant as a censure of the director; rather they are intended to illustrate how notions of equality were conceptualised in 1950s New Zealand. The director himself would apologise for some of the thematics contained within the film, which he described as “… warmed by the dying embers of a sentiment that saw Māoris as “noble savages” (O’Shea 1999, p.65; Babington 2007, p.90). It is argued that O’Shea was presenting a view of Māori as co-equals within the auspices of the Better Britons model of New Zealand society. The director was advocating for Māori, as Brown Britons, to be considered of the same social status as Pākehā.
The intersection of race and class is framed within the rural and urban dichotomy where there is a marked distinction between attitudes of primarily rural-based Māori characters to the relationship of Tom and Rawi, and to urbanised Pākehā characters. This is best illustrated in Rawi and Tom’s encounters with other characters on their return to the city, when their relationship becomes serious. Tom’s interest in Rawi meets with overt disapproval from Tom’s friends and family. In one scene where Tom meets his friends in the city, they “snub” Rawi, which makes her self-conscious “… about her race”.

It is, however, the meeting between Rawi and Tom’s family which highlights the barriers the young couple are facing. Tom’s father dislikes Rawi on sight an attitude of which she is made acutely aware. Rawi interprets Tom’s father as “… a tough nut to crack”, and when Tom announces the couple’s engagement, Mr Sullivan Sr. leaves the room in disapproval. Invariably Tom’s friends and family, in particular his sister, are described as “snooty” and look upon Rawi with disdain. These are terms, however, which are more closely associated with class, rather than “race”. Yet Rawi interprets her “race” as a key factor in why her relationship with Tom is met with disapproval. It is suggested that in these themes there is evidence of the conflation of race and class issues, wherein an individual’s ethnicity corresponds with social status. Rawi, for example, interprets this situation in her meeting with Mr Sullivan Sr. as based upon the fear of bringing “bad blood into the family”. As Rawi states, “what is often left unspoken is the crueller” and it is made clear in these scenes that there are barriers in the film, some of which are visible, like colour, and others invisible, like class.

While *Broken Barrier* addresses the issue of racial discrimination, the racism directed toward Rawi is somewhat downplayed in the film. This factor is best illustrated in the discussion between Tom and Johnny about the disapproval Tom has experienced in his relationship with Rawi. Johnny describes the situation as “ a lot of fuss about nothing” and Rawi is invariably described as being “sensitive about her race”. The incidents in which the tensions arise are described as “petty”, but this is not Rawi’s view of the racism she experiences in the city. Due to the racial discrimination she encounters, Rawi leaves the city to return to the East Coast. As a result of the opposition Rawi and Tom face, Tom in fact becomes prejudiced against Māori. In meeting Johnny for the first time, Tom exclaims “… not another Māori”. When Tom leaves Rawi for his sojourn through the countryside, the narrator states, “he [Tom] needed a place to think. Somewhere away from Rawi and Māoris, and magazines”.
What is evident in these scenes is that there is a minimising of the racism experienced by Rawi and she is, in turn, blamed for being “sensitive” in her responses to racial discrimination. Arguably, the downplaying of racial discrimination is indicative of the tension it generated in 1950s New Zealand. This factor is best illustrated when Rawi addresses one of New Zealand’s core ideals of racial equality by stating, “there is no colour bar, but colour does matter”. Further, when Tom seeks out Rawi in the city, her accommodation is less than ideal. Tom observes; “I suppose Māoris have to take what board they can get”. Thus, there is, in fact, a colour bar acknowledged by Tom, which obviously affects social status and opportunities for Māori.

What these exchanges suggest is that the belief in racial equality over-.rode the obvious evidence to the contrary. This factor was noted by a UK reviewer, in the *Monthly Film Bulletin*, who found one of the few matters of interest in *Broken Barrier* was its presentation of “… the extent to which prejudice persists in a country which has accepted racial equality as a principle” (cited in Babington 2007, p.89). *Broken Barrier* ends with the statement from the United Nations Declaration on Human Rights, Paris, 1948, “There shall be no discrimination on the grounds of race or colour”.

As evidenced throughout the film, however, there is racial prejudice in New Zealand society. Symbolically, one of the central awakenings in the film is experienced by Tom through his relationship with Rawi and friendship with Johnny. As discussed below, the relationship with Johnny is as crucial to Tom’s changing attitude toward Māori and racial discrimination as is Tom’s relationship with Rawi. Through the “mateship” which forms between the men, Tom is provided with key insights into the relationship between Māori and Pākehā, and eventually returns to Rawi. In this fashion, Tom is depicted as the enlightened New Zealander who opens both his heart and mind to Māori. In doing so, Tom becomes O’Shea’s version of the true cultural nationalist exemplar by practising the core ideals of New Zealand, rather than just espousing the rhetoric.

### 8.5 Gender: inter-ethnic love affairs and the noble side-kick

Positioned at the centre of the film is an inter-ethnic love affair between Tom and Rawi that personalises race-relations for the audience. Similarly to *Rewi’s Last Stand* (1940), the relationship between Tom and Rawi is used as an allegory to examine race-relations and
racial discrimination in New Zealand society. The other central relationship depicted in 
*Broken Barrier* is between Tom and Jonny. Through the friendship, Tom comes to recognise 
the racial barriers to Māori in the country. Outlined below is how the inter-ethnic love affair 
and the friendship between Tom and Jonny is used as a vehicle to make social comment about 
the state of the nation in terms of race-relations.

### 8.5.1 Inter-ethnic love affairs – exceptional Māori women and Pākehā men

Similarly to *Rewi’s Last Stand* (1940), *Broken Barrier* continues the relationship of 
exceptional Māori women and European men. In a parallel with Takiri and Ariana, Rawi is 
depicted as a Māori woman of rank, with tribal responsibilities to her people and as a trained 
professional nurse in the city centres. Rawi is a transcendent figure in that she has standing in 
both Māori and Pākehā contexts. There are a number of factors to be considered in these 
types of inter-ethnic love affairs. The first is the reinforcement of the class/race debate where 
there is an intersection of ethnicity and social status. Arguably, this class/race distinction is 
most marked in the film *To Love a Maori* (1972) where a rich Pākehā woman, Penny, falls in 
love with an impoverished Māori man, Tama. In the film *Broken Barrier*, however, it is 
argued that Rawi is depicted as “exceptional” in order to provide the rationale for a Pākehā 
man to fall in love with a Māori woman (thus breaking down the racial/class barrier) and also 
to act as a metaphor for the type of “new” New Zealand that can be forged through the 
marriage of characters such as Tom and Rawi. Rawi is the embodiment of Tā Āpirana 
Ngata’s Brown Briton and Tom is the heir of the pioneer.

There are a number of subtle codes embedded in *Broken Barrier* in relation to the social codes 
and mores of 1950s New Zealand, especially in terms of how Māori were situated within the 
national framework. One is best illustrated in the narration of Tom at the beginning of his 
relationship with Rawi where Tom is invited to a tribal meeting to discuss his involvement 
with her. In this scene, Rawi adorns herself with a moko, which engenders the following 
response from Tom “She hardly looks like Rawi with that war-paint on her. She [Kiri] 
thought she would frighten me off”. This exchange between Tom and Rawi illustrates how 
Māori were to be engaged and amalgamated into the nation where it would be Māori making 
all the cultural concessions.

These cultural exchanges between Tom and Rawi serve to remind the audience that the idea 
of being “Brown Britons” is, in fact, to be a second-class citizen. On examination, what is 
glimpsed through the encounters between Tom and Rawi is that Māori are acceptable in
1950s New Zealand so long as Māori are not too “native”. This factor is made explicit by Tom, when he states, “they [Māori] seem to get a great kick out of this tribal business. Did Rawi belong to all this? Rawi’s happy with the Māoris – well let her be. I’m not going to wait around here much longer”. It is argued that Tom’s reaction to Rawi centres upon the cultural nationalist ideals of presenting New Zealand as a modern nation. In this scene, Tom espouses the assimilationist-integrationist views about Māori culture, custom and tribalism as looking backward to the past rather than forward to the future.

It is however, the relationship between Rawi and Tom that is used as a vehicle to examine race-relations through Tom’s recognition of the tensions in New Zealand society. Tom comes to realise that the slogan of racial equality masks some uncomfortable truths which subvert the national mythology of race-relations. In this fashion, O’Shea vests his hope for a more equal New Zealand society in the character of Tom who returns to live with Rawi in the heartland of the country, in her tribal area and with her whānau. O’Shea is inverting the one-sided policy of assimilation-integration where Māori make all the concessions by leaving culture and custom behind to move to the modern city centres. This inversion would be further extended in Chapter Nine, *To Love a Maori* (1972).

**8.5.2 From contested masculinities to “mateship”**

Tom’s awakening to racial and class barriers is influenced by his experiences with Rawi, but crystallised through his friendship with Johnny. Tom’s resistance to Māori culture is dissolved by the death of Johnny, who sacrifices himself in a fire to save Tom. Although Tom is witness to the racial discrimination Rawi is subjected to, these incidents are minimised, causing tension between the couple. In fact, as outlined above, Tom on occasion blames Rawi for being overly sensitive about racial discrimination. The sacrifice and death of Johnny, however, provides Tom with the opportunity to re-examine his attitudes to Rawi, which leads to their reunion on the East Coast.

The relationship between Tom and Johnny is important for two reasons. Firstly, Johnny is an interesting extension of the “noble savage”/warrior trope. As discussed in *Rewi’s Last Stand* (1940) the nobility of the Māori warrior in the Battle for Orakau Pa was heightened, but in *Broken Barrier* the focus is on “friendship” between the men. It is suggested that Johnny symbolises the “noble savage” who saves his European counterpart and makes the ultimate sacrifice for friendship. The second reason is the notion of “mateship” which was a central feature of the man alone stereotype. One of the characteristics within this trope is the idea
that significant relationships are developed between men, where women are portrayed as disruptive to mateship or characterised as interrupters (Belich 2000, pp.252-260). This point is best illustrated when Tom dismisses Rawi’s concerns about racial discrimination, but grants salience to Johnny’s observations on the situation.

On examination, the notion of mateship is an important thematic in Broken Barrier, one which replaces the issue of contested masculinities in the construction of the nation. The film, for example, highlights the “friendliness” of the Māori people and the participation of Māori in the nation-building project. Johnny is not depicted as a warrior, but as a “noble savage” or “simple fellow” in his relationship with Tom. In this fashion, the “warrior-savage” is constrained or emasculated and in turn, evolves into the “noble sidekick”. This factor is best illustrated by the fact that the two men are not adversaries and do not contest with each other over women or land. Johnny becomes Tom’s mentor and teaches Tom bushcraft. This Tom equates with racial equality where the “whites are learning from the brown”. Essentially, Tom draws his main understanding of the hypocrisy of race-relations in New Zealand through his mateship with Jonny.

**Conclusion**

In this chapter the main subjects examined have been the influence of the 1950s view of cultural nationalism on race-relations. As argued, Broken Barrier stands inside and outside the cultural nationalist tradition because it challenges the notion of New Zealand having the best race-relations in the world by focusing on the subject of racial discrimination. The work stands inside the cultural nationalist tradition by advancing a form of equitable amalgamation between Māori and Pākehā within the auspices of the Better Britons model. The notion of being inside/outside the cultural nationalist tradition makes Broken Barrier a seminal work, as it both challenges and reinforces the ideals of 1950s New Zealand. As outlined, Broken Barrier exhibits the local variant of the fatal impact thesis or the cultural authentic/cultural degenerate dichotomy by depicting rural Māori as “Brown Britons” and “authentic” and urbanised Māori as potentially corrupted. At its core, however, the work was designed to highlight racial discrimination and advance a form of equity for Māori inside the nation-state. It was John O’Shea who described the relationship between Māori and Pākehā as the “essential drama” of this country. Given the importance New Zealand placed upon having harmonious race-relations, O’Shea was presenting his view of how to effect a truly authentic and equal relationship between Māori and Pākehā. As argued O’Shea’s “essential drama” has
been an ongoing and continuous process that has been shaped by broader social, historical and political factors. What will be discussed in the next chapter on *To Love a Maori* (1972) is how contextual influences, (informed by international movements such as civil and women’s rights) framed Māori subjectivity and race-relations in 1970s New Zealand society.
Chapter Nine: To Love a Maori (1972)

Introduction

In this chapter the influences on Māori subjectivity in Rudall Hayward’s 1972 film, To Love a Maori are examined. Contextually, To Love a Maori is situated in the local and global cross-currents of the 1960s and the early 1970s. The “Sixties” was a turbulent era, which produced numerous influential movements, including the counter-culture, New Left protest movements from overseas and the phenomenon of “radicalised youth”. At the national level, the visiting American academic, Professor David Ausubel, would highlight the disjuncture between the depictions of New Zealand as a progressive nation, but the reality of a country with “mid-Victorian” social attitudes and dubious economic policies which continued to ignore the growing tensions in race-relations. These tensions are evident in To Love a Maori and will be discussed further below.

There is an overt propagandist message in the film, regarding race-relations in which the director takes somewhat of an educator’s role to inform the New Zealand public on how both Māori and Pākehā should engage inside the national framework. As with Hayward’s earlier work, Rewi’s Last Stand (1925/194), and John O’Shea’s Broken Barrier (1952), To Love a Maori continues the use of an inter-ethnic love affair to examine race-relations. This cinematic depiction was one of the last social taboos to be broken in New Zealand film and its use in To Love a Maori to examine race-relations reflects the changing social values and mores in New Zealand society. The main narrative centres on the inter-ethnic love affair between a Māori man (Tama) and a Pākehā woman (Penny). Tama and Penny first meet as dancers in a new production by a Māori choreographer, Matangi Kingi based on race-relations through the sexual attraction of Māori and Pākehā to one another. This places an analysis of race-relations at the forefront of the film. Tama and Penny’s love affair faces strong opposition from Penny’s parents, Mr and Mrs Davis, because of Tama’s ethnicity and social status. The relationship between Tama and Penny results in a number of trials and tribulations that expose the underbelly of racism in New Zealand society. In a similar fashion to Broken Barrier (1952), To Love a Maori poses questions about the disjuncture between theory and practice of a country known for its “racial equality”.
9.1 Social context – influences at both the national and international levels

Although *To Love a Maori* was made in 1972, it is the social context of the 1960s which influences the film. Similar to the *Māoriland* and cultural nationalist eras, the 1960s was important as an historical and literary period because the era was marked by significant global events and intellectual trends including the counter-culture, the American Civil Rights Movement, the student protests in France of May 1968, and increasingly vocal opposition to the Vietnam War. It is important to note that these events at the international level would also be replicated in New Zealand, where local activist groups, inspired by the broader protest movements overseas would use them to advance change at home.

In the New Zealand context, international events, especially in relation to human rights issues, would set the platform to analyse the relationship of Māori and Pākehā. It was in the 1960s, for example, when New Zealand society would witness the first major protests about the Treaty of Waitangi and New Zealand’s continued sporting contact with Apartheid or racially-segregated South Africa. The subjects of the Treaty and racial discrimination against Māori in New Zealand society would shape the country’s view of race-relations for the next two decades, but in the context of *To Love a Maori* these tensions were just gaining prominence.

The 1960s are closely associated with radical change and political unrest. Scholars view the period as reflective of a society on the cusp of radical change, evidenced in the comments of Colin James (James 1986, p.131) who described the “sixties” generation as having the “temperament of challenge and change” toward the “establishment”. While in retrospect this perception is accurate, it is important to revisit the New Zealand of the late 1950s and 1960s in order to understand more clearly what people wanted to change.

9.1.1 Fortress New Zealand

One of the common metaphors used to describe New Zealand during the 1950s and 1960s is that of a “Fortress” (Russell 1996, pp.9-70). The visiting American Professor, David Ausubel, identified in his work, *The Fern and the Tiki* (1960, p.57) New Zealand’s “Fortress” mentality, which in his opinion, extended toward important matters, such as the “… morals, ethics, education, intellectual attainment, public taste, good manners, tolerance, family life and the deportment of children …”. Ausubel’s work would receive unfavourable criticisms, because it described New Zealand society in unflattering terms (Kemble-Welch 1960, p.52;
Renwick 1960, pp. 11-12). In Ausubel’s view, New Zealanders had an enthusiasm for being “progressives”, which was excessive and largely misplaced.\textsuperscript{116} The key areas Ausubel identified in association with the idea of erroneous “progressivism” were social attitudes, economics and race-relations. When reviewing *The Fern and the Tiki*, James McEnteer (1987, pp.49-51) described Ausubel’s criticisms of New Zealand as:

*In his book* *The Fern and the Tiki* (1960) Ausubel pointed out ‘the apparent paradox of an advanced welfare state co-existing with an essentially mid-Victorian social ideology’. He found the women oppressed, the schools authoritarian and conformity rampant, despite a contentious atmosphere. What he appeared to despise above all was the air of smug self-satisfaction among the natives [New Zealanders in general], ‘holier than thou attitudes …’

While Ausubel may have received strong criticisms for expressing his views in the social context of the 1960s, Roger Mackey noted in the *Evening Post* (16 July 1986) that Ausubel “was, as an American might say, damn right when it came to predicting New Zealand’s future”. Ausubel’s comments in relation to the idea of being socially “progressive” and in particular, to the “air of smug self-satisfaction” amongst the natives [New Zealanders], are reminiscent of Rudall Hayward’s sentiments in making *To Love a Maori*.\textsuperscript{117} Similarly, in 1965, Bruce Mason (1986, p.120) wrote “… the situation in New Zealand in the 1960s for the artist and intellectual is often so intolerable, the smugness and complacency so monumental that, paradoxically, the climate may soon be ripe for a masterpiece …”. In relation to Mason’s comments, Bruce Harding (2006, p.2) identifies the cross-currents of the 1960s as formative for writers such as Keri Hulme.

The perception of New Zealand in the 1950s as a “Fortress” with its rigid social and moral conformity, motivated change in the 1960s and beyond. Arguably, the best example of the idea of the Fortress mentality centres upon “youth” issues, which had come under increasing scrutiny in the public domain both at home and abroad. Terms such as “juvenile delinquent” had entered popular culture through artistic and literary forms where films, such as *The Wild One* (1953), starring Marlon Brando, and *Rebel Without a Cause* (1955), with James Dean, focussed on the issue of “youth rebellion” against authoritarian figures of the State.

In the New Zealand context, the subject of moral and juvenile delinquency would enter the public consciousness with the Parker and Hulme case in 1954, which culminated in *The
Mazengarb Report (1954). The Mazengarb Report was sent to every household in New Zealand and would act as a catalyst for the Indecent Publications Amendment Act (1954), which specifically targeted “youth” (see Glamuzina and Laurie 1991; Mazengarb 1954; Yska 1993). The Act placed restrictions on comics and pulp literature, and enabled the Police to confiscate literary publications deemed a “danger”. These policy and legislative restrictions were designed to ensure that young people, especially, would conform to the prevailing ideology of the “puritanical” 1950s.118

9.1.2 The cusp of change

By the late 1960s New Zealand was a society on the cusp of radical change. Key movements, such as human rights, the rights of women and importantly, workers would galvanise people both at an international and national level, to challenge the “establishment”. The period from 1968 to the mid-1970s was closely related to what is termed in the literature the “rise of the New Left” and included such social movements as civil rights, students, women’s liberation, anti-racist groups, environmental groups and, gay and lesbian rights (Poata-Smith 1996).

It is important to note, however, that one of the key factors which would influence “social change” would be economics. At the international level, the collapse of the long boom resulted in a period of sustained class conflict from 1968 through to the mid-1970s (see Harman 1988; Poata-Smith 1996; Roper 1993), when the United States abandoned the gold standard. A time of unprecedented economic prosperity in New Zealand society would end and be replaced by a period of unprecedented political activism. The groups associated with the New Left in the protest movements of the 1960s and 1970s were influenced by particular philosophical traditions, such as Marxism and Feminism, which shared a common accord on social equality. In the 1980s and 1990s, the “common accord” of a number of these groups would fracture into identity-based politics, but in the 1960s and 1970s, the New Left coalesced to challenge the social order.

The significant events of May 1968, which began with student strikes in Paris and attracted the support of approximately two-thirds of the French workforce, brought down De Gaulle’s administration (Kurlansky 2004). De Gaulle’s government would however, be returned to power with an increased majority. The student protests were replicated in Europe, America and New Zealand. Significantly, the evenements of May 1968 were associated with radical youth and left-wing causes. Essentially, this was a protest movement based upon challenging
the social values and mores of the “establishment”, including methods of education, sexual freedom, civil, human and workers’ rights.

One of the key themes of the counter-culture was the concept of the generation gap which is evident in *To Love a Maori*. This is best illustrated in the discussion between Mr and Mrs Davis following the discovery of Penny’s relationship with Tama. Mr and Mrs Davis declare upon seeing Penny with Tama “why is she [Penny] always trying to shock us?”. Mr and Mrs Davis extend this notion further by blaming Penny’s liberal education on her differing attitudes on race/ethnicity and class. Mr Davis makes this point explicit by stating, “She [Penny] was alright before she went to Arts School”. What is revealed is that Penny shared similar attitudes to her parents before exposure to a liberal education. The character of Penny represents “radicalised youth” which is evident in the marked differences in attitudes between herself and her parents.

**9.2 The alliance of the oppressed**

Primarily, the groups that would challenge the establishment in the 1960s and 1970s in New Zealand were Māori, women, workers, students, and people of colour, such as Pacific Islanders. This natural alliance between such groups is depicted in the film, as those people supportive of Tama and Penny’s relationship are urbanised Māori, the working class, feminists, people of colour and gay people. This theme is evident at the wedding reception of Tama and Penny, where members from each constituency are present, although some of the characters have not featured earlier in the work. The wedding reception is used as a metaphor for the “natural constituency” of peoples who have been oppressed by the establishment and have grouped together to change the social order. Furthermore, this natural alliance introduces the subject of diversity in the film and the theme of a melting-pot of peoples.

There are a number of characters in *To Love a Maori*, who are didactic figures or representative of particular groups and social forces in New Zealand society. For example, the character of Deirdre represents the women’s movement and gender equality. Deirdre is portrayed as a crucial supporter of Tama and Penny’s relationship, and she directly challenges the racist and classist attitudes of Mrs Davis. The working class is represented by a number of characters, such as Tama’s work-mates, who support Tama and Penny at critical times when the Davis family is absent. This theme is evident at the wedding when Mr and Mrs Davis refuse to attend or contribute to the occasion. It is left to Tama’s work-mates, urban Māori family, and Penny’s friend, Deirdre to organise the wedding and reception.
Similarly, there are characters in the film that are presented as antagonists and representative of unsavoury ideas circulating in New Zealand society. For example, Mr and Mrs Davis are encoded with the social and moral ills of the country and are utilised as a measurement of the differing attitudes between generations. One of the primary messages Hayward is conveying is that marginalised groups should coalesce through the shared commonality of oppression and challenge the establishment.

What is being advanced in *To Love a Maori* is that a fundamental shift in attitudes on issues such as race/ethnicity, class, gender, sexuality and education is occurring in New Zealand society; in essence that societal change is inevitable. Hayward depicts an alliance based on similar politics and attitudes as a way to maintain harmonious race-relations inside the nation-state. As will be discussed further below, *To Love a Maori* was produced at a time when Māori protest movements, influenced by radical movements overseas, were gaining national attention. Hayward’s vision of New Zealand is evident in the film and was an appeal for Māori and Pākehā to work out their differences, but to remain inside the national framework.

**9.3 The generation gap – race-relations and hypocrisy**

As outlined above, *To Love a Maori* was Hayward’s attempt to stir the national conscience about race-relations and to re-examine the relationship between Māori and Pākehā in New Zealand society. How this new vision of race-relations and New Zealand society was conceptualised by Hayward relates to the two central characters, Tama and Penny and the encounters with Penny’s parents, Mr and Mrs Davis. The Davises are portrayed as Pākehā, wealthy and unbeknownst to Penny, hold strong racist sentiments about Māori. It is made clear throughout the film that Mr and Mrs Davis are representative of the social values and mores which Penny, Tama and like-minded supporters want to change.

The attitudes of the Davises to Māori are best illustrated when Penny invites Tama to meet her parents, in a scene reminiscent of the meeting between Rawi and Tom’s family in *Broken Barrier* (1952). Although Tama has reservations about meeting Penny’s parents, Penny assures Tama that her parents will be receptive. Penny’s rationale is based upon her father always telling “overseas visitors that we have the best race-relations in the world” and that “Māori are a more advanced people. Good at rugby and make good soldiers”. Unfortunately, the meeting between Tama and Penny’s parents is less than welcoming. What this interaction sets in place is the notion of “hypocrisy” regarding race-relations and how the older generation is not to be trusted when confronting ethnic difference.
Penny’s father makes the disjuncture between theory and practice regarding racial equality explicit in his overt disapproval of Tama. Mr Davis refuses to shake Tama’s hand and explains his racism away by saying he has American visitors arriving, who do not understand “our race-relations”. Penny responds by leaving with Tama, saying to her parents “we should practise what we preach”. Furthermore, Tama tells Penny’s father that “he should go and live in South Africa”, a comment that clearly references South Africa’s political ideology of apartheid. As will be discussed later, opposition to sporting links with South Africa had gained prominence in the 1960s and 1970s. A number of groups were opposed to the exclusion of Māori and Pacific Islanders from the All Blacks’ (New Zealand’s national rugby team) tour of South Africa. South Africa would be used in a contradictory fashion, firstly, to remind Māori how other “races” fared in the world and, secondly, by groups identifying hypocritical attitudes in New Zealand. While the country held ideals based upon equality and in particular, racial equality, it continued to have sporting links with a country which practised apartheid.\textsuperscript{120} It is argued that \textit{To Love a Māori} intentionally references international issues to comment on the local state-of-affairs between Māori and Pākehā.

\textbf{9.4 Cultural authentic/cultural degenerate; the rural/urban divide}

In some ways, \textit{To Love a Māori} begins its examination of race-relations in New Zealand society where \textit{Broken Barrier} (1952) left off. At the beginning of \textit{Broken Barrier} (1952), Rawi, for example, makes reference to urbanised Māori, establishing a dichotomy between urban and rural Māori. In both films, urban Māori are portrayed as being susceptible to the dangerous influences of the city, such as alcohol. In \textit{To Love a Māori}, the film opens with the two brothers, Tama and Riki, leaving the rural East Coast of New Zealand for Auckland. Tama, one of the lead characters in the film, is going to Auckland to further his education, while his younger brother, Riki is going to seek work. Tama and Riki meet their cousin, Tina, on the bus, where it emerges that Tina is, in fact, running away to the city for excitement. The different experiences of each character create a number of sub-plots which crossover throughout the film.

What Tama, Riki and Tina represent is termed “the Big Three”: work, money and pleasure, which were the primary reasons for Māori moving to the urban centres (Metge 1964, p.128; Reeves 1979, p.10). Tama is the young Māori man going to the city for a purpose: namely, to undertake an apprenticeship and education. Conversely, Riki, the younger brother, has left school without qualifications and does not have prospects in the city, but is nevertheless
going to seek work. In the city, Riki drifts dangerously close to a life of crime. Both Pākehā and Māori characters take advantage of his rural naivety. This is made explicit when Riki is not prosecuted for a crime because one of the criminals, who is Māori, informs the police, that Riki is a “country mug”.

Tina is seeking excitement in the city, but unfortunately, her experience turns to horror. In a striking plot-twist, Tina is abducted by Russian sailors, held against her will and raped. Tina’s experience will be discussed further in the section on gender. As in Broken Barrier (1952), one of the codes embedded in To Love a Maori is the dichotomy between the rural and urban areas. Each area is encoded with features which rely on stereotypical attributes to distinguish one from the other. The rural area, for example, is depicted as New Zealand’s “heartland”, whereas the urban centres are characterised as potentially dangerous, especially for Māori. In a scene reminiscent of Rawi’s mother in Broken Barrier (1952), Tama’s mother observes, upon his leaving, that “the city won’t get him down”, which alludes to the experiences of other Māori who have been changed by the city. What is suggested is the allusion to the “dangers” of the urban centres for Māori, and how Māori, once located in the cities, become corrupted or “inauthentic”. Hayward draws on the established trope that Māori court danger and may lose their essential “Māoriness” when leaving their “natural” rural environs. In this fashion, the city is portrayed as a modern-day kai tangata (eater of humanity), which cannibalises Māori and turns Māori from being essentially good to potentially dangerous. As do other directors, such as O’Shea, Barclay, Mita, Tamahori and Caro, Hayward uses location as a parable for the potential corruption of Māori who move to an urbanised environment.

Although the distinction between rural and urban Māori is a recurring pattern in New Zealand’s cinematic record, it is important to note that by the 1970s, many Māori were into the second-generation of urbanisation (Reeves 1979, p.10). For example, between 1940 to 1963 the Māori population in the urban centres would rise from 10% to 60%. From the 1980s onwards, the majority of the Māori population were urbanised and approximately 80% live in the city centres. It is suggested that Hayward was presenting the rural Māori stereotype as a contemporary phenomenon, when in fact rurally-based Māori were the minority at the time of the film’s production.
9.5 Race-relations and racial discrimination

The subject of race-relations was one of the key local issues which David Ausubel identified as tenuous in New Zealand during the 1960s and as having the potential for conflict. Hayward was motivated to produce *To Love a Maori* in order to stir the public consciousness on race-relations which suggests the issue was topical. Ausubel (1960, p.230) predicted that:

*Maori-pakeha relations will gradually deteriorate until a series of minor explosions will compel the adoption of preventive and remedial measures. The Bennett Affair is only the first of a long series of unpleasant incidents that will erupt in the next decade.*

This situation will intensify Maori racial nationalism and eventually compel Maori leaders to dig their heads out of the sand and organize a self-protective movement similar to that of the National Association for the Advancement of Coloured People in the United States.

As a progressive nation, two of the core New Zealand ideals centred upon racial and social equality for all. New Zealand’s role as a model for race-relations had been inculcated into the consciousness of successive generations of New Zealanders. Since the 1950s, however, the limitation of New Zealand as a model for race-relations had been raised in works such as John O’Shea’s *Broken Barrier* (1952). Similar themes of discriminatory practices toward Maori can be found in Noel Hilliard’s work *Maori Girl* (1960), which was written in the social-realist genre and in New Zealand terms, became a considerable commercial success (see Robinson and Wattie 1998). Hilliard’s work would in fact, become a tetralogy with the accompanying texts of *Power of Joy* (1965), *Maori Woman* (1974) and *The Glory and the Dream* (1978). Primarily, the subject matter of *Maori Girl* focused on the widespread practice of racial discrimination for Maori in the urban centres of New Zealand society.

These works identified colour barriers for Maori, racial discrimination and social inequalities. At this time, for example, it was a common practice to advertise rental housing for “Europeans only” (Belich 2000, p.190). These factors are identified in *To Love a Maori*, where there is a directive code that such attitudes are not progressive and in fact, were unjust. This is best illustrated when Tama and Penny marry and try to find accommodation. The young couple are turned away by a number of landlords and agents when they see Tama. In a key scene, one agent states to Tama and Penny that “the landlord will not have Islanders or Maoris”.
In *To Love a Maori*, characters that hold racist and classist attitudes, such as Penny’s parents, are depicted as hypocritical, untrustworthy and are censured accordingly. In a pivotal scene, Fancy, who is a drug courier and tries to initiate Riki into a life of crime, is depicted as the archetypal villain. Unbeknownst to Riki, Fancy has used Riki to carry drugs and when the deal turns sour, Fancy turns his rage upon Riki. Fancy swears at Riki (profanity has not been used in the film before this encounter) and ends the business relationship by saying, “this is what you get for trying to help dumb Māoris”. Thus, not only is Fancy treacherous, but he is racist as well.

Similarly to *Broken Barrier* (1952), the intersection between race/ethnicity in *To Love a Maori* centres on social status, where race/ethnicity is, in fact, equated with class. This theme is identified in a pivotal scene between Penny and her mother, Mrs Davis. Both Mr and Mrs Davis make reference to how Penny’s relationship with Tama will be perceived in their social circle, which is mainly Pākehā and wealthy. Penny responds to her mother’s criticisms by saying “you are worried about your status”, which in this instance, refers to social position in New Zealand society. Further, in a conversation with a lawyer-friend on the golf course, Mr Davis states “Māoris are not welcome in our social circle”.

These comments reinforce where Māori were situated in the strata of New Zealand society and clearly reveal that it was not the same stratum that the Davis family inhabited. What this means is that “to love a Māori” in the 1960s and 1970s was to be associated with the lower social orders of New Zealand society. In this fashion *To Love a Maori* reveals similar attitudes to *Broken Barrier* (1952) in the intersection between race/ethnicity and social standing in New Zealand society.

In *To Love a Maori*, the subject of racial discrimination is addressed and moral claims are made against characters, such as the Davises, who hold racist attitudes. There is a tendency, however, to minimise racial discrimination or obscure the effects of the same by providing solutions to the problems, rather than addressing the subject. Racism is characterised as the product of the older generation, such as the Davises or of people wanting to take advantage of Māori like Fancy. The film suggests that the answer to racial discrimination is to ally with other people that have faced social oppression.

On examination there appeared to be the common practice of denying the existence of widespread racial discrimination or of rationalising the issues by suggesting New Zealand
had better race-relations than other parts of the world. For example, writing in response to Ausubel’s work, for example, G Kemble-Welch (1960, p.52) wrote:

Two of his [Ausubel’s] claims – that Māori are discriminated against in hotels and barred from work in banks – would meet fairly general agreement. When the controlling companies deny that it is their policy, they may be examples of the hypocritical ostrich which he seems to think should be our national bird. But this is a minute fragment of our way of life and is not evidence of a general colour bar.

The practice of racial discrimination was, however, more widespread than Kemble-Welch acknowledged. As James Belich (2001, p.190) notes, in 1959 Dr Harry Bennett was refused service in an Auckland bar on the grounds of being Māori and in a survey of hotels, which was conducted in 1958, one-quarter refused to accept a booking by letter when a Māori name was supplied. Thus, there was the contradiction of racial harmony in theory, but racial discrimination in practice.

Although films such as Broken Barrier (1952) and To Love a Maori acknowledged racial discrimination, there appears to be a directive code embedded in the cinematic accounts, which appeals to maintaining harmonious race-relations, rather than addressing actual racism. Further, New Zealand may have had better race-relations than other countries, but this does not necessarily equate to being a model for racial harmony. From the 1970s onwards, New Zealand’s self-image as a model for race-relations would be tested by the broader protest movements, which had as one of their core issues the subject of racism.

**9.6 Assimilation-integration; the Hunn Report (1961)**

In the 1950s and 1960s, the Māori population was subject to a number of social experiments, under the guise of “modernising” New Zealand (see Belich, 1996; King 2004; Walker 1990a). Schemes such as “pepper-potting” Māori families in the state housing areas were designed to speed up the assimilation process. A number of migrant groups, such as the Dutch, also experienced “pepper-potting” in the 1950s where the main motivation was to “blend” peoples into a national New Zealand identity (Lochore 1951). From post-World War II until the 1970s, the State-directed policy of assimilation-integration was implemented by successive governments.

It is argued that the policy on integration sustained the belief that New Zealand was a country without racial problems and was focused on achieving universal “equality”. While the
rhetoric of the policy was based on equity between Māori and Pākehā, its application reveals a different view. The rhetoric of assimilationist-integrationist policy is best reflected (and lastly articulated) in the Hunn Report (1961). The Hunn Report would gain infamy in the following decades and be used as an example of institutional racism.

The Hunn Report was a review of the Department of Māori Affairs that made a number of far-reaching recommendations on social reforms regarding the Māori population. One of the key recommendations was that Māori relocate from the rural areas to the city centres to fill the work shortages and enable the alienation of Māori land under the guise of “progress” (Hunn 1961, p.15). Commensurate with Hunn’s view was the idea that if the Māori population was urbanised, then Māori land could be utilised and brought under Crown title. The Hunn Report categorised the Māori population into three distinct groups:

1. A completely detribalised minority.
2. The main body, pretty much at home in either society.
3. Another minority complacently living a backward life in primitive conditions.

A number of the propositions underpinning the Hunn Report are evident in To Love a Maori, with the characterisation of Māori figures into three distinct groups. The Māori criminal, who dupes Riki, symbolises the detribalised minority; the character of Tama exemplifies the educated Māori man who can function in both societies; and the Māori characters on the East Coast, who are viewed through the eyes of Penny’s parents, are depicted as the “primitives”. What this suggests is that the normative assumptions about Māori, which were exhibited and legitimated in social policy, affected an acceptance of stereotypes that are clearly evident in To Love a Maori (Berger and Luckmann 1966; Berger, Ridgeway, Fisek and Norman 1998, pp. 379-405). In turn, these views give weight to Berger and Luckmann’s argument (1966), that beliefs about identities, about kinds of people and their attributes, legitimate actions in accordance with dominant categories.

9.6.1 Assimilation-integration, the Hunn Report and notions of racial equality

As an historical document, the Hunn Report provides a salient example of the State’s active construction of Māori identity perpetuated under the guise of national interest. While the integration and assimilation of Māori into mainstream New Zealand society were State goals for “harmony”, these were not necessarily beneficial for the Māori population. Policies couched within the auspices of a national “good”, such as the modernising of Māori land into
Crown title, were instrumental in the further alienation of remaining tribal lands. As would become apparent, the theoretical propositions contained in the Hunn Report, while possibly well-intentioned expressions of political liberalism, were fundamentally detrimental to the Māori population.

Although the document was released under a National government, the Hunn Report was commissioned by the Labour Government and at a time when the Labour Party held the four Māori seats. The Labour-Māori alliance was one of the most enduring political alliances between Māori and the State in the 20th Century (Belich 2000), though in the 1990s and early 21st Century, the relationship became increasingly fractured. National’s Minister of Māori Affairs, Ralph Hanan, implemented the findings of the Hunn Report throughout the 1960s and 1970s and in particular certain aspects of the report, such as the elimination of legislation which contained “differentiation between Māoris and Europeans”. These “differences” were characterised as beneficial to race-relations by removing the distinctions between the two populations which centred on Māori land and culture. For example, Hunn (1961) identified 58 instances of “Māori privilege”; 35 instances of “Māori disability”; 69 instances of “Māori protection” and 102 instances of “different procedures” which would be fast-tracked by the Government to speed up the assimilation process. Arguably, the 58 instances of “Māori privilege” were protections against further Crown encroachment on Māori land and resources.

The above factors may have been couched within the idea of “national interest”, but they were controversial, and Hunn himself saw the potential for dispute. Hunn commented that “here and there are Māoris who resent the pressure brought to bear on them to conform to what they regard as the Pākehā mode of life”. He then went onto rationalise any opposition to his policies by making an appeal to those who wished to live a “modern way of life, common to advanced people” (Hunn 1961, p.16).

While Hunn foresaw the possibility of dissent from the Māori population, it is probable that he could not anticipate the extent of opposition in the decades which followed. The Hunn Report became a symbol of institutional racism and received widespread criticism. It is important to note that Hunn produced his report based on dominant ideas circulating in New Zealand society regarding the assimilation of Māori in order to present the country as “modern” and progressive.
The self-confidence with which Hunn dismissed potential conflict amongst the Māori population on his findings appears naïve today, but there has been a long-standing tradition in New Zealand of advancing particular points of view to Māori groups under the rationale of national interest. This factor is best illustrated by the comments of Dr Bruce Biggs (in *Te Ao Hou* June 1961, p.1) when presenting the findings of the Hunn Report to the Northland Young Māori Leaders Conference:

… the process attempted by policy changes should take Māori opinion carefully into account [and] there was some danger … that European rather than Māori opinion may be attempting to set the pace … the Hunn Report, in our view, takes full cognisance of it.

The comment by Biggs illustrates an interesting peculiarity in New Zealand society, which is to present authoritative visions to Māori groups about where Māori should be situated in the national framework, without collaboration between the respective populations. Hayward is also presenting a vision to New Zealand society of how Māori should function inside the nation-state, by using strong directive codes where national interests quite clearly take precedence.

Further key ideas found in the Hunn Report, such as intermarriage and integration which were used to advance a progressive, blended New Zealand society, are also evident in the film. A factor made explicit when Penny and Tama are congratulated at their wedding for “achieving integration”. Moreover, in the encounter between Deirdre and Mrs Davis, where Mrs Davis is critical of Tama and Penny’s relationship, Deirdre responds with “the Government encourages integration” and “it [integration] is an approved policy of the Government”. In these exchanges what is explicitly articulated, as a progressive view of race-relations, are the views embedded in social policy and in particular, the Hunn Report.

9.7 The intersection of social policy and the arts: the State as ally

Although *To Love a Maori* is characterised as an examination of race-relations in New Zealand society, designed to “stir the national conscience”, there is one notable omission in Hayward’s critique, namely the State. The State would become a major target of protest in the 1970s, but it is excluded from criticism in the film. In fact, social policy and the authorities of the State are utilised to legitimate the differing social attitudes between the generations. In *To Love a Maori*, State policies are implicitly posited as ways forward for
progress on a wide range of issues, such as education, housing and employment. Tama, for example, is encouraged to enter the teaching profession by his teacher at the Auckland Polytechnic in the hope that “one day you [Māori] will be teaching here”.

Similarly, Tama’s Aunty (played by Ramai Hayward) makes the comment that she is awaiting a State House in order to accommodate her family coming to the city from the rural areas, and integration is posited as the best way for the two peoples to become closer. Thus State policy is covertly utilised in the film to reinforce and legitimate national interests with reference to Māori. In a pivotal scene where Riki has been duped into standing as lookout in an attempted burglary, it is the Police who are portrayed as “fatherly” by allowing Riki a second chance beyond a life of crime. Riki takes this opportunity to avoid potential criminality by joining the New Zealand Army. In this fashion Hayward directly uses the State as an ally to endorse his vision of race-relations in the film.

The association of Māori and the Army is a subtle message, especially as the Vietnam War was taking place when the film was produced. Although Riki’s aunty is at first opposed to the idea of him joining the Army, Riki’s eventual career-path is presented as a positive outcome in the film. In contemporary times the association of Māori and the army is still strong, and the armed services is a place where “warrior culture” can be authentically expressed for the good of the nation. Hayward returns to his nation-building roots and as in Rewi’s Last Stand, draws on the image of the prowess of historical Māori military deeds in To Love a Māori.

In the social context of the 1960s and 1970s, however, issues such as opposition to the Vietnam War and the rise of political unrest regarding race-relations in New Zealand society, were beginning to gain public attention. At the time the film was produced, there was strong opposition to the Vietnam War both at home and abroad. Yet Hayward associates Māori, through the character of Riki, with the Armed Services as a positive contribution to the nation for the recuperation of potential criminals.

At the national level, there were the beginnings of protest movements associated with Māori issues, such as the alienation of Māori land, the Treaty of Waitangi, and institutional racism. Primarily, a number of the protest leaders had been influenced by radical politics from overseas which will be discussed further below. What is suggested is that Hayward’s presentation of a blended New Zealand society where allied groups coalesce against the “establishment” was, in actuality, an appeal to maintain national and “racial” harmony inside
the nation-state. The vision Hayward presents in his film is not a radical view of changing the “establishment”, but an appeal to maintain the status quo with a societal-level shift in attitudes. In essence Hayward vests his hope for harmonious race-relations and a harmonious New Zealand society in the attitudinal change of the younger generation. A sentiment also contained in Niki Caro’s film, *Whale Rider* (2002).

### 9.8 Political unrest – rugby and radicals

The sport of rugby, which was the national game of New Zealand and had once been used as a model of egalitarianism between the “races”, became instead a symbol of the hypocrisy regarding race-relations (Phillips 1996). The importance of rugby as a metaphor for racial harmony featured in the film *Broken Barrier* (1952), where Tom and Rawi attend a rugby match, and Tom wishes the “races” could always get along so well. In the years to come, however, rugby as a symbol of racial harmony would become increasingly politicised and the focus of civil unrest during the Springbok Tour of New Zealand in 1981.

In 1960 there was opposition to the exclusion of Māori and Pacific Islanders in the national team when playing South Africa. Opponents of the tour to South Africa adopted the slogan “No Māoris, No Tour” and although they were unsuccessful in 1960, they did stop the proposed All Black tour in 1967. The protests against the exclusion of Māori and Pacific Islanders in the All Blacks touring team would result in the South Africans relenting in 1970 and allowing a fully representative New Zealand team to play in the country (see Templeton 1998).

New Zealand’s sporting links with South Africa provided an interesting paradox within the context of race-relations. If New Zealand was the model for race-relations, then South Africa, under apartheid, was the antithesis. When Tama, for example, suggest that Mr Davis should “go and live in South Africa”, he was making reference to the apartheid system, about which New Zealanders had become cognisant through opposition to continued sporting links with South Africa. It is important to note, however, that the example of South Africa was used in a contradictory fashion. It reinforced the idea that New Zealand did not have a “race” problem in comparison with countries like South Africa and also served to remind Māori that there were countries where other “native races” did not fare so well.

This theme is made explicit throughout *To Love a Maori* by characters such as Penny and Mrs Davis. In a discussion with Tama, Penny reminds the audience that Māori are “the most
advanced race in the world”, to explain why she is in a relationship with Tama and to reinforce the idea of New Zealand being a progressive country. Conversely, Mrs Davis makes the comment that Māori are “the best treated race in the world and should start acting like it”, which serves to remind Māori that other groups of people in an international context have not been treated as well. These comments, however, serve dual purposes. Firstly, the statements continue to promulgate the notion of New Zealand as an exemplar for race-relations, but do not address the issue of growing dissent at the national level on matters of race/ethnicity. Secondly, the comments seek to remind Māori that they should know their place within New Zealand’s national framework.

9.8.1 Portents of Māori radicalism

The early portents of “Māori activism” came in the shape of two newsletters, *Te Hokioi* and MOOHR. The MOOHR newsletter originated from the Māori Organisation on Human Rights. *Te Hokioi* was named after the original Waikato newspaper of Te Tuhui and King Tawhiao. The newsletter appeared in 1968 and was called “a taiaha of truth for the Māori nation” and raised issues such as: “the pollution of shellfish resources by the aluminium smelter in the South Island, the stripping of paua beds along the Wairarapa coast by commercial divers, and the commercial exploitation of greenstone in the Arahura Māori Reserve …” (Walker 1990a, p.208).

Importantly, the newsletter linked these issues to the Treaty of Waitangi. The aims of MOOHR focussed on defending human rights, the erosion of Māori rights by legislation, and opposition to racial discrimination in housing, employment, sport, and politics. Similarly to *Te Hokioi*, MOOHR advocated upholding the Treaty of Waitangi and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, accusing the education system of “cultural murder” for the lack of inclusion of the Māori language in school curricula (Walker 1990a, p.210).

It is important to note that both *Te Hokioi* and MOOHR had strong left-wing leanings and were closely aligned with class struggles. In the following years, the “class” orientation in Māori protest movements would be superseded by a focus on identity politics, but in the social context of 1960s and 1970s, the Māori protest groups formed part of a coalition of groups fighting against all forms of oppression. Within this coalition, there was a strong intersection between class and race/ethnicity. For example, a close working relationship was formed between Pākehā anti-racist groups such as CARE and HART, and Māori groups who were opposed to sporting relations with the South African apartheid regime.
It was, however, the group Ngā Tamatoa (the warrior children), which would become the public face of radical Māori youth in the late 1960s and early 1970s. By the time, Hayward was making *To Love a Maori*, the actions of Ngā Tamatoa had begun to gain public attention. A number of the leaders of Ngā Tamatoa were university-educated and styled themselves upon radical individuals and groups, such as Malcolm X and the Black Power movements overseas. In 1971, Ngā Tamatoa targeted the Government’s celebrations of the Treaty of Waitangi on Waitangi Day and protested by wearing black arm-bands, declaring the day a time of mourning, instead of celebration (Walker 1990a, p.211).

In 1972, Ngā Tamatoa would be instrumental in organising a petition to recognise the Māori Language, an initiative which would come to fruition with the Māori Language Act in 1987. The public display of protest and targeting of Waitangi Day, as New Zealand’s national birthday, was a strategically devised example of disharmony on the part of Ngā Tamatoa. Primarily Ngā Tamatoa targeted symbols of national identity, racial harmony and the place of Māori inside New Zealand society. Thus, Ngā Tamatoa’s actions presented a serious challenge to the views Hayward examined in his films.

As in *Rewi’s Last Stand* (1940), Hayward is using the cinematic account to constrain debates in relation to issues of race-relations which were occurring in New Zealand society at the time. Although *To Love a Maori* precedes some of the most significant protests centring on Māori issues, radical political activists were already coming to public attention. Hayward, however, depicted a vision of New Zealand where Māori and Pākehā would retain national harmony, if only the cultural nationalist generation would reconsider its attitudes toward race/ethnicity, class and gender. It is argued that Hayward’s film was an appeal to the radical elements of the Māori protest movement and supporters, in which the director was promoting racial harmony and urging Māori to seek commonality with oppressed groups inside the national framework, rather than seeking independence.

### 9.9 Gender: inter-ethnic love affairs and contested masculinities

As discussed, one of the last social taboos to be broken in New Zealand film was the relationship between Māori men and Pākehā women. Although inter-ethnic love affairs have been used historically to explore the relationship between Māori and Pākehā, the established, acceptable trope was relationships between Māori women and Pākehā men. The changing societal attitudes toward issues such as race/ethnicity, class and gender, are reflected in the portrayal of an inter-ethnic love affair between a Māori male character, Tama and a Pākehā
female, Penny. There had been relationships between Māori men and Pākehā women in New Zealand society, but such interactions were largely ignored in the cinematic accounts. The absence of Māori men-Pākehā women relationships suggests a moral and ideological code in operation which censored certain aspects of social relations in film. Considering there was intermarriage between Māori men and Pākehā women, the absence in the cinematic records suggests early 20th century social mores may have been more rigid than in the 19th century.

It is important to note, however, that Māori men resented the general acceptance of the double standard whereby Māori woman could marry Pākehā men but not vice versa. At Bristol in 1863, for example, the entertainer Horomona Te Atua (quoted in Belich 1996, p.253) made his views to an English audience explicit by stating:

*He had not seen the laws had had the effect of making the English and Māori nations one nation. In his opinion, the best plan to unite them would be that the two races should marry together (laughter and applause) … Some of the New Zealand women [Māori] had married English settlers, but the British ladies had not married with the Māories (laughter) … New Zealanders were anxious to give their females to Europeans, but their example had not been followed by the English (cheers and laughter).*

As discussed in *Rewi’s Last Stand* (1925/1940) and *Broken Barrier* (1952), there has been a strong association between race/ethnicity, and social status in New Zealand’s cinematic accounts. Inter-ethnic relationships in film between Māori women and Pākehā men have centred on the notion of “marrying-up” for Māori women and “marrying-down” for Pākehā men. In *To Love a Maori*, there is an inversion of this stereotype, where Penny, the daughter of a wealthy Pākehā family, marries an impoverished Māori man, Tama. The relationship between Penny and Tama is used as a metaphor for transcending race/ethnicity and class issues. This is evidenced by the reunion of Penny and her parents following the birth of her and Tama’s son. Mr Davis, who has exhibited racist and classist attitudes throughout the film proclaims, “I want to see my grandson”. There is a directive code at play suggesting that the intangible emotion of love can help to transcend unsavoury attitudes.

As with the relationships of Bob and Ariana, and Tom and Rawi; the relationship between Tama and Penny symbolises the future direction of New Zealand, away from the old cultural nationalist ideals toward a more progressive nation. In *To Love a Maori* progress is where
societal attitudes toward race/ethnicity, class and gender are re-examined and become more equitable. The relationship of Penny and Tama offers the possibility of amalgamating Māori and Pākehā with a new ‘twist’. Whereas Ariana and Rawi offered the opportunity of advancing settlement and modernism respectively, Penny’s relationship with Tama offers the potential of Pākehā becoming “native”.

This theme is made explicit in a key scene, where Penny and Tama return to Tama’s tribal area. While on the beach, Tama asks Penny “What does it feel like to be a Māori”? Penny replies “It feels like freedom”. What this scene reveals is that by throwing off the shackles of civilisation and social conformity, Penny is brought closer to nature by her association with Tama. Thus, the adoption of certain aspects of Māori cultural life is a tonic for repressed cultural nationalist New Zealand society.

One of the key differences advanced by Hayward in To Love a Maori regarding a new national identity is the idea that Pākehā have the opportunity to be assimilated into Māori cultural life. As Penny herself states on the subject “It’s [Māori culture] part of our lives and we should be exploring it”. The clear message is that if New Zealanders were to adopt positive aspects of Māori cultural life the entire nation could become more liberated.

9.9.1 The objectification of the Māori warrior

One of the key ways in which Māori and Pākehā are encouraged to “explore” each other is through sexual relations. Penny and Tama’s relationship exemplifies this position where there is an overt focus on sexuality throughout the film and in particular, on Māori male virility. On first encounter Tama and Penny meet at a new dance show based upon “race-relations” through the inter-marriage of Māori and Pākehā. The sexual attraction between the two peoples is emphasised and made explicit when the narrator of the show states “Although some parents don’t want their children to marry Māori, some are irresistibly drawn to each other”. What this suggests is that the relationship between Māori and Pākehā has been antagonistic in terms of settlement history, but that there has been a strong tradition of sexual relations between the two groups of people.

The sexual theme is utilised throughout the film to explain Penny’s interest in Tama, setting the platform to adopt certain aspects of Māori cultural life to facilitate mutual integration. When Tama takes Penny to a museum to see whakairo (Māori carving), they muse over the carvings where male genitalia are exhibited. The carvings are linked to Māori male virility,
which creates a sexually charged atmosphere between Tama and Penny. Tama deflects the tension between himself and Penny by stating, in reference to the carvings “You Europeans are not used to our uninhibited ways”. Coupled with the comments above on “freedom”, this interaction suggests a relationship with a Māori man might release the sexual inhibitions of repressed European women.

This idea about sexual inhibition was a central theme of the sexual revolution, a key feature of the counter-culture and feminist movements. As discussed above, there is a strong feminist theme in To Love a Maori, which is evident in the comments made by of Deirdre to Mrs Davis. Deirdre alludes to the objectification of the South Seas maiden by European men and extends this further by saying, “Now it is our [European women’s] turn”. In this scene Deirdre is equating gender equality with the freedom to objectify Māori men. It appears that Deirdre’s vision of gender equity is the inversion of sexualising Māori women by transferring the object of desire to Māori men. Thus, Māori are still objects for desire by Europeans, but the freedom for European women to objectify Māori men is advanced in the film as a progressive change in societal attitudes.

While the film inverts the inter-ethnic love affair, there is continuation of the notion of exceptionalism in the character of Tama. Tama is presented as an exceptional young Māori man, who is embracing both the opportunities available in modern New Zealand, such as education, and the future with Penny. As evidenced, Tama and Penny’s relationship transcends racial/ethnic and class barriers. What this suggests is that the promise of a better New Zealand is couched within the intermarriage of Penny and Tama, a woman from the highest levels of European society and an educated Māori man.

9.9.2 The dangerous foreigner – Māori women as victims

The international perception of New Zealand has motivated a number of directors to present “our own stories” or “local” views of the country in film. In the 1960s and 1970s for example, when Hayward was producing To Love a Maori, there had been criticism from visiting academics, such as Ausubel (1960) about New Zealand society and in particular, race-relations. The criticisms about New Zealand from the international arena were both unwelcome and summarily dismissed. The “idea of the international” is a key thematic in To Love a Maori and it is suggested that Hayward was responding to the dangerous influences from overseas in his work. The counter-culture, protest movements and radicalised youth were global phenomena, but had an impact at the national level. Primarily, groups such as
Ngā Tamatoa had been influenced by radical overseas politics which, as evidenced by some of the codes contained within the film, had the potential to cause conflict in New Zealand regarding race-relations.

As argued some of the codes embedded in To Love a Maori involved an appeal to the more radical elements of the Māori protest movement to maintain “racial harmony”, albeit with a change in attitudes on the part of the cultural nationalists. What is suggested is that the tensions generated by the international protest agenda and in particular, the potential for a dangerous alliance between Māori and overseas groups, is evident in the film. This theme is best illustrated in the scene where Mr Davis blames his racism toward Tama on Americans visitors whom the Davis family are expecting and who, according to Mr Davis “do not understand about our race-relations”.

On further examination, the dichotomy between the international and national, suggests that Māori may be mistreated or led astray by people from abroad. Commensurate with this view, the international is constructed as a “dangerous foreigner”, unfamiliar with the special place Māori hold in the national framework. This factor is best illustrated in a pivotal scene where Tama and Riki’s cousin, Tina, is kidnapped and raped by Russian sailors. In this striking plot twist, it transpires that Tina has been held hostage on a foreign vessel for four weeks and gang-raped by the Russian sailors. Tina’s eventual rescue by the State suggests the view that Māori are best served and protected from outsiders by those at home.

There are a number of points in this scene which coincide with other themes embedded in the film, regarding the situation of Māori in New Zealand society. The first is that Tina has run away from home and is headed to the city for excitement. Almost from the start, Tina is characterised as a potential victim fit for corruption in the city. Her character is introduced through the soundtrack of “Māori Girl”, which suggests that Tina has travelled far from home and should return. The song “Māori Girl” references Noel Hilliard’s work of the same name and this correlation suggests Tina will not find happiness in the city and it would be best for her to stay “at home” in the rural areas. As it transpires, the corruption of Tina in the city is immediate, as she is targeted by a foreign sailor on her first day there.

The second point to consider is the manner in which Tina is found and offered protection by the authorities of the State. Riki finds Tina at the Auckland port, where she is on the point of collapse. A police officer is walking by and notices Tina’s distressed and dishevelled state. He immediately calls for an ambulance, whereupon Tina is taken away to receive care and
protection after her ordeal. It is argued that this is a metaphor for the care and protection of Māori by the State. Thus, the State is depicted as the ally of Māori in this scene, where Māori are assured of protection from the dangers posed by the international. Further, in the final scenes of the film the Russian ship has been captured by the State authorities and forcibly returned to face charges regarding Tina’s rape.

Primarily, this scene serves as a warning to Māori women who run away from home and seek excitement in the “big city”. Tina’s punishment for disobeying her parents is to be gang-raped by Russian sailors over a period of four weeks where according to Tama’s aunty, “she [Tina] had been made use of”. Tina’s ordeal is portrayed as a moral tale where the naivety and unsophisticated rural Māori ”girl” is exploited by predators in society. There is however, an element of reproach directed toward Tina for causing her own downfall by running away from home and becoming prey to the Russian sailors.

**Conclusion**

In this chapter the main subjects examined have been the influence of the broader social, political and cultural issues in the depiction of race-relations in the cross-currents of the 1960s and 1970s. As argued, a number of influences at the international and national level are evident in *To Love a Maori*. There was an overt and explicit propagandist message in the film regarding race-relations where Hayward utilised key factors in the social context to address the Māori-Pākehā relationship and posit ways forward to maintain national harmony. Given some of the critical events occurring at the time when *To Love a Maori* was produced, it is evident that Hayward used the work to engage with some of the challenging contemporary ideas circulating in society, but also advocated maintaining the status quo with a societal shift in attitudes. This is also evident in the way that the film directly references State policy and depicts the State as an ally in New Zealand society. In the next chapter the film *Utu* (1983) is analysed. *Utu* (1983) continues the examination of New Zealand’s essential drama, but is informed by the aftermath of a period of considerable unrest and depicts the State in a different light.
Chapter Ten: Utu (1983)

Introduction

What are examined in this chapter are the influences on Māori subjectivity and race-relations in Geoff Murphy’s 1983 film, *Utu*. *Utu* is a seminal and subversive work in its re-examination of popular New Zealand myths regarding the settlement of New Zealand. The film was produced in the aftermath of the protest movements and the Springbok Tour (1981). One of the key thematics in *Utu* is redressing the historical balance of the representation of race-relations in the early cinematic accounts (such as *Rewi’s Last Stand* 1925 and 1940) which portrayed a civilised European settlement of New Zealand. Murphy sets *Utu* in the period of the Land Wars in the late 19th century, in the same era as *Rewi’s Last Stand* (1925/1940) and directly references Hayward when re-examining the myths of settlement from a 1980s perspective, thereby exposing the ideological slants in earlier works. Murphy’s *Utu* is less chivalrous and certain than Hayward’s work, as when Murphy was presenting his work the established tropes of Māori as a noble but vanquished foe could no longer be taken for granted.

In earlier works such as *Rewi’s Last Stand* (1925/1940), *Broken Barrier* (1952) and *To Love a Maori* (1972) there were strong moral directives, to both Pākehā and Māori, regarding “race-relations” and national harmony. One of the key differences between *Utu* and those accounts is the theme of moral ambivalence towards race-relations. There are, however, codes regarding the possible future for Māori and Pākehā in *Utu*, but there are, for example, very few characters, like Reverend Morgan, utilised to make moral claims regarding the settlement of New Zealand. Outlined in this chapter are key events in the social context that influenced how race-relations are examined in *Utu*, such as the Māori protest movements, the Springbok Tour and the ideological shift away from cultural nationalist views toward biculturalism. There is also a section that critically examines the use of gender to represent particular social forces regarding race-relations.

It is important to note that the term “utu” is often described as ritualised vengeance, but as a concept, it is broader than its popular use. The term “utu” is better described as reciprocity or restoring balance, which is a key theme in the film and linked conceptually to the moral ambiguity evident in the main narrative threads of the work. There are four main narrative threads in *Utu* which overlap and interweave in the film, and are drawn together in the final resolution. The first centres on the former Crown soldier, Te Wheke who, after a military
mistake that kills his family, seeks vengeance against the army and raises an armed group to resist settlement. The second thread focuses on Lieutenant Scott [“Lt. Scott”], an army officer and a New Zealander by birth, who is charged with capturing Te Wheke and falls in love with a Māori woman, Kura. The third storyline is framed around Williamson, a settler, whose wife, Emily, is killed in one of Te Wheke’s raids. Williamson seeks vengeance upon Te Wheke, the man Williamson holds responsible for Emily’s death. The fourth narrative thread centres on Wiremu, a soldier in the army who is an ambiguous character and only reveals his position at the end of the film.

10.1 Social context: New Zealand 1983

The year 1983 marks a significant moment in New Zealand’s artistic and literary achievements. Keri Hulme completed the bone people, which would win the Booker McConnell Prize for literature in 1985. Donna Awatere would publish the last article of a polemical trilogy in Broadsheet magazine entitled ‘Beyond the Noble Savage’ (1983). Awatere’s trilogy would be republished in 1984 under the title Māori Sovereignty and there would be implications for the direction of race-relations and public social policy as a result of this document. In the years following, Hulme’s novel the bone people would be received in a controversial and contradictory fashion. CK Stead would criticise Hulme on the grounds of her racial/ethnic inauthenticity to write as a Maori and Joy Cowley would thank the author for “giving us, us” (Stead 1986, pp.159-161; Cowley and Blank 1984, p.60).

There is a metaphor in Stead and Cowley’s divergent views which centres on race-relations. After a period of civil unrest from 1975-1981, what it meant to be “us” [New Zealanders] was somewhat in dispute. As discussed in the previous chapters, historically what it meant to be New Zealanders centred on the three traditional ideals of racial and social equality, and welfare for all. A significant part of New Zealand’s national identity and international profile was based upon the idea that the country was a model for “race-relations”. In the actual social context the film Utu entered, however, self-confident claims regarding racial harmony had receded and appeared to belong to another era.

By 1983, the subject of race-relations had become a topic fraught with tension and fractious politics. These tensions are evident in the comments made by the Race Relations Conciliator, Hiwi Tauroa, in the book Race Against Time (1982), which predicted that New Zealand was on the brink of “irreconcilable racial conflict” (Tauroa 1982). This theme of uncertainty regarding “race-relations” is evident in the film, Utu and there is, as will be discussed further
below, an atmosphere in the film which suggests it was the “End of the Golden Weather” for New Zealand’s innocence on a wide range of issues. Geoff Murphy (quoted in Dennis and Beiringa 1992, pp. 130-149), sums up the mood of the nation with his comments following the success of his film *Goodbye Pork Pie*:

*Inflation was running at double figures, people were beginning to queue at the dole office, Māori people outraged to find themselves treated as second-class citizens were being dubbed as ‘radicals’, and the country was beginning to slip downhill economically, socially and racially. Suddenly here was a film [Goodbye Pork Pie] where the heroes didn’t buy any of this shit. And it was funny. … It was the last laugh.*

As indicated by Murphy’s comments, New Zealand’s future direction was uncertain in a number of key areas, such as economics and race-relations - which were key issues Ausbel had identified in 1960. Beginning less than a year after the release of *Utu* there would be a period of reform which would herald a different era in New Zealand. From this period of reform, the ideology of “one nation - one people”, within modernist and cultural nationalist terms would formally give way to neo-liberalism, and biculturalism (see Fleras and Spoonley 1999). Officially, the country would not become bicultural until 1985, after the Fourth Labour Government came to power, but as can be seen in *Utu*, there is a sense that change in the country’s ethnic relations was inevitable. How the country would change, however, was yet to be decided in 1983, as that time precedes the adoption of biculturalism and the reframing of New Zealand’s history through this lens. In this fashion, *Utu* is an important historical account because it was produced when New Zealand was on the cusp of ideological change, but not quite yet there.

**10.1.1 Social and economic change**

As discussed, economics has been a primary influence on policies underpinning race-relations. In *Broken Barrier* (1952), for example, it was argued that one of the themes influencing the representation of Māori was to portray Māori farmers as core contributors to the country’s economy. In the social context in which *Utu* was produced the economic fortunes of New Zealand had begun to change. With the collapse of the “long boom” and the Middle-Eastern OPEC oil shock, New Zealand faced an economic crisis as its terms of trade
fell precipitously. In 1973, Britain, New Zealand’s major trading partner, joined the European Economic Community (“EEC” now known as the “EU”), a move which effectively shut out its former colonies in the Commonwealth.

Arguably, for the first time in New Zealand’s history, the country truly was in a position to forge a sense of nationhood, away from Great Britain. As discussed in Rewi’s Last Stand (1925/194) and Broken Barrier (1952), the notion of being “Better Britons” had underpinned the Māoriland and cultural nationalist eras. By the time Utu was produced, however, independence had been forced upon New Zealand. What is suggested is that the relationship between Māori and Pākehā became of primary importance in the reconstruction of New Zealand’s sense of nationhood, at the very time when race-relations, and the future direction of the country were uncertain and subject to rising tension. In this fashion, Murphy is writing back to the confident assertions contained within New Zealand’s profile of having the “best race-relations” in the world, evident in earlier works and the dominant views that justified the assimilationist-integrationist policies where Māori would become “Brown Britons”.

**10.2 The importance of birth-place**

There is in Utu the drawing of a sense of commonality through birth-place between Māori and Pākehā, and the creation of a distance from Britain. This theme is evident in the interactions between Wiremu and Lt. Scott, who draw a connection based on birth-place. When the audience is introduced to the character of Lt. Scott, he makes a point of informing the British Officer, Colonel Elliot, that he [Scott] “was born here”. Wiremu reinforces this connection, through birthplace, when he comments to Scott that, “like you, Lt. Scott, I was born here”. It is argued that the connection of birthplace to the characters is a metaphor for difference in attitudes between the “old world” and the new.

The character of Colonel Elliot is used as a representative of the British class system in order to differentiate between the “old world” of the Empire and the new. Elliot is portrayed as effeminate, homosexual, classist, racist and has an arrogance bordering on mental instability. In a scene where Wiremu takes the opportunity to shoot and kill Colonel Elliot in the confusion of an ambush, Wiremu and the settler Williamson share a conspiratorial moment. After Wiremu shoots Colonel Elliot, Williamson asks Wiremu in te reo Māori “Has fate decided his time has come”? Wiremu responds, “Yes, exactly”. When Scott asks Wiremu and Williamson what they are discussing, Williamson covers for Wiremu saying in English “They [Te Wheke’s people] just got Elliot”.

What the above scenes set in place is the notion that there are still common bonds between Māori and Pākehā which are set in opposition to Great Britain. The end of the Empire and New Zealand as a colonial “outpost” of Britain is symbolised by the death of Colonel Elliot. Drawing commonality through place of origin and differentiation from Britain has not been without controversy. Reid Perkins (1996, p.17) identified Michael Black’s *Pictures* (1982) and Geoff Murphy’s *Utu* (1983) as a:

… crucial shift in the cinematic representation of our nineteenth century past; though not, I would argue, any kind of a clean break. For while they differ significantly from earlier films in their willingness to point an accusatory finger at the injustice and destructiveness of colonialism, important elements of continuity remain in terms of an ongoing endeavour to construct an affirmative Pākehā identity … Now, it is much more their [Pākehā] instinctive sense of affinity with the indigenous landscape and its people, which identifies the commendable European characters of these films as progenitors of an authentically Pākehā identity.

While evidence could be found to support Perkins’ comments in the film, it is important to note these statements were made in a different social context from the one which influenced *Utu*. Perkins’ statement, for example, is made in retrospect and at some distance from a period characterised by unprecedented political activism in New Zealand’s history. What is argued is that the events directly preceding *Utu* are pivotal in understanding the messages conveyed in the film and in connecting the work to ideas circulating in the social context in which the intended audience would constitute meaning.

**10.3 The protest movements - 1973-1983**

As discussed in the chapter on *To Love a Maori* (1972), the portents of “Māori” radicalism had begun to gain public attention in the 1970s. From 1973 to 1983 New Zealand witnessed significant protests which would change the direction of the nation’s policies. In 1972, the incoming third Labour Government had campaigned with the slogan “It’s time for a change” and as it eventuated, “change” would characterise this period, whether by force or design. The protest movements of the 1970s and 1980s would expose a rift in New Zealand society, based upon different political leanings. Primarily, these issues would centre on race-relations and the Treaty of Waitangi, which had begun to gain prominence in the public domain. As
argued, groups such as Ngā Tamatoa became the public face of radicalised Māori youth and were involved in a number of highly-profiled protests, such as the Waitangi Day celebrations in 1971. It is important to note that one of the primary targets of protest groups in the 1970s would be the State, its institutions and celebrations of national identity, such as Waitangi Day. Since the 1940s, Waitangi Day had become a day of celebrating nationhood, but in the 1970s, the national day of celebration would be the focus of unresolved issues regarding race-relations and the Treaty of Waitangi.

A struggle ensued over the celebration of Waitangi Day and commemoration of outstanding issues around Māori grievances which still holds true today. Primarily, symbols of nationhood became targets of protest by groups, whereas in earlier times they had been used as emblems of national unity. In 1973 the State sought to circumvent the challenges to nationhood and race-relations by renaming and reframing Waitangi Day to “New Zealand Day”. The Labour Government led by Norman Kirk introduced the New Zealand Day Act, which superseded Waitangi Day. One of the quintessential images of the Norman Kirk era is the Prime Minister holding the hand of a young Māori boy walking across the Treaty grounds. This image was, as Michael Bassett (2004) stated, to symbolise “a new era of race-relations”. It did, but not in the way Kirk had hoped.

The new ceremony of nationhood (New Zealand Day) presented an irresistible challenge to Ngā Tamatoa, who protested and declared the day one of mourning for the loss of 25.2 million hectares of Māori land (Walker 1990a, p.211). In response to the public show of dissent, the Government sought the advice of the conservative Māori Council, who presented a submission outlining legislation which breached the Treaty of Waitangi. One of the significant Acts identified in the Māori Council’s submission was the 1967 Māori Affairs Amendment Act, which had stemmed from the findings of the Hunn Report. The Government responded to the Māori Council’s submission by establishing the Waitangi Tribunal, which could only hear claims from 1975 and excluded retrospective cases back to the signing of the Treaty in 1840.

In 1975, issues regarding Māori land grievances and the Treaty of Waitangi would provide one of the defining moments of race-relations in the form of a Land March from Te Hapua in the Far North to Wellington. The group known as: Te Roopu o Te Matakite (“Te Roopu”) marched under the slogan “Not one more acre of Māori land”. The Land March was led by 80-year old Whina Cooper, a grandmother from Te Rarawa in the Far North and first
President of the Māori Women’s Welfare League who in later years would become known as *Te Whaea o te Motu* (the Mother of the Nation). The image of Whina Cooper holding the hand of her granddaughter when setting off on the Land March would provide one of the iconic pictures of the Māori protest movements in the 20th Century.

This picture symbolised the increasing focus on Māori grievance regarding land and the Treaty of Waitangi. As will be discussed further below the Land March would illustrate that Māori grievance was not a movement primarily driven by young radicals. The constituency of Te Roopu o Te Matakite comprised radicals, activists, trade unionists and feminists (see Walker 1990a, p.215; Poata-Smith 1996, pp.103-106). By the time Te Roopu arrived in Wellington from the Far North, the group that had started-off with 50 core members, numbered well into the thousands. Te Roopu presented a memorial, regarding Māori land alienation by the State to the Prime Minister, Bill Rowling, who had taken the reins of power upon the death of Norman Kirk in 1974.

10.4 *Fractures in the one-nation, one-people ideology*

As discussed in earlier chapters, the Labour–Ratana alliance had been one of the enduring political relationships in the 20th Century. In 1975 however, there would be a dramatic change in Government from Labour to National, led by Robert Muldoon. As a public figure, Muldoon’s shadow looms large over New Zealand’s political landscape from 1975 to 1984. The National Government campaigned under the slogan “New Zealand – the way you want it” and one of the ways the public wanted “it” was without racial problems. Protests, however, regarding Māori land issues and breaches to the Treaty of Waitangi, did not subside under Muldoon’s tenure, but rather increased.

In 1977, the Orakei Māori Action Group, led by Joseph Hawke, occupied Bastion Point for 506 days in opposition to the Auckland City Council’s proposal to subdivide the remaining tribal lands of Ngāti Whatua. Merata Mita, the partner of Geoff Murphy, and Māori consultant for *Utu*, filmed the occupation in the documentary “507 Days” and, pointedly, would lose her employment with the State-owned television broadcaster Television New Zealand, for sympathy toward Māori issues (Walker 1990a). The Bastion Point occupation ended after 506 days of occupation when the Police forcibly removed the protestors. In the main, the protestors left peacefully, but the image of the Police forcibly removing people, including the elderly, was given full coverage to the public through the medium of television.
The advent of television in New Zealand coincided with the dramatic increase of civil unrest and by the time the protest movements were at their height, the images of conflict regarding race-relations were conducted in a very public forum. It is suggested that television, as a vehicle, exposed racial and social issues to the public in a way never seen before, facilitating a very divisive national conversation. What is argued is that access to issues previously constrained, could no longer be hidden from scrutiny with the advent of television.

10.5 The State, Māori and race relations: friends or foes?

In the social period that influenced Rewi’s Last Stand (1940) and Broken Barrier (1952) Māori members of Parliament had advocated recognition of the Treaty at the highest echelons of Parliament, with limited success. A common perception in New Zealand is that the Treaty of Waitangi was “lost” from the public consciousness for 150 years until the protest movements brought the document centre-stage. While the public may not have been aware of unresolved issues regarding the Treaty, successive Governments most certainly were. In the social context of Utu, Parliament was not exempt from the protest activity. Although the State was the key target of protest movements at this time, there would be a very public protest by Matiu Rata, the Member of Parliament for Northern Māori (now known as “Tai Tokerau”), who in 1979, resigned from Labour to start his own political party, Mana Māori Motuhake.

Rata expressed his dissatisfaction at Governmental apathy toward Māori issues and pointedly identified the underlying cultural nationalist ideology of “one nation – one people” as a dismal failure:

\[
\text{We have, as a people, never felt more let down, more insecure, and more economically and socially deprived than we are today … We will no longer tolerate policies, which take no account of our language, customs and lifestyle, nor will we continue to accept being governed or administered by anyone who does not understand the way we think or appreciate our values.}
\]

(10 November 1979, Auckland Star; also cited in Walker 1990a, p.228).

Rata went onto declare that Māori needed to be “masters of our own affairs” and reiterated the slogan of Te Roopu by asking for “every acre of land wrongfully taken from us back”. Thus, cracks began to appear in the political alliances between Māori and Pākehā at the highest levels of power.
The relationship between Māori and Pākehā, which had been presented in earlier films as a cornerstone of nationhood, had become uncertain. One of the defining features of the protest movements was the coinciding of interests in Māori society between “radical” and “conservative”. Organisations such as the Māori Council and Māori Women’s Welfare League, for example, showed support for the protest movements along with the radicalised youth of Māori society, such as in the He Taua incident. Some academics such as Ranginui Walker (1990a, p.243) have emphasised this overt commonality in Māori society with comments such as:

Although Māori radicals are the cutting edge of social change, the conservatives are the slow grinding edge. Basically both radicals and conservatives pursued the same objectives of justice, resolution of Māori grievances under the Treaty of Waitangi, recognition of rangatiratanga and mana whenua, and an equal say with the Pākehā in the future of the country.

There is a tendency to collapse a wide range of groups with different interests and aspirations into such a description, a point which will be discussed further below. The coinciding, however, of the conservative and radical elements of Māori society around land alienation, Treaty issues and in the wider protest movements did change the political landscape between Māori and Pākehā which is evident in Utu.

In earlier films such as Rewi’s Last Stand (1940), Broken Barrier (1952) and To Love a Maori (1972), certain Māori characters such as Ariana, Johnny and Tama were employed to differentiate “friend” or “foe”. In the 1980s, however, Māori could not be so easily categorised into “good and “bad” or used to make moral claims regarding race-relations and national harmony. The consolidation of the conservative and radical elements of Māori society in the protest movement blurred the boundaries of “who” constituted “friend” or “foe”. Groups such as the Māori Council and Māori Women’s Welfare League had worked in conjunction with the State since the 1940s and 1950s respectively, but were active in the protest movements. Those organisations which had once given assistance to the State, were now supporting those critical of the institution.

As evidenced there was an ambiguity in the relationship between Māori and Pākehā in the 1980s which is reflected in Utu. This theme is best illustrated in the interactions of Wiremu and the settler Williamson. Lt. Scott, who is leading a group of Māori soldiers hunting for Te
Wheke, stops at the Williamson farm to speak to the settler about the death of his wife. On seeing the Māori bushrangers, Williamson asks Lieutenant Scott “How can you tell they’re not his men”? Wiremu responds “I can tell”. Williamson then asks Wiremu “How can we tell you’re not one of them”? Wiremu states “You can’t”. It is argued this exchange symbolises the uncertainty in differentiating “friend or foe”. In the relationship between Māori and Pākehā it could be assumed, for example, that Māori, such as Wiremu (working on behalf of the State as a kupapa soldier) was a “friend”, but this encounter reveals that he may, in fact, be a potential “foe”.

The uncertainty in the loyalties of Māori is a theme in the film that centres on the position of Māori in the “national” framework. As discussed in earlier chapters, the State and its institutions were arbiters of national identity and harmony through race-relations, and these themes have been reinforced in the cinematic record. The question of Māori “loyalties” are replayed throughout the film and best illustrated with the Māori bushrangers leaving the army to join Te Wheke’s group. What this suggests is that Te Wheke’s cause of revenge, independence and war against the “Pākehā” was seductive to Māori, including those who had been working for the Crown or British Army.

On examination, this theme of uncertainty and ambiguity can be seen as a metaphor for the new relationship of Māori and Pākehā, influenced by the protest movements. The protest movements had revealed that Māori support could not be assumed as part of a “one nation - one people” ideal of national identity. Such a view is evident in the Governor General, Sir David Beattie’s speech on 6 February (Waitangi Day) 1981 “I am of the view we are not one people, despite Hobson’s oft-quoted words, nor should we try to be. We do not need to be”. What this suggests is a fundamental social-level shift in attitude from the State-decreed assimilationist-integrationist policy, where Māori made all the concessions, to a re-examination of how race-relations may be conducted.

10.6 The State as enemy

One of the distinguishing features of Utu is its open criticism of the State’s role in Māori and Pākehā relations. It is argued that this theme stems from the civil unrest of the protest movements throughout the 1970s and 1980s, especially the Springbok Tour. The 1981 Springbok Tour would see the alliance of a large and diverse cross-section of New Zealanders
in opposition to the Tour, which will be discussed below. The Māori protest movements in
the 1970s and 1980s were positioned committed to eradicating all forms of oppression,
including racism, sexism and class struggles. Membership of these groups was not
necessarily based upon ethnic lines, but the political leanings of individuals in those
movements. This is best illustrated in the newsletter of Te Roopu o te Matakite (1975),
which sought an alliance with the groups seeking the eradication of oppression based upon
political positions, “We see no difference between the aspirations of Māori people and the
desire of workers in their struggles” (cited in Poata-Smith 1996, p.104).

Primarily, the main target of these groups was the State, its institutions and agents. This
theme is evident in Utu, where those responsible for setting Te Wheke on the path of
vengeance are agents of the Crown. Symbolically, the motivation for Lance Corporal Te
Wheke to desert the Army and seek utu is a military mistake, which results in the death of his
wife, child and whānau. It can be seen that Murphy is using the tragedy of Te Wheke as a
metaphor for the role of the State in Māori and Pākehā relations. It is suggested that Murphy,
like Hayward, is appealing to the shared interests of Māori and Pākehā in terms of national
interest, but the difference is that Murphy is drawing on shared opposition to the actions of
the State. Thus Murphy characterises the State as an enemy of the people, rather than an ally
as Hayward did.

In 1977, Roger Donaldson released his film Sleeping Dogs, which was based upon the
premise of a totalitarian State and the resistance of ordinary citizens. Coincidentally, Sleeping
Dogs was released the year before Bastion Point, where the State had used force to evict
protestors occupying Māori land. It was, however, the Springbok Tour in 1981 where the
State, as totalitarian and acting against its citizens, would be contrasted with those opposing
continued sporting links with South Africa. Given the social context which Utu crosses, it is
argued that Murphy is appealing to a core sector of New Zealand society, which had opposed
the Springbok Tour, to re-examine race-relations at the local level.

10.7 The Springbok Tour 1981 – “1, 2, 3, 4 - we don’t want your racist
tour”

As outlined in To Love a Maori (1972), opposition to continued sporting links with South
Africa had first come to prominence in the 1960s regarding the exclusion of Māori and
Pacific Islanders from the national rugby team touring South Africa. Rugby, as New Zealand’s national game, had long been used as an example of egalitarianism and racial harmony, where people of all “races” played together equally. The exclusion of Māori and Pacific Island All Blacks from touring South Africa cast doubt over how important race-relations were in comparison to rugby. Although Māori and Pacific Islanders were included in the All Black team in the 1970 tour, the continued sporting links with South Africa became a moral issue for a number of New Zealanders. In 1973, the Springboks were scheduled to tour New Zealand, but there were groups, such as Halt All Racist Tours (“H.A.R.T”), which were strong opponents of continued sporting links with South Africa. H.A.R.T had promised widespread civil disruption if the tour went ahead and the Labour-led Kirk Government (1972-1975) cancelled the tour (see Chapple 1984; Coney 1981, pp.8-11; Newnham 1983). The National-Muldoon Government, however, continued sporting contact with South Africa in 1976, citing the differentiation between sport and politics, and allowed the All Blacks to tour. The continued contact with South Africa resulted in a boycott of New Zealand by 21 African nations at the 1976 Summer Olympics at Montreal, but this did not dissuade the Government from allowing the Springboks to tour in 1981.

The 1981 Springbok Tour saw the rise of a “coalition” of activists from a wide range of political backgrounds, opposed to sporting links with South Africa. Groups, such as The Mobilisation to Stop the Tour (“MOST”) in Auckland, had a diverse constituency and included trade unionists, church organisations, student groups, socialists and women’s groups (Poata-Smith 1996, pp.97-116). In Wellington, a wide range of protestors would coalesce under the group Campaign to Oppose the Springbok Tour (“COST”) and there would be organisations set up in the main centres, throughout New Zealand, to oppose the tour.

What would be witnessed during the Springbok Tour of 1981 was an unprecedented level of activism and civil unrest. The last time civil unrest appeared on such a scale was during the 1951 Waterfront Lockout. These images of a country divided are captured in Merata Mita’s documentary Patu! The documentary filmed the Springbok Tour from the protestors’ perspective to counterbalance what Mita described as the “official” position of the tour. Mita’s work would be censured through the media as “a license to promote the cause of Left-wing elements who flout and disobey the laws of the country” (Editorial November 1982, Bay of Plenty Times); however, Patu! would win the Sundance Film Festival award in 1983 and is now regarded as a seminal work of a significant moment in New Zealand’s history.
Those opposed to the tour came from a wide range of liberal backgrounds, such as the middle-class, Māori radicals, socialists, unionists, churches, students and women’s groups (Belich 2000, p.498). Thus, the constituency opposed to the Springbok Tour came from a broad spectrum and could not be easily dismissed as agitators and activists.

As Mita noted, the documentary was made under extreme circumstances and much of the footage had to be sent out of the country for safe-keeping for fear that the Police would confiscate it and prosecute protestors captured in film (Mita 1983). There is in Mita’s comment the suggestion that the State did not act fairly and used its powers in a totalitarian manner to quell opposition to the tour. One of the legacies of the Springbok Tour is the questionable and partisan role which the State, its institutions and agents played in restraining the civil unrest caused by the tour, restraint which had been sanctioned by the Government. While the Government sought to characterise quashing the protests under the guise of “law and order”, many opponents of the tour viewed continued sporting links with South Africa as morally reprehensible (Belich 2000, p.498). What is argued is that the State lost its moral authority to act in good faith toward all of its citizens because of its actions during the Springbok Tour. By mobilising the institutions of the State, such as the Police, Army and criminal justice system against citizens exercising their democratic right to protest, the Government employed extreme measures to control the situation.

There are, in these competing views of the tour, themes which are evident in Utu. The premise in Utu is based upon the justification that certain actions, such as opposing the “law”, are legitimate if it is a moral cause. In posing the moral dilemma in Utu, Murphy was appealing to a wide sector of New Zealand society which had been opposed to the tour. Conversely, there were a number of New Zealanders who supported the Springbok Tour and the State. Muldoon would be re-elected with a slim, but sufficient majority in the 1981 General Election.

It is argued however that one of the legacies of the Springbok Tour was the stirring of national conscience about the intolerance of “dissent” or opposing views in New Zealand society. This is best illustrated in the documentary Patu! where protestors including women, were beaten by tour supporters and police when demonstrating. As Mita (1983, pp.11-21) noted:
It was the first time in my life I have passed women who were being kicked and punched, I had to keep running. The cameramen who were behind me were beaten. Also, the crowd went for the cameras, they ripped out the film so there was no record of that violence.

The intolerance of dissent in New Zealand was discussed in the chapter on *Broken Barrier* (1952), where the State had used war-time powers to quash the union and unionist members in the Waterfront Lockout of 1951. Thirty years later the State would repeat those actions and use its full weight to quell opposition to the Springbok Tour.

### 10.7.1 Māori and the Springbok Tour

There was a strong Māori presence in the Springbok Tour with a number of high-profile Māori protestors formed the core of the squad, named *Patu*. Mita would use this squad as the namesake of her documentary and the Patu squad was deemed the section most likely to breach police lines (Poata-Smith 2001, p.231; Newnham 1983). As will be discussed in the section on gender, Māori women formed a core part of this constituency\(^{136}\) and as Poata-Smith (2001, p.231) notes, “thirty-three of its [Patu] thirty-seven marshals were women”, a factor which raised the public profile of Māori women in leadership roles. For a number of Māori activists, involvement in the anti-tour movement offered the opportunity to raise awareness regarding racism at the national level. As Ripeka Evans (1989) states:

> We decided that the Springbok Tour was a chance to get New Zealand whites to turn their eyes from overseas racism to te take Māori [the Māori issue]. We realised that the whites who would care about our brothers and sisters in Azania would be the ones who would have the most potential to care about our struggles.

Many involved in the anti-tour movement, however, resisted the connection between racism at home and the wider international context of anti-racist protest. The resistance to connecting racism at the national level and supporting anti-racist movements abroad would create a fracture in the anti-tour movement, which would have ramifications for the Left in the years that followed.\(^{137}\) A number of Māori felt that the attempt to draw the links between international protest action and what was occurring in New Zealand with Māori rights, was met with hostility. As Hilda Halkyard (quoted in Awatere 1981, p.12; Poata-Smith 2001) noted:

> We wanted to show our Black solidarity for the Black movement in Azania. Even so,
we got a real hard time from whites. Like, on the night of the first game, at Eden Park I started to talk about the Treaty of Waitangi and somebody called: “What’s that got to do with it …”.

While the Springbok Tour was occurring, the “struggles” to recognise Māori land and Treaty issues were ongoing; for example, the Raglan Golf course land, taken from Māori in World War II. The lack of connection between racism abroad and at home would fracture the alliance of the Left and set the platform for Māori politics to develop along “ethno-cultural” lines in the mid-1980s. It is important to note, however, that while some members of the anti-tour movement were hostile to Māori issues, not all were. As Poata-Smith (2001, p.236) notes, “a significant minority [of the anti-racist movement] came to understand and support demands for Māori liberation”.

In the aftermath of the Springbok Tour, there was a climate of self-reflection regarding race relations and national identity. As a result of Great Britain joining the EEC, the ties to the “Motherland” had been cut. The protest movements, centring on Māori land alienation and the Treaty of Waitangi, meant there was a fracture in the relationship which had been the cornerstone of nationhood. Furthermore, the Springbok Tour had seen unprecedented activism and civil unrest. For a large number of New Zealanders, the State, its institutions and agents had lost moral authority. What is argued is that these themes shaped the construction of Utu and are evident in the film.

**10.8 Re-examining popular myths in race-relations, settlement and the construction of national identity**

The re-examination of popular myths perpetuated in New Zealand’s cinematic records is a key thematic in Utu. Myths about settlement, the construction of national identity and positing a potential future for both peoples had characterised earlier films, such as Rewi’s Last Stand (1925/194), Broken Barrier (1952) and To Love a Maori (1972). In Utu, however, there is a theme of moral uncertainty which was absent in earlier films. This is best illustrated in the characterisation of the “essential drama” of Māori and Pākehā in Utu, where the message conveyed is that the justification of actions depends on which side of the argument you are on.

It is important to note, however, that Murphy does not readily make moral appeals to either side and that the main characters in the film are both sympathetic and flawed. In a review of
Utú, Paul Attanasio (1985) identified this moral ambiguity and uncertainty with character identification as: “What lends Utú its particular richness is the way director Geoff Murphy plays with your sympathies; you never know which side you’re supposed to be on – and neither, evidently, do the characters. What is argued is that the themes of moral ambiguity and uncertainty are utilised in Utú as plot devices to re-examine myths in the cinematic account and national historical narratives. In this fashion, Utú is Murphy’s response to the work of Rudall Hayward and in particular, Hayward’s films The Te Kooti Trail (1927) and Rewi’s Last Stand (1925/194). It is suggested that these two themes are important in providing utu or a counter-balance to the construction of nationhood, where the revisory message conveyed in Murphy’s account is that both sides in the Māori-Pākehā relationship have committed less than honourable acts.

10.8.1 Referencing Hayward in Utú

The re-examination of popular myths is best illustrated in a pivotal scene in Utú, where there is a replay of the role of missionaries. In Utú of the role of Reverend Morgan from Rewi’s Last Stand (1940) is re-imagined as the “Vicar”. The Vicar is depicted as venal and vile, and uses his pulpit to advance the cause of settlement, rather than remain objective. In his sermon to a predominantly Māori congregation, the Vicar associates Māori rebellion with the work of the Devil, saying, “SATAN is at work in this land”. Whereas Reverend Morgan, in Rewi’s Last Stand (1940), was characterised as a good person, who cared for his Māori flock and was the “eyes and ears of the Governor”, the Vicar in Utú is Reverend Morgan’s antithesis. When Te Wheke beheads the Vicar in front of his congregation because it transpires the Vicar has “… other Masters”, the message conveyed is that the Vicar’s political activities brought about his own death (underlined by the Gospel text which the Vicar cited). Furthermore, the Vicar’s death is portrayed as an act of justice not for preaching the word of God to the Māori congregation, but for being involved in the laws of man by working as an agent of the Crown. It is suggested that the Vicar’s collusion with the Crown is portrayed as an act of hypocrisy in Utú, whereas in Rewi’s Last Stand (1940), Reverend Morgan’s involvement with the highest officer in the land was conveyed as a moral good. Thus, to a 1980s audience the Vicar is portrayed as an unsympathetic character who is exposed as an agent of the State. The audience perceives his death as an act of brutal justice. Furthermore the Vicar’s association with the State suggests the State would be viewed by a core sector of the New Zealand audience as a malign force, a clear demarcation between Murphy and the works of Hayward.
It is important to note that there are a number of subtle references to Hayward’s work in *Utu*. The audience, for example, first observes the character of Kura alone in the bush when she encounters Lt. Scott and Henare. She steals Lt. Scott’s prized rifle and is pursued by Henare in an effort to recover the weapon. In a scene reminiscent of the meeting between Takiri and Gordon in *Rewi’s Last Stand* (1925), Kura jumps from a waterfall into a river. Rather than being rescued by Lt. Scott or Henare, however, as Takiri was by Gordon, Kura’s actions are a direct challenge to her male pursuers, signalling that she is, in fact, more adept in the bush than they are.

In arguably the strongest reference to Hayward, there is a direct correlation between Kura and Te Wheke with Te Kooti’s lieutenant the “half-caste” Baker McLean (also known as Peka Makarini) in *The Te Kooti Trail* (1927) and the death of the “Māori maiden”, Monika. Like Kura, Monika is sacrificed in order to withdraw audience sympathy from Te Wheke (Perkins 1996, pp. 17-27). It is at the sacrifice of Kura in *Utu* that the audience withdraws support from Te Wheke and his path of vengeance for the death of his wife and family.

What is argued is that Murphy has directly referenced Rudall Hayward to re-examine some of the core myths in the construction of national identity. The themes of settlement, civilisation and progress, which were central to earlier works including: *The Te Kooti Trail* (1927), *Rewi’s Last Stand* (1925/194), *Broken Barrier* (1952) and *To Love a Maori* (1972), are re-framed and re-contextualised from a 1980s perspective. Some of the popular myths, which have been outlined above, were pivotal to the construction of earlier models of nationhood. In light of the protest movements of the 1970s and 1980s, the earlier, self-confident accounts of New Zealand’s history, national identity and the place of Māori, began to appear dated.

**10.8.2 Re-examining the relationship of Māori and Pākehā**

As discussed above, the theme of moral ambivalence in *Utu* is conducted through interpersonal relationships. In earlier works, such as *Rewi’s Last Stand* (1940), *Broken Barrier* (1952) and *To Love a Maori* (1972), there had been strong moral codes, aimed at both Māori and Pākehā, about harmonious race-relations for the “good of the nation”. Although there is a directive code in *Utu* about Māori-Pākehā relations, this is not revealed until the end of the film. Further it is this theme of “moral ambivalence” in *Utu* which sets the account apart from those films that preceded and followed. In essence, the audience is left to draw its own conclusions on events in the film, as each of the main characters is both sympathetic and flawed. What this suggests is that Murphy made his characters sympathetic, in order to
convey the message that the standard accounts of the settlement of New Zealand are not easy to categorise in terms of progress, civilisation or morality.

When examining the main characters in *Utu*, the theme of ambiguity in sympathies emerges. Te Wheke, for example, is a man set on the path of vengeance by a military mistake, which results in the death of his wife and family. The situation facing Te Wheke is couched within moral terms and his actions are premised upon the justification of “natural law”. In this fashion, “natural law” is considered as a moral dilemma, where Te Wheke’s desire for retribution for the death of his wife and family, takes precedence over the “laws of man”. Ultimately, however, the actions of Te Wheke result in the deaths of other people, leading them to embark on the path of vengeance too. What this sets in place is the escalation of “natural law”, where almost all of the main characters have a moral justification for utu, but, as it transpires in the film, have responsibility as well. Thus, the message conveyed is that while some may have cause, their actions are not necessarily as morally justified as they first appear and all involved bear partial responsibility for the situation they find themselves in.

The escalation of moral justice is best illustrated in the character of the settler Williamson. Williamson’s wife Emily is killed when defending her husband in an alteration with Te Wheke. As a result of Emily’s death, Williamson also seeks revenge upon Te Wheke, which conveys the message implicit in the concept of utu: that for every action there is another, until the balance has been restored. When confronting a captured Te Wheke, Williamson states “You took up the musket to answer the death of your family and the destruction of your home. SO DID I”. While it appears, on the surface, that Williamson has a moral cause to seek vengeance for Emily’s death, it transpires that the settler refused military protection, through pride. Williamson’s refusal left him and Emily vulnerable to Te Wheke’s attack. Thus, Williamson, as articulated by Wiremu, is not innocent in relation to unfolding events and must bear some responsibility for the death of Emily.

The reflection of Māori and Pākehā characters on their personal actions and moral responsibility for conflict in *Utu* is a clear departure from earlier films. In earlier works the directors played an educator’s role, giving direction to the audience through characters in the films on how people should interact with one another in New Zealand society. While *Utu* reworks popular myths in the construction of nationhood, the code embedded in the film is that both sides have committed less than honourable acts. In essence *Utu* removes the moral justification utilised in films such as *Rewi’s Last Stand* (1925/194) and subverts the idea of
the “settlement” of New Zealand as being a civilising mission or indeed a lament for a defeated foe. What is argued is that Murphy is utilising the notion of moral relativity in *Utu*, with sympathetic but deeply flawed characters and appealing to the audience to draw its own conclusions on the events unfolding in the film.

Lt. Scott best illustrates this theme of a sympathetic, yet flawed character. As discussed above, Lt. Scott is a New Zealander and shares the commonality of “birthplace” with Māori characters such as Wiremu. Lt. Scott is placed in opposition to the character of Colonel Elliot, who is British and describes Scott in derogatory terms as a “colonial”. Scott has an inter-ethnic love affair with Kura and almost leaves his military career behind for a relationship with her. As it transpires, Te Wheke murders Kura for her perceived collusion with the Army and relationship with Lt. Scott.

Whereas earlier characters, such as Bob Beaumont, were Māorified Pākehā with civilised cores, Lt. Scott is depicted as a man who is willing to use the guise of civility to commit murder. Upon learning of Kura’s death at the hands of Te Wheke, Lt. Scott declares himself the most qualified candidate to execute Te Wheke. He states “I am the Senior Officer here and without prejudice”. Wiremu, however, stops Scott and identifies that Lt. Scott has been wounded twice by Te Wheke and therefore, is not without prejudice. What is revealed to the audience, however, is the extent of Lt. Scott’s prejudice toward Te Wheke because of Kura’s murder. Scott’s declaration of being “without prejudice” is a false claim. In this fashion, Murphy questions the assumption that those working for the State automatically constitute a benign and impartial authority.

**10.9 Māori Characters - friends or foe?**

Arguably, the most ambiguous character is Wiremu, a man employed by the Army and placed second-in-command, to Lt. Scott, of the Māori bushrangers. He is educated, admires technology, plays chess and, in fact, is the leader of the Māori bushrangers in all but name. Wiremu has, however, an ambivalent relationship with some of the bushrangers, Lt. Scott and the Army as a whole. In a pivotal scene where one of the bushrangers leaves to join Te Wheke and releases a tirade upon Wiremu, calling him a traitor to his own people, Wiremu asks the ranger if he has read a document, which is upon the desk. When the ranger responds that he “cannot read”, Wiremu asks his wife if she heard what the ranger had said. Wiremu’s wife nods her head vigorously and it is assumed by the audience that Wiremu is offended by the ranger’s comments. Moreover, the assumption is made that Wiremu’s wife shares similar
sentiments to the bushranger, but Wiremu responds with “He said he can’t read”. What is revealed in this scene is that Wiremu is the inversion of Bob Beaumont and is a civilised Māori with an ambiguous core.¹⁴⁴

Wiremu’s ambiguity is reinforced throughout the film and evident in the interactions between himself, Lt. Scott, Colonel Elliot, Williamson and the Māori bushrangers. When Lt. Scott asks Wiremu, for example, why he has not joined Te Wheke’s men in fighting against the Pākehā, Wiremu responds “does it matter which side we are on?” It is not until the end of the film that Wiremu’s loyalties become clear and he makes the ultimate sacrifice for peace by killing his own brother, Te Wheke.

In a crucial scene, when Te Wheke is tried by a makeshift military court and the main characters such as Lt. Scott, Matu (Kura’s Auntie) and Williamson are competing to execute Te Wheke, for personal reasons, it is Wiremu who steps forward. As this scene unfolds, Wiremu reveals why each character cannot kill Te Wheke and in some cases, holds protagonists such as Williamson responsible for the path they are on. Wiremu declares himself the only person fit and without personal motivation to execute Te Wheke. What is revealed in this final scene is that Te Wheke is Wiremu’s brother and as such, Wiremu does not have any personal reason to kill Te Wheke, but does so to ensure peace.¹⁴⁵

A number of key themes arise from Te Wheke’s execution by Wiremu and require examination. Wiremu’s execution of his brother serves as a metaphor for Māori-Pākehā relations in the social context of Utu. As outlined above, Wiremu does not reveal a position on either side until the end when he claims to be the only person with enough authority in both Māori and Pākehā contexts to execute Te Wheke. As he states “I am a Corporal in the militia. I have standing in this Court and my mana is of this earth”. Unlike the other characters, Wiremu agrees to make the ultimate sacrifice in killing his brother not for emotional or moral reasons, but for reasons of logic and honour to both sides. By declaring himself “neutral” in this encounter, Wiremu agrees to shoulder the burden of restoring the balance between Māori and Pākehā. This is best illustrated by Wiremu’s comments “I think Pākehās have killed enough Māoris and Māoris have killed enough Pākehās … I have no desire for utu, no ledger to balance. I am without prejudice”.

Importantly, Wiremu is the only character Te Wheke will submit to, which takes the execution of Te Wheke out of the Army’s jurisdiction and into a wider cultural context. By agreeing to kill Te Wheke, Wiremu ensures that Te Wheke’s mana is intact by observing the
cultural rituals and protocols in the honourable death of a warrior. Wiremu, for example, performs a haka in which the remaining bushrangers and Williamson join him. What is observed is that all present recognise Wiremu’s authority in both Māori and Pākehā contexts, to restore the balance. The weapon Wiremu chooses to use is the finest technology available and passed to Te Wheke for approval. Wiremu asks Te Wheke to “prepare a place for me” in heaven and reassures Te Wheke he will be welcomed in Hawaiki because he has “earned his place”. The brothers hongi and Te Wheke is granted the opportunity to waiata before Wiremu kills him. Upon Te Wheke’s death, what is revealed is the obvious pain Wiremu felt in killing his brother.

What is witnessed in the scene between Wiremu and Te Wheke is a private cultural moment made public by circumstances. It is observed from this scene that there are social conventions in Māori society which can constrain escalating radicalism. This scene is a metaphor for race-relations and, in particular, Māori radicalism in New Zealand society. Murphy is appealing to Māori to sacrifice the radical for the good of the nation. The theme of moral ambivalence in Utu is the counterbalance to re-examining popular myths in the settlement of New Zealand, where both Māori and Pākehā have committed less than honourable acts. The underlying message, however, from this final scene, is that national harmony has to be maintained and Māori must make the ultimate sacrifice by constraining the radical for the “good of the nation”.

In this fashion Murphy, like Hayward in To Love a Maori (1972) is appealing for a societal-level shift in attitudes, but for the maintenance of national unity. The Land Wars of the 19th century are analogous to the present-day conflict in 1983. The appeal by Murphy to the audience in these character encounters is for New Zealanders to re-examine the history of the country and to remember that there may be differences between Māori and Pākehā, but there is also common ground as well.

### 10.10 Gender: comprised loyalties, contested masculinities and inter-ethnic love affairs

One of the key plot devices used in the films, to engage the audience, has been the subject of gender and in particular, inter-ethnic love affairs and contested masculinities. As argued, these inter-personal relationships between characters have been used as a metaphor for the relationship of Māori and Pākehā. There is a return in Utu to the concept of contested masculinities between Māori and Pākehā men which characterised earlier films such as
Rewi’s Last Stand (1925/194). It is suggested, however, that these encounters are often intensely fluid, as Māori and Pākehā men fight on either side of the Land Wars or are involved in the conflict for personal reasons.

Similarly, the relationships between women and men in Utu are not fixed, but do provide the motivation for vengeance. In this fashion, men do not compete for women, but as a result of actions that have involved the sacrifice of women. The roles which both Māori and Pākehā women play in Utu challenge the fixed ideas evident in Rewi’s Last Stand (1925/194) of women as a metaphor for civilisation. Female characters are depicted as warriors, farmers, defenders, femme fatales and victims. The characterisation of women in active, rather than passive, roles is a departure from earlier works and it is argued that this thematic can be found in the broader influences of the women’s rights movement which is referenced in Utu.

10.10.1 Contested masculinities

There is a return to the concept of contested masculinities in Utu, as illustrated in the interactions between the male characters in the film. Traditionally, land and women provide the motivation for contested masculinities between men in settlement narratives. As discussed in Rewi’s Last Stand (1940), the concept of contested masculinities could be seen in the interactions between Bob Beaumont and Tama Te Heu Heu, regarding possession of Ariana. In Utu, however, land and women explicitly are not addressed explicitly. Land as a focal point of conflict, for example, is raised only once in Utu, when Williamson orders Te Wheke off “his” farm and where Te Wheke responds by saying to his taua (war party) “he says it’s his land!” Yet, the conquest and settlement of land underpinned the New Zealand Wars.

This scene suggests that the subject of land and settlement, which was a primary issue for conflict between Māori and Pākehā, is abdicated in favour of the personalised encounters between characters, regarding pain and loss. Thus, what Murphy is drawing upon is a sense of the characters inter-connection, a metaphor for shared pain and loss in the settlement of New Zealand by both Māori and Pākehā. What emerges in Utu is a conflict-encounter narrative conducted at the personal level to appeal to the emotion of the situation, rather than the deeper politics involved in the settlement of New Zealand. Instead of competition for land amongst the characters, there is competition for audience sympathy, which is issue-specific. Primarily audience sympathies depend on the pain and loss of the central characters. There are no clear battle-lines drawn between Māori and Pākehā regarding land in the
conflict; rather, it is a matter of which character possesses the moral justification to wreak vengeance on the other.

Williamson, for example, is shown to be sympathetic toward Māori and has close contact with Māori in the area he lives. Williamson, however, is motivated to take up arms to avenge the death of his wife Emily. He shares situational loyalties with the Army, but is not motivated by honour or obligation to the Crown. As outlined above, when Wiremu shoots Colonel Elliot, it is Williamson who covers up the action and lays the blame for the Colonel’s death on Te Wheke’s men. This suggests that Williamson’s involvement in the capture of Te Wheke is not about taking a side in the struggle, but is rather about the personal desire for vengeance.

Similarly, Lt. Scott is depicted as a character whose “love of country” often conflicts with his sense of duty to the Army (van Gelder 1984). This thematic can be seen in the interactions between Colonel Elliot and Lt. Scott, in that Scott has more affinity with New Zealand than the Colonel does. Scott’s duties to the Army are tested in his love affair with Kura when he agrees to leave the militia for a life with her, only to find that she has used him to escape from captivity.

The character of Colonel Elliot is encoded with all the effete Old World attitudes of the Empire toward the colony and native peoples. He is used as a metaphor for the British class system, which seeks to establish racism and classism in the new world. Further, there is the suggestion that, while Elliot holds racist and classist views of Māori, he is in a sexual relationship with his young Māori manservant. In a scene where Elliot is losing a chess-match to Wiremu, the Colonel engenders a violent confrontation with the Māori servant in order to upset the chessboard to prevent the inevitable loss to Wiremu. What this scene sets in place is the notion that the British class system will not play fair in the settlement of New Zealand regarding Māori. The code embedded in this scene and reinforced by the comparison of Lt. Scott with Colonel Elliot is that Māori will be better served by ordinary New Zealanders than agents of the Empire.

By deferring the subject of land as the main point of contention between Māori and Pākehā, what is placed centre stage is vengeance. There are no clearly defined sides in the battle and ethnicity is removed as a motivating factor for conflict. As will be discussed further below, the only two characters that construe the conflict as ethnic-based are Te Wheke and Elliot – two characters symbolically sacrificed for the “good of the nation”. In this fashion, the
events of *Utu* are used as a parable of what could happen in New Zealand society if there were to be a return to the conflict of the 19th century with the racists (Elliot) or radicals (Te Wheke) holding power.

10.10.2 The warrior as savage

The image of the warrior has been one of the quintessential symbols of Māori masculinity in the cinematic record. It can be seen in the transformation of the character of Te Wheke from a Lance Corporal in the Army, through the symbolic adoption of a Ta Moko to indicate a return to warrior-hood, so that the image of the Māori male as warrior is encoded with a number of key themes. In the act of taking the Ta Moko, a custom that had begun to reduce in frequency at the point of contact with Pākehā, Te Wheke is shedding the garb of civilisation to return to the traditional ways of a warrior. Te Wheke’s act of embracing the custom of Ta Moko is used in *Utu* as a metaphor for the return to savagery. In the symbolic adoption of Ta Moko, Te Wheke is rejecting civilisation, including all the rules associated with the Army, such as order, structure, control and Māori working with Pākehā in the construction of nationhood.

The civilisation and savagery embodied by Te Wheke, is juxtaposed with those characters seeking a middle ground in the conflict. This theme of the warrior-savage is best illustrated in Te Wheke’s beheading of the Vicar, his involvement in the death of Emily Williamson, the murder of his Captain and importantly, of Kura. Further, when Te Wheke appeals to the Vicar’s mainly Māori congregation, it is for an already lost cause to take vengeance upon the “Pākehā”. It is important to note that Te Wheke is one of the few characters who construe the conflict as one based upon ethnicity.

This is an important theme because the only other character to frame the contestation along ethnic lines is Colonel Elliot. In this fashion, Te Wheke and Elliot are depicted as sharing similar views on ethnicity. Elliot, representing the old world, is conveyed as wishing to maintain the order of the Empire, where Māori will be treated as second class citizens. Conversely Te Wheke’s character wants to kill Pākehā and drive them from the country. As both Elliot and Te Wheke are killed in *Utu*, what this reveals is the need to sacrifice radicals on each side in order to have harmonious race-relations. Ultimately, such sacrifice is posited as a national “good”. The code embedded in these characterisations is that those holding extremist views are detrimental to race-relations and national harmony. Murphy’s hope for harmony is vested in those wishing to find a middle ground and common accord.
What is argued, however, is that the main theme of the film is revealed in the sacrifice of Te Wheke at the hand of his brother. As outlined above, Wiremu makes a pragmatic decision to execute Te Wheke, claiming that he is only one without the desire for utu. It is important to note that Wiremu also killed Colonel Elliot, and it is suggested that these acts are symbolic in the construction of a new sense of New Zealand nationhood, where extreme views are foregone for a moderate position by Māori, and endorsed by Pākehā. In this fashion, Wiremu commits the ultimate acts, in the murder of Colonel Elliot and the execution of Te Wheke, for the “good of the nation”. Symbolically, the character of Wiremu, the civilised savage, is encoded as mediator between the Old World and the New.

10.10.3 Women as femme fatales, victims, sacrifices and active agents
There is a departure in *Utu* from the traditional representation of women. As outlined in previous chapters, women have been central features in the inter-ethnic love affairs. These inter-ethnic love affairs have been used as a metaphor, in which women represent the opportunity of progress in race-relations. Further, Māori women have been juxtaposed with Pākehā women in films, such as *Rewi’s Last Stand* (1925/194), where gender roles have been blurred between masculine and feminine acts. In *Utu*, there is a blurring of masculine and feminine acts by both Māori and Pākehā women. The settler Emily Williamson, for example, is depicted as a defender of both her land and her husband in the battle with Te Wheke. This is best illustrated in the scene where Emily takes up arms to defend the farm against Te Wheke, laying down her life to save her husband from Te Wheke’s gun.

Similarly Kura is portrayed as an active agent in the battle between Te Wheke’s men and the Army. Kura is depicted as a *femme fatale* who seduces Henare away from the Army to join Te Wheke’s group, and engages Lt. Scott in a love-affair. It is the relationship which develops between Kura and Scott that ultimately leads to her death and Scott’s moral decay when he seeks to avenge Kura by murdering Te Wheke in a mock military court.

Thus, women are used as a metaphor for sacrifice and vengeance. Women provide the motivation for vengeance on the part of all the main characters in *Utu*. Te Wheke, for example, seeks vengeance for the death of his wife and daughter. Similarly Williamson uses the death of Emily to try and avenge himself upon Te Wheke. Kura’s death sparks Lt. Scott’s murder attempt on Te Wheke under the guise of civility through the institution of the Court. In this fashion women are used as contradictory objects. While women are portrayed as active agents in warfare and settlement, it is the “corrupting” influences of women which set
in place the theme of vengeance and violence. In essence, *Utu* returns to the socio-centricity of men, whereby “real” relationships occur between respective masculinities and women are portrayed as an interruptive or corruptive force.

The sacrifice of women is used as a justification for obsession in the conflict which follows. Arguably, the two characters that best exemplify this theme are Te Wheke and Williamson. Williamson becomes fanatical in his desire for utu against Te Wheke, but in the final scene he cannot kill his “wife’s murderer who sits before him”. Ultimately, Te Wheke’s wrath and desire for justice turns on his own people where he kills members of his group, including Kura. What is seen in *Utu* is that women cause both Te Wheke and Williamson to lose sight of reason and reality. It is left to the logical and pragmatic Wiremu to end the conflict, steering events away from emotion and back to reason. In this fashion Wiremu is set in direct contrast to the other characters where he is depicted and is the inverse of Bob Beaumont. Wiremu is characterised as the native with a civilised core which references the stock character of the Māori-Pākehā as the bridge between the old and new worlds.

There are a number of themes to consider in the interactions between men and women. The first is that men are depicted as irresponsible in the care and protection of women. This is best illustrated in the scene where Wiremu holds Williamson partially responsible for Emily’s death. In the case of Te Wheke’s murder of Kura, there are codes which are reminiscent of the “warrior” as irresponsible with Māori women. Kura is a supporter of Te Wheke, but because of Te Wheke’s increased paranoia toward the Army, he blames her for the “advanced warning” because of her relationship with Lt. Scott. Further, Lt. Scott is implicated in the neglect of care and protection of women due to his relationship with Kura.

While women characters in *Utu* break certain stereotypes in the cinematic record, for example by being “active agents” in warfare, they also fall into the well-established tropes of *femme fatales*, victims, sacrifices and love interests. It is suggested that the reason why women are granted agency in *Utu* is because women were highly visible in the 1980s protest movements in New Zealand. As outlined above, Māori women in particular had a significant presence in the protest movements, but given the fate of Kura it is suggested a code embedded in the film is that Māori women should be guarded in their relationships with Māori men. Conversely, in an interesting twist, Te Wheke’s would-be “executioner” is Mata, Kura’s aunt, who unbeknownst to Te Wheke, harbours vengeful thoughts of her own. Thus, the metaphor is
that Māori loyalties between and within the group, based upon gender lines, cannot be guaranteed in the conflict.

**Conclusion**

The main focus of this chapter has been the influence of the social context of the 1970s and 1980s on the themes contained in *Utu*. As has been argued, the social context of New Zealand society had an effect on how Māori and the relationship between Māori and Pākehā were examined in the film. Similarly to *Rewi’s Last Stand* (1925/194), *Broken Barrier* (1952) and *To Love a Maori* (1972), *Utu* was used as a vehicle to provide a social commentary about Māori-Pākehā relations at a time characterized by political unrest. As argued, these broader issues in the social context when the work was produced are key thematics which shape the nationalised narrative of race-relations in New Zealand film. While Murphy was more ambiguous in his work, it can be seen that the same set of themes such as the importance of race-relations and national harmony underpinned the representation and interpretation of Māori in film. In this fashion, Murphy joins Hayward and O’Shea in exploring the essential drama of Māori-Pākehā relations, but from a contemporary 1980s perspective. It is argued that *Utu* is an important work because it acts as bridge in the historical cinematic accounts from the end of assimilationist-integrationist influenced work toward what could be considered “bicultural” views of New Zealand. What is interesting about the ideological shift in *Utu* is that the country would not officially adopt biculturalism until after 1984, the year after the film was released. As indicated by the key thematics in the film, the ideological influences circulating in society at the time the work was produced had some bearing on how Māori-Pākehā relations were portrayed in *Utu*. In the next section, the two films *Ngati* (1987) and *Mauri* (1988) are analysed to examine Māori-Pākehā relations once the country had officially adopted the socio-political ideology of biculturalism and before the shift toward the bicultural two world-view model of race-relations.
Old and new forms of cinema

This section analyses four films *Ngati* (1987), *Mauri* (1988), *Once were warriors* (1994) and *Whale Rider* (2002), in order to examine the claim that films from 1985 onward constitute a demarcation between “old” and “new” forms of cinema. As outlined in Chapter One, *Ngati* (1987) and *Mauri* (1988) have been described as “emphatically Māori” (Perkins 1996, pp. 17-27), but as will be outlined in the filmic analysis, these works evidence contemporary understandings of race-relations influenced by the socio-political ideology of biculturalism. Moreover, this section is informed by the historical overview, propositions and thematics set out in Chapter Four, *The advent of biculturalism*, Chapter Five, *The two world-view model* and Chapter Six, *Māori cultural nationalism, the Māori renaissance and Māori women* respectively. The filmic case studies contained within this section are to be read in conjunction with the above chapters for context and principal elements that will be identified in the works.

As identified in the filmic chapters in this section, it can be seen that the narratives in the works function, alongside the State directives, as cultural and political accounts about race-relations. *Ngati* (1987) and *Mauri* (1988), for example, are direct responses to the State’s assimilationist-integrationist policies of race-relations, as well as accounts of New Zealand society and history framed by cultural nationalism. Moreover, *Ngati* (1987) and *Mauri* (1988) make direct reference to earlier works which suggests a continuing critical dialogue about race-relations and where Māori are situated inside the national framework. In this fashion, there is a connection between the films that form a narrative of their own which responds, reworks or reimagines race-relations from a different point of view.

Similarly, *Once were warriors* (1994) and *Whale Rider* (2002) are embedded in the socio-historical context of the late 1990s and early 21st Century. As will be examined, the narratives contained within these films connect with State directives regarding race-relations, the social concerns of the Māori social body and contemporary understandings of Māori subjectivity. It is argued that these films continue to exhibit causal relationships between State policy, and reconfigure the nationalised race-relations narrative to reflect present day influences and concerns.

In order to investigate the claim, the following reference points and indicators are used:
1. An over-view of the social concerns that form part of the critical dialogue about race-relations;

2. The dominant views of race-relations in the social contexts when the works were produced and how the same are connected to the governing State policy;

3. An analysis of the filmic case studies exploring how the above frames notions of Māori subjectivity inside the race-relations narrative and are borne out in the works.

In the early 21st Century a number of our pioneering and leading artists have passed away including, John O’Shea (2001), Michael King (2004), Tama Poata (2005), Wi Kuki Kaa (2006), Barry Barclay (2008) and Merata Mita (2010). These artists were instrumental in key moments and movements in New Zealand’s history, and in the way the country came to re-evaluate itself in terms of race-relations. The contribution of these artists to New Zealand as a whole is incalculable. As Graham Tuckett (2008) noted in his tribute to Barry Barclay “there is a clearing where a forest once stood”.
Chapter 11: Ngati (1987)

Introduction

This chapter examines the influences on Māori subjectivity and race-relations in Barry Barclay’s seminal work, Ngati. As outlined, Ngati forms part of the Māori Renaissance when Māori artists began to articulate in a way that has been described as “emphatically Māori”.150 Barclay’s work arose in the aftermath of a period of civil unrest in New Zealand society and in particular the protest movements of the 1970s, 1980s and the 1981 Springbok Tour. As set out in Film case study 5, Barry Barclay and Tama Poata, the scriptwriter of Ngati, were directly involved in the broader protest movements of that period. It is argued that a key thematic of Ngati and also Mauri (1988) is to present a re-examination of race-relations from a Māori point of view by directly referencing core cultural nationalist myths about the assimilation and integration of Māori under the auspices of ‘modernisation’. As discussed in Chapters Seven, Eight and Nine, assimilation and integration policies formed a core part of the nationalised race-relations narrative about where Māori should be situated in ‘modern’ New Zealand society. Barclay’s Ngati inverts or, as Stuart Murray (2007, p.88) notes, “re-works” cultural nationalist assumptions. A principal element of the Māori protest movements was the criticism of government policies that contributed to the loss of Māori culture, language, heritage and land alienation through the process of urbanisation. Ngati responds to the cultural nationalist version of New Zealand by offering a different time-line and potential future for Māori society.

Ngati is set in the fictional town of Kapua on the East Coast of the North Island and comprises three main narrative threads. The first thread centres on Ropata, the son of Iwi and Hine, brother of Sally and best friend of Tione who is dying of what is thought to be leukaemia. The second is based on the return of the Australian raised Dr Greg Shaw who has come to Kapua to train under Dr Bennett. Unbeknownst to Greg Shaw, he has Māori heritage and is related to the local community in Kapua through his mother. The third thread focuses on the fight by the Kapua community to keep the local freezing works open, in opposition to The Company who wish to close the works. It is argued that these three main narrative threads raise and explore important issues about the State of the nation at a time when New Zealand had officially adopted biculturalism.
11.1 Social context - referencing the protest movements in Ngati

The social context that informed Ngati was a pivotal era in New Zealand society characterised by civil unrest. Key movements, including anti-racism, gender equality and, calls for redress and honouring the Treaty of Waitangi, focussed on protesting against all forms of oppression. Importantly, the 1981 Springbok Tour changed the way New Zealand society viewed itself in terms of race-relations. If Utu (1983) evidenced the “pause” in New Zealand society where “change” was inevitable, but the country had not decided what direction to take, then Ngati exhibits the influence of broader discussions about race-relations away from cultural nationalist assumptions toward bicultural aspirations. It is important to note, however, that Ngati was produced at a time termed the “advent of biculturalism” when the socio-political ideology was in its developmental stage and had not yet bifurcated into the two world-view model.151

As discussed in Chapter Four, the Fourth Labour Government adopted biculturalism officially in 1984 as a way in which to address and negotiate race-relations. The influence of the recent past on race-relations and the potential for conflict is indicated in Peter Calder’s (1987) review in the New Zealand Herald of the film:

Ngati is a deceptively gentle film. Its images are composed with a wistful pensive restraint and its pace is easy and friendly. Yet bubbling beneath its surface is the most powerful political statement about Māoridom – and by extension all indigenous culture – our cinema has not yet managed.

Barclay viewed making Ngati as, in itself, a “political act” and while, as noted by Calder, the film is “deceptively gentle” the work draws indirectly on the political turbulence of the 1970s and 1980s.152 Similarly to Witi Ihimaera’s The Matriarch (1986), Ngati can be seen as a response to and critical engagement with, earlier cultural nationalist accounts of the construction of New Zealand history, settlement, race-relations and where Māori were situated within that framework. In effect, Ngati is a re-examination of race-relations in New Zealand society. The film addresses the notion that particular attitudes associated with “modernising” Māori may have in fact, not been beneficial to the Māori population or the country as a whole and offers an alternative account.
11.2 Re-working cultural nationalist myths: the inversion of Māori as detractors to progress

The subject of re-examination is a principal element in *Ngati* and can be seen in the way that Barry Barclay references *Broken Barrier* (1952), in order to highlight similarities between the two films, but also to convey his own directorial point of view about Māori in the cultural national framework. Both films were made and produced by John O’Shea’s Pacific Productions, set on the East Coast of the North Island of New Zealand, and were placed in the same time period. Thematically, the films address similar issues, such as nation building and the depiction of Māori as core contributors and participants in New Zealand’s economy.

One of the directive codes in *Broken Barrier* (1952), however, was to focus on Māori as progressive contributors in the modernisation of New Zealand society in response to cultural nationalist views, that Māori were impediments to civilisation. In *Ngati* the theme of “modernisation” is inverted, so ideas about progress and civilisation are seen to depend on one’s point of view. This theme is made explicit in the conversation with the class-conscious Australian Doctor, Greg Shaw, and the local Māori bus-driver. Upon arrival, Shaw states, “Kapua is a dead-end”, to which the bus driver responds, “we like it like that”. Further, when Dr Shaw is leaving, he states, “I thought I was sent here to teach the natives about the outside world. I was a bit stuck up eh? It turned out, I was the pupil”. The character of Greg Shaw plays an important transitional role between himself and other actors in the film in his realisation that the Māori community has much to offer “the outside world” and by extension, New Zealand society.

The idea of the “modern” in *Ngati*, as an inverted cultural nationalist myth of assimilation, is juxtaposed with the rurally based life-style of local Māori. It is suggested that the subtext of the subject of modernisation in *Ngati* is that it may in fact have been detrimental to Māori and come at the expense of the local people’s way of life. By extension, Barclay’s directorial code is that assimilation-integrationist policies, that submerged Māori culture into the Brown Britons model, are also a primary cause of the civil unrest about race-relations in contemporary New Zealand society. Primarily, as the title suggests, “Ngati” is about a community of Māori who are related to one another. One of the major characters is named “Iwi”, which is also the title for the overarching structure of traditional Māori society. The term “ngāti” however, was the central social and political working unit of Māori society that, in turn, provides one of the cornerstones for the Iwi.
The idea of the “modern” in the rural, can be seen as a direct response to the cultural nationalist, assimilation-integrationist policies that proposed the “blending” of Māori into mainstream New Zealand society. Within the “one nation - one people” view, Māori were required to make all the concessions and assimilate by keeping core parts of Maori culture (ascribed in the Hunn Report) under the rationale of civilisation and modernisation. These cultural nationalist views underpinned Māori and Pākehā relations until (officially) 1984 when the Fourth Labour Government came to power. While the sentiments contained in the Hunn Report were met with significant resistance and became the focus of protest upon its release, it was not until the official adoption of biculturalism that the policy was formally superseded.

“The Company”, whose officials display unsavoury and racist attitudes toward Māori, represent those who held power in the cultural nationalist era. The Company is about to close the largest source of employment in Kapua, namely the freezing works. There is a clear association in Ngati between The Company and its officials, and representatives of the State. This is evident when it is revealed that The Company comes with a predetermined agenda (to close the freezing works), which is couched within the discourse of “being good for the local community” (Māori), but is, in fact the direct opposite. For example, one company official declares that “we’ve been good to your people”. This comment is juxtaposed against the hostility of one official toward Mac, the Marae Chairman, on finding out a meeting between The Company and local community has been delayed. In this exchange there is an authoritarian threat that The Company may not be as “good” to the people in future. As events transpire, The Company has already decided to close the works and the meeting is procedural, rather than consultative.

The attitudes of The Company are representative of the State toward Māori in the cultural nationalist period and beyond. The State, its attitudes and practices with Māori had been a central target in the protest movements. Given the recent 1981 Springbok Tour where the State had played less than fair with protestors, the framing of The Company, as a State-type figure in Ngati draws on the mistrust of draconian, authoritarian institutions to act in good faith. Issues such as institutional racism embedded in State practices would lead to a Ministerial Inquiry in 1986 that would find racism in the State sectors “endemic”. It is argued that The Company’s underhanded actions in relation to the closure of the freezing
works symbolically represents Māori-Crown interactions, where the State defined in careful and rigid parameters how race-relations would be enacted. As outlined, within the cultural nationalist view of race-relations, it was Māori who made all the concessions in the State policy of assimilation-integration.

The construction of The Company as a somewhat intrusive, authoritarian and malignant force in the community of Kapua is placed in direct contrast to the Māori-Pākehā interactions between other characters in the film. While The Company officials are visibly Pākehā, they do not stand in as representatives in a clash of colours and culture between Māori and Pākehā. Similarly to Mauri (1988), the distinction is made between those who work for the State and those who serve the interests of the mainly Māori community.

11.2.1 Issues of race/ethnicity and class – Māori-Pākehā interactions

In comparison to The Company, local Pākehā people such as the Bennetts and in particular their daughter Jenny, are depicted as having real and meaningful relationships with Māori. For example, Jenny Bennett is best friends with Sally, Iwi and Hine’s daughter. Further, Jenny has remained in Te Kapua, while Sally has moved to the city. It is important to note that the Bennetts are portrayed as Pākehā-Māori and are familiar with local Māori custom and protocols. Jenny Bennett is the schoolteacher, but also gathers kai moana with the Māori community, is familiar with Māori custom and authoritative enough to reprimand the children for breaking kina on the beach by saying “don’t let the old people catch you doing that”.

Furthermore, it is Jenny and her family who act as the interface between Greg Shaw and his introduction to Māori culture and reconnection with his own whānau.

In this fashion “location” becomes a significant feature between Māori and Pākehā in terms of closeness and familiarity. This thematic is best exemplified by the character of Sally who is portrayed as an ambiguous character in that she is both educated and urbanised. As one of the Aunties tells her, “you educated people move too fast”. Sally’s ambiguity is reinforced when her father, Iwi tells her “you have forgotten our ways. Too long in the city. Don’t mess with mate Māori”. What is evident is the juxtaposition of Jenny Bennett, the Pākehā-Māori and Sally, the potentially corrupt urbanised Māori-Pākehā. Thus, “being Māori” or “being Pākehā” is not indicative of a particular political position on race-relations.

The reframing of Māori and Pākehā into a two world-view model would be evident in later works, such as Once were warriors (1994) and Whale Rider (2002), but in Ngati and Mauri
the construction of politics along ethno-cultural lines is not as marked. Indeed, given the characters of Sally and Jenny, it is argued that such distinctions are blurred. What is suggested is that the characters of Sally, Jenny, the Bennetts and The Company reference the dynamics of the broader protest movements of the 1970s and 1980s. As outlined in Chapters Four and Five, political affiliations to the protest movements were heterogeneous, fluid, dynamic and often competing, in ways that crossed ethnic, cultural, gender and class lines. Both the director and scriptwriter of *Ngati* had multiple political affiliations in the protest movements.

The clear directive message of the interactions between characters in *Ngati* is that both Māori and Pākehā can have meaningful relationships and that the enmity between Māori and Pākehā can be overcome through mutual respect and understanding. Given the social context in which *Ngati* was produced there is a quiet, understated message of harmony that is evident in the relationships between the Bennetts and members of the local Māori community. In this fashion, *Ngati* aligns with *Broken Barrier* (1952), *To Love a Maori* (1972) and *Utu* (1983) in that it is advancing co-operation between the two peoples, but with a change of attitude.

**11.3 Bicultural co-operation: Māori autonomy and redress**

While Māori sovereignty issues are not addressed explicitly until the end of the film, there are however clear themes relating to Māori autonomy or *tino rangatiratanga*. The comments by Calder in his film review, allude to the social context in which *Ngati* was made in that issues of Māori sovereignty were under discussion. If The Company can be seen as representative of the State, it is argued that community control of the freezing works is a metaphor for Māori sovereignty and for Māori to take a greater role in the running of their own affairs. Such views were circulating in New Zealand society in the 1980s with discussions regarding partnership as promised in terms of the Treaty of Waitangi. These notions of partnership formed a core part of the bicultural framework, but how “partnership” was to be enacted was still in negotiation when *Ngati* was being made. It is important to note, however, that Māori do not escape criticism or responsibility in the situation of employment or lack thereof at Kapua. At the meeting where the closure is discussed, a Māori farmer makes this explicit by stating “Māori farms are not supporting our works”. Thus, if Māori are to be in charge of their own future, then the theme is that the people must make a commitment to the development of Māori society, in order to ensure this outcome.
It is the central character of Iwi, however, who makes the ultimate personal sacrifice, when he agrees to manage the “Pākehā” run sheep station, Nga Kuri in order to secure employment for the community of Kapua. In a career playing characters who make the ultimate personal sacrifice for the “good of the nation”\textsuperscript{157}, Wi Kuki Kaa, as Iwi brings an added dimension of power when he gives up the opportunity for autonomy by agreeing to work for Nga Kuri. In this fashion, Iwi agrees to work and cooperate with Pākehā in order to ensure Māori autonomy for the community. The clear directive message in this encounter is that Māori and Pākehā must work together in the tino rangatiratanga of Māori inside the nation-state.

There is, however, a further metaphor that can be found in Iwi’s decision to work with Nga Kuri. Many individuals prominent in the Māori protest movements would work with the State and its agencies in the 1980s to change perceptions of Māori, and race-relations in New Zealand society. People such as Donna Awatere and John Rangihau would become involved in writing biculturally-based social policy in the public service sector. It is argued that this reveals Barclay’s “hope for change” in the new bicultural New Zealand where unsavoury attitudes in institutions maybe changed from the inside out.

### 11.4 Māori law/lore: co-equals on the landscape

As in Mauri (1988), Māori culture is utilised as a demarcation point in Ngāti to establish a point of difference between those people who will embrace a “bicultural” New Zealand future, and those who will not. It can be seen, for example, that officials of The Company are reluctant to change or share power, but are forced to through ‘people power’. It is, however, the character of Dr Greg Shaw who acts in a transitional role and is transformed by his experiences in Kapua and the revelation of his family history. On introduction Greg Shaw is used as a representative of people who regard “native peoples” as inferior and has superior notions about modernisation. Greg’s realisation that his position as a doctor does not guarantee him automatic respect from the local community and that he is, in fact, the student in Kapua changes his outlook about Māori.

It is through the expositions of the Bennettts that the audience learns that Greg Shaw is intricately connected to Kapua and its people, through his late mother. Further, it was possibly the rejection of Māori traditions and spirituality, in the strong belief of modern medicine that may have cost Dr Shaw his Māori wife, and Greg his mother. There is a directorial code in Greg’s rediscovery of his Māori heritage and culture, and establishing the same as a co-equal in wider New Zealand society throughout the film. This can be seen in the
The importance of Māori culture is evident in the social obligations placed upon Jenny Bennett in hosting Greg Shaw as “manuhiri” (guest). There are a number of host responsibilities applied to the welfare of guests in Māori society. While Jenny Bennett is not Māori, it is made clear to her by the local Māori people that she is subject to the same social and cultural obligations as everyone else. First, Dr Bennett reminds Jenny that, “he [Greg] is manuhiri”, which is reinforced by one of the Aunties, who tells Jenny Bennett to “look after him. He’s manuhiri”. What this suggests is that both Māori and Pākehā are subject to Māori cultural customs and protocol in the New Zealand landscape.

Further, there are a number of key scenes where Māori culture is used as a reference point by those who are familiar and friends with Māori, and those who are not. In the scene where Jenny takes Greg to the pub and they meet Sally, there are a number of insider jokes between the two women at Greg’s expense. This is evident when Greg proudly says to Jenny and Sally “they taught me a new word. Kiore”. With barely concealed smiles, Jenny and Sally say to Greg “Kia ora”. Unfortunately for Greg, he has mispronounced a Māori greeting (kia ora). Making it sound like the term for a rodent (kiore). In this fashion, Greg is depicted as a well-intentioned, but cultural novice. Greg’s lack of familiarity with te reo Māori is used as a source of humour and a reference point between those who are immersed or familiar with Māori culture and those who are not.

Greg’s lack of familiarity, however, does not represent institutional power or a danger to Māori interests. Greg’s naivety is also not portrayed as detrimental to the future direction of the country. Rather, it is through Greg’s journey into his past, that the audience understands how superior attitudes toward Māori are misguided and can be changed. Like Tom Sullivan in Broken Barrier (1952), Greg becomes the exemplar in the film in his reconnection with Māori culture, customs and heritage.

Those who are depicted as both “ignorant” of Māori culture and custom and dangerous, are The Company officials. This can be seen in a number of scenes where The Company
officials are portrayed as snobbish, racist, patronising and hostile to Māori people. In the scene where The Company officials are in attendance at the Marae to discuss the closure of the freezing works, a man from the audience begins a whaikorero. Mac, the marae chairman, groans and one of The Company officials asks what is being said. Mac responds, “He is talking about all the people who will be affected”. The man performing the whaikorero was not discussing this subject at all, but Mac used Māori cultural protocol as a way to keep the closure of the works at the forefront of discussion. What emerges from this scene is the distance of The Company officials from Māori culture, their perfunctory attitudes toward meaningful partnership and the hypocrisy of their earlier rhetoric of being concerned about Māori interests.

11.4.1 Spirituality
Arguably, the strongest metaphor for establishing the importance of Māori culture as a full and equal partner in its own terms on the New Zealand landscape centres on the figure of Ropata. Ropata has an illness that neither Māori nor Pākehā medicine can cure. The boy is terminally ill with leukaemia. Ropata is beyond the help of the Tohunga or doctors in 1948 New Zealand and it is in the impotence of both Māori and Pākehā medicine to cure him that the central theme of equality is framed. Principally, that neither Māori or Pākehā medicine is superior to the other. This is best illustrated when Iwi is questioned by Sally as to the validity of Māori medicine in curing Ropata. Iwi responds with “Pākehā medicine can’t cure Māori sickness” to which Sally responds “neither can Māori”. It is argued that in the face of an illness that cannot be cured, both Māori and Pākehā medicine has limitations. Thus, notions of superiority or the value of one over the other becomes a moot point in the face of Ropata’s suffering and eventual death.

As events transpire, there is arrogance in the assumption that Pākehā medicine is superior to Māori. Greg’s father, Dr Shaw Senior who was the resident doctor before Dr Bennett, refused to have the Tohunga (spiritual leader) perform karakia (incantations) on Greg’s mother when she was ill. Mrs Shaw was the only person in Kapua to die and there is an implication that her death was as a result of her husband’s strong belief in the superiority of Pākehā medicine and attitudes toward Māori medicine. In the conversations between Dr and Mrs Bennett, Greg’s heritage, why Greg is unaware of his and his mother’s people and the reasons for his relocation to Australia are revealed to the audience.
Conversely, when Jenny Bennett was an infant she was dangerously ill in the same epidemic, Dr and Mrs Bennett allowed the Tohunga to perform a karakia over her cot. The Bennetts believe the actions of the Tohunga saved Jenny’s life. Thus, the Pākehā-Māori Bennetts were more open to Māori medicine and spirituality than Dr Shaw, a man married to a Māori woman and father of a Māori child. Both men were of equal status in terms of qualification, but one embraced Māori spirituality and culture, while the other did not. What these events suggest is that Māori culture and spirituality have relevance inside the modernist national framework.

The intersection of Māori culture and spirituality is an overt theme in both Ngati and Mauri (1988). There is the spiritual connection between Tione and Ropata, at the moment of Ropata’s death. In the classroom, Tione stands and says, “it’s Ropata. I can hear it”. Jenny does not question the validity of Tione’s statement and allows the children to leave. In this fashion, Māori culture and spirituality are used as key demarcation points in that there may be forms of connection which are inexplicable to the dominant culture, but should not be denied. These themes are reminiscent of John Rangihau’s model of Māoritanga and Pākehātanga where Māori spirituality and culture were denoted as core components of difference. It is important to note, however, that notions of Māori spirituality and culture in Ngati are not indicative of rigid boundaries in the work. Rather, the thematic is that mutual respect, understanding and an open mind will grant entry to Māori society, and form a core part of building a new nation beyond cultural nationalist propositions.

11.5 Cultural authentic/cultural degenerate - the rural and urban divide

While Ngati as a film symbolises a different view of New Zealand history and posits an alternative timeline that avoids the ills of urbanisation for Māori, the work does utilise the cultural authentic/cultural degenerate dichotomy that has been well-established in earlier films. Melanie Wall (1997, p.43) described both Ngati and Mauri as utilising a contemporary stereotype that she termed a “quintessential Māori”. In Wall’s view:

“The stereotype of the quintessential Māori … is a contemporary stereotype actively generated by Māori themselves to reclaim their right to self definition and establish a foundation of political activism. Significantly, though, this supposed rebirth of the Māori identity has relied upon the colonial stereotype of the Black Other as the primitive/exotic. This tendency is clear in the selective reimag(in)ings of ‘Māoriness’ by revisionist film-makers, as in Barry Barclay’s Ngati (1987) and Merata Mita’s
Both films are set in the past where a quintessential Māori identity is (possibly) less problematic, its unified expression more protected from fragmentation as their lived experience fits more comfortably with what is considered to be ‘traditional’.

Wall’s article focused on the construction and use of Māori stereotypes in the media and while it is agreed that Ngati and Mauri (1988) are critical works in constructing a new bicultural mythology in the nation-building exercise, the image of the ‘quintessential Māori’ has been used throughout the cinematic record in various guises. In particular the cultural authentic/cultural degenerate dichotomy uses, as a frame of reference, notions of essential or quintessential Māori juxtaposed with potentially corrupt Māori to make social comment on social concerns of the Māori population and how to function inside the nation.

As discussed in this thesis, the cultural authentic/cultural degenerate dichotomy is a meta narrative that runs through the nationalised race-relations narrative and evidenced in the works depicting Māori-Pākehā interactions. In this instance, however, Ngati and Mauri (1988) are inverting images, and responding to earlier works by drawing on the same frame of reference. What is argued is that constructs of a ‘quintessential Māori’ are not necessarily new or contemporary stereotypes, but old ones that are reworked and reconfigured in the films to establish a Māori point of view on race-relations.

As Wall identifies, “location” is important in that rural New Zealand has been used to denote particular characteristics about people and the relationship between Māori and Pākehā in the cinematic record. This theme is evident in the interactions of characters in Kapua, where both peoples that have remained in the heartland of rural New Zealand engage and interact in meaningful ways. Māori characters who have become urbanised, such as Sally, are characterised as objects of suspicion by both Māori and Pākehā alike until her position is revealed at the end of the film. In these encounters there appears to be a directorial nod to earlier works that portrayed rural New Zealand as the place where “real” Māori reside. As with Broken Barrier (1952), Ngati extends this metaphor to include Māori and Pākehā characters where “location” is utilised as a heuristic for political sympathies, and loyalties to a more bicultural view of the country.

On the surface there is a directive code in the film to urbanised and educated Māori that is resolved at the end of the work. This theme is evident in the discussions between Sally and
her father, Iwi. As it transpires in the film, Sally has lived in the city centres and returned to Kapua to help her whānau with Ropata. Her mother is also heavily pregnant and Sally has come home to assist her parents. In the exchange between Iwi and Sally, where Iwi tells Sally she has been too long in the city and “forgotten our ways”, Sally responds with “Māori mumbo jumbo more like it”. Further, Sally reinforces her suspicion of Iwi’s beliefs by stating, “Dad and his bloody Māori superstition” when she learns Iwi has banned Ropata’s friends from seeing him. At the end of the film however, Sally decides to remain in Kapua and as a result, embrace a more traditional community-based lifestyle. It is, however, Sally’s experiences in the urban centres and her education that motivate her to speak out against The Company’s plans to close the freezing works when others stay silent. This theme will be discussed further in Section 11.6.

While the urban drift is not explicitly addressed in Ngati, it foreshadows the alternative view presented in the film. In essence Ngati is a “what if” tale, in that if State policy had not encouraged Māori into the city centres, alienated Māori from land and culture, then the last three decades of protest may not have occurred. If, for example, the freezing works stay open in 1940s Kapua, Māori would not have been subject to urbanisation and those “lost” to the cities would have, potentially, remained in the rural areas. In this fashion, the “what if” scenario raises the possibility that Māori-Pākehā relations would not have deteriorated and the protest movements might not have been necessary because Māori would have been full partners in New Zealand society commensurate with the promises made in the Treaty of Waitangi. By making the active decision to work together for the betterment of its people and control of its own affairs, the local Māori community, as representative of Māori society, is advocating the possibility that New Zealand society could have been transformed.

In this sense, Ngati does not make a clean break with the established tropes of the representation and interpretation of Māori in earlier films, but inverts or reworks them. This is evident in the referencing of core cultural nationalist values such as notions of being ‘modern’ and progressive, equality (and fairness) and assimilation. This theme directly references the protest movements, especially assimilationist-integrationist propositions about Māori being “modernised” in the nation state.

As discussed in this thesis, the impact of the urban drift of Māori and the loss of land, culture and language had been a core criticism of the protest movements. The loss of culture and language is evident in the character of Greg Shaw who, for example, has a professional
occupation and on arrival, has particular negative attitudes about Māori. Shaw, however, does not know his own family or local history and at times proves himself inept in a cultural context in Kapua. What can be seen through the character of Greg Shaw and his transformation at the end of the film is that ideas about the modern and progressive depend on one’s point of view. Similarly, the cultural nationalist ideal of “equality” is challenged by the depiction of the actions of The Company. The Company is authoritarian, has a pre-determined agenda and pre-conceived attitudes about Kapua and its inhabitants. For the majority of the film there is a power imbalance between The Company and Kapua community, until the “people power” of the local community restores the balance, and chooses to control its own destiny. Moreover, there is a subtle nod to assimilation through the marriage of Dr Shaw Senior and his Māori wife, where, rather than becoming “one people” through inter-marriage, Māori were subsumed and lost in the process.

11.6 Gender: Māori women as political activists and inter-ethnic marriages

For a film often described as ‘deceptively gentle’, Ngati reserves some of its most powerful scenes for its climax and in particular, for the characters of Sally and her father, Iwi in response to The Company. In the scenes between Sally, Iwi and The Company what is revealed are directorial nods to the role women played in the recent protest movements, discussions about women’s place inside Māori culture, and the restoration of gender balance between Māori men and women. Apart from Sally, the women in Ngati hold a form of quiet and understated power, but ultimately, men make or must endorse the decisions on the future of Māori society. In Ngati men do not compete for women’s attentions; although there is a burgeoning romance between Greg and Jenny, it is largely left uninterrupted by third parties. The notion of contested masculinities is absent in the film and there is a reworking of “mateship” between characters, such as Iwi and Dr Bennett. It is argued that there are no clear boundaries for contestation between men in the film, but rather, competing views between The Company, as representative of the State, the local community and inside the local community about differing strategies to effect transformation.

In Ngati the women are central to the resistance, by the community, to The company. The mana of women in Ngati is best illustrated in the scene where Sally moves from the kitchen to the wharenui and stands up to The Company officials. Symbolically, this move by Sally from the wharekai to the wharenui, can be seen as women inhabiting the domain of men and taking their roles as leaders (or joint leaders) in Māori society. Before Sally’s actions, the
men in the audience are depicted as over-awed by the occasion and the presence of The Company officials. For example, when The Company officials set out their views on why the freezing works should close, the only person to stand and make an attempt to offer a counter-position is Mac. Mac asks the people to consider “their future and the future of Kapua overall”, which is met with stony silence.

It is left to Sally to offer a counter-view to The Company that “thanks shouldn’t be one-sided”, which makes reference to the contribution of Māori in the workforce. This theme is extended further by Sally when she states that Māori should “run our own freezing works, our own farms, our own fisheries. Let us run them ourselves”. The women in the kitchen give Sally their blessing from the sidelines and support her actions. It is argued that what is revealed in this scene, through Sally’s polemic to The Company, are the views of Barclay and Poata regarding tino rangatiratanga. Sally, the youthful, urbanised, educated, ambiguous and outspoken Māori woman acts as the narrator for Māori sovereignty inside the cultural domain (wharenui).

What emerges from this scene is the active political power of women in a social and cultural context, referenced to the role of women in the protest movements. Arguably, Sally’s comment is the clearest reference to Māori sovereignty in Ngati, but it is utilised to consolidate the community of Kapua, in order to convey a strong directorial code to Māori. In this way the “radical” and “conservative” elements of the protest movements are brought together, to show that aspirations for the transformation of Māori society, and the country as a whole may, in fact, be complementary.

Symbolically, it is Iwi, the patriarch of the whānau, who gives Sally’s actions the ultimate endorsement. Upon arrival at the meeting, Iwi witnesses Sally’s speech and responds with “she makes sense. You see the trouble with us is we hear the voices and the sounds of our young people, but sometimes we do not hear the message”. What is revealed in this scene is that men and women, the older and younger generations, rural and urban, the educated and uneducated, the traditional and modern can come together in common accord for the betterment of all. These views were important in the social context when the protest movements were in the recent past and change in New Zealand society was imminent. It is argued that Ngati offered a possible future for Māori society where Māori and supporters could work together in common accord, but within the national framework of New Zealand.
In arguably the most powerful scene in the film, which leads to the resolution of the narrative about the future direction of Kapua, Iwi stands to deliver his whaikorero in te reo Māori which directly excludes The Company. Iwi, as a transitional figure, has been worn down by grief and sorrow through the illness and eventual death of his son. He is characterised as a quiet powerhouse, suspicious of change and modern science. This is evident in his exchanges with Sally about the effectiveness of modern medicine over Māori spiritual practices to cure Ropata.

Iwi’s delivery of the line to the community, about The Company - “Greetings to the ears being pissed in by that lot there” - is a break from his earlier characterisation of the strong silent type who does not reveal his emotions. Iwi’s deliberate exclusion of The Company through his use of te reo Māori is an assertion of his and his people’s mana that they can participate in both worlds, whereas officials of The Company cannot. The directorial message is raising the question as to how can The Company, as representative of the authoritarian power of the State, represent or be trusted with Māori interests when they are primarily mono-cultural. What is revealed in this scene is the assertion of Mana Māori as an active, equal, ready and able partner in the new bi-cultural New Zealand that Barclay is advocating.

Furthermore, what this encounter suggests is that although Māori women had been active in the protest movements, in order to effect change, Māori society would need the tacit approval of Māori men. This scene provides a counterpoint to the ambiguous metaphor contained within Utu (1983) where it was suggested the actions of Matu in attempting to kill Te Wheke revealed a politic that Māori men could not rely on the total support of Māori women. In Ngati however, the exchanges between the women and Sally underscore that change will not occur in Māori society without the agreement of men and women.

11.6.1 Inter-ethnic marriages

There is a subtle re-working of the cultural nationalist myth about inter-ethnic marriages as a way to effect assimilation and integration of Māori and Pākehā in New Zealand. As outlined in Rewi’s Last Stand (1940), Broken Barrier (1952), To Love a Maori (1972) and Utu (1983), inter-ethnic love affairs have been used as a way in which to bring Māori and Pākehā together, or provide explanations as to why the two peoples are apart. The promise of progress offered by inter-ethnic marriage underpinned the relationships of Ariana and Bob, Rawi and Tom, Penny and Tama and also, Lt Scott and Kura. In Ngati, however, there is an
inversion of the promise of progress and integration through inter-ethnic marriage with the character of Dr Greg Shaw. Greg is the child of a Māori mother and a Pākehā father, highly educated and a professional doctor. While Greg could be seen in cultural nationalist terms as a modernised Māori and progressive in terms of education and social status, it is revealed in the film that Greg’s father has deliberately kept his Māori heritage a secret. What can be seen in the exposition and revelation of Greg’s family history and heritage is that the Māori side, in the inter-ethnic marriage equation, has been lost.

Greg’s loss is resolved at the end of the film when he visits his mother in the urupa and encounters Tione who shows Greg the appropriate cultural rituals of how to conduct himself around the dead. There is, however, another re-working of the inter-ethnic love affairs in Ngati that suggests the director was not imparting negative codes about relationships between Māori and Pākehā. As indicated in Section 11.6, there is a burgeoning romance between Greg and Jenny. In this fashion Greg is characterised as a Māori-Pākehā, whereas Jenny is the Pākehā-Māori and acts as the interface between Greg and the local community. What is suggested is that the reworking of the cultural nationalist view of inter-ethnic marriages is the directorial message of not forgetting, but embracing, the Māori side of the equation.

**Conclusion**

What have been examined in Ngati are the influences on Māori subjectivity and representation, the reworking and responses to earlier works and in particular cultural nationalist ideals about where Māori should be situated inside the nation State. In essence, it is argued that Ngati is the re-examination of New Zealand’s history within a Māori setting, in which questions are raised regarding the idea of progress (in cultural nationalist terms). As discussed this reworking and responding to cultural nationalist propositions in Ngati is not so much of a clean break from earlier works, but a reconfiguring to provide a Māori point of view regarding race-relations and the position of Māori inside New Zealand society. The film does advance a “clean break” from cultural nationalist notions of race-relations by offering an alternative view of Māori and New Zealand society that reflect bicultural themes. In this fashion, Ngati is not advocating that Māori remove themselves from the nation-state, but that the nation-state transforms its attitudes toward Māori and removes overt control of Māori affairs. What is advanced in Ngati is a form of biculturalism where Māori are full and equal partners inside the national framework. The re-examination of New Zealand history from a Māori point of view aims to reconcile the past and move forward to becoming, as Mita
suggests “one nation”, but acknowledging “two peoples”. Thus, re-examination, reconciliation and the Treaty are utilised as nation-building narratives with the view of acknowledging Māori autonomy, but inside the national framework. Thematically, Ngati shares similarity with Mauri (1988) and commonality with Utu (1983) in the re-examining of New Zealand’s race-relations and national harmony. Undertaken in the next chapter is a critical analysis of Mauri (1988) in order to trace the key thematic of the nationalised race-relations narrative as it evolved from cultural nationalist propositions to bicultural ones.
Chapter 12: Mauri (1988)

Introduction

This chapter examines the influences on Māori subjectivity and race-relations in Merata Mita’s seminal work, Mauri. Similarly to Ngati (1987) and as outlined, Mauri forms part of the Māori Renaissance when Māori artists began to articulate in a way that has been described as “emphatically Māori”. Mita’s work arose in the aftermath of a period of civil unrest in New Zealand society and in particular the protest movements of the 1970s and 1980s, and the 1981 Springbok Tour. As set out in the Film case study 6, Merata Mita, the director, writer and producer of Mauri, was directly involved in the broader protest movements of that period which focussed, in part, on race-relations. It is argued that a key thematic of Mauri is to present a Māori point of view about race-relations by re-examining core cultural nationalist myths about the integration and modernisation of Māori into wider New Zealand society.

Symbolically the establishment of a Māori view-point on race-relations is influenced by the advent of a bicultural discourse, where Māori aspirations were founded on becoming full Treaty partners in a bicultural New Zealand society. Thematically, Mauri is similar to Ngati (1987) in its response to core cultural nationalist values about Māori inside the nation state (which were underpinned by assimilationist-integrationist policies). Mita (quoted in Peters, p.107) rejected the notions of “reworking” in her film and stated that:

It was my intention to reflect a Māori point of view of our changing society. To see it as a Māori sees it, to write visually as a Māori would write it. To re-write and re-see negates our place as being a legitimate one from which to view social changes within Aotearoa.

As discussed in Chapters Seven, Eight and Nine, Rewi’s Last Stand (1925/1940), Broken Barrier (1954) and To Love a Maori (1972), assimilation and integration policies formed a core part of the nationalised race-relations narrative about where Māori should be situated in modern New Zealand society. Mita’s Mauri inverts the cultural nationalist assumptions by presenting a Māori view-point of the assimilationist-integrationist policies and their impact on the Māori population. In this fashion, Mauri is constructing a Māori narrative of race-relations and actively engaging in a critical dialogue by responding to earlier works of Māori-Pākehā interactions. As Mita (1992, p.49) once said “The Māori filmmaker carries the
burden of having to correct the past and will therefore be concerned with demystifying and decolonising the screen”.

Controversially, Mita (1992, p.47) once described the New Zealand film industry as a “white neurotic one” and part of the “colonial syndrome of dislocation” fuelled by “the fear and repression caused by political guilt”. O’Shea (1996, pp.19-20) found Mauri more challenging to the “bicultural cloak” and race-relations narrative than Ngati (1987), due to its strong views toward Pākehā. Arguably, this is because Mauri is more direct in its response to cultural nationalist accounts in earlier works.

As discussed, thematically and in terms of narrative structure, Mauri reflects Ngati (1987) in that it focuses on three main narrative threads. Mauri is set in the rural area of Te Kaha in the 1940s and in a predominantly Māori community. The three main narratives are relationship centred and weaved around the main characters of Kara (the kuia/elderly matriarch of the community) and Awatea (Kara’s granddaughter), Ramari and Steve Semmens, and the pivotal figure of Rewi/Paki. A sub-plot in the main narrative is the construction and impending opening of a rehabilitation centre for Māori that is to be opened and run by the State. At first the rehabilitation centre is viewed as an endeavour of ‘hope’ in terms of partnership between the local community and the State. As events unfold, however, the promise of partnership turns out to be a false hope and evidences the State’s perfunctory relationship with Māori. The film opens with a birth, ends with a death, but the metaphor is clear: it is about life and in particular, life in a Māori community and the serial continuity of Māori on the New Zealand landscape weathering the storms of history.

12.1 Social context

The social context that informed Mauri was characterised by a period of turbulent protest and civil unrest. As Mita (1989) once stated, Mauri was a film that offered hope to resolve racial tensions and could “find that pathway that would lead to resolution without violence”. Mita’s comments are reminiscent of those made by Hiwi Tauroa (1982), the race-relations conciliator, who believed New Zealand was on the brink of irreconcilable racial tensions. Given Mita’s involvement in the protest movements of Bastion Point and the violence captured on screen in Patu!, her documentary on the 1981 Springbok Tour, the potential of a violent confrontation to effect the demands for justice about the Treaty of Waitangi and
racism in New Zealand society was not out of the realms of possibility. The comments made by Mita and Tauroa about “race-relations” are an indication of the very real tensions in the social context that informed Mauri.

Mita’s statement about finding a pathway to resolve racial tensions without violence highlights one of the key themes of Mauri. Importantly, Mauri was motivated, in part, by Mita’s attempt to “heal” Māori and the nation. In 2010 at the Mana Wahine Lecture Series, Mita observed that what drove her work was “the quest for justice as the quest for healing” and that Mauri was motivated to provide a “healing arch” for Māori because of how much Māori “had suffered” throughout New Zealand history. Furthermore, in responses to questions from the floor about the “new taniwha rising [Rogernomics]”, Mita agreed that at the time Mauri was in production, she was unaware of what the future held in the shape of the neoliberal reforms and its impacts on Māori society.161

What are evident in the film are themes of re-examination, reconciliation and addressing racism in New Zealand society - core issues of the broader protest movements. These issues were central to, as Mita notes, the quest for justice in asserting the position of Māori as a co-equal partner in New Zealand society and commensurate with promises made in accordance with the Treaty of Waitangi. Similarly to Ngati (1987) the work is a re-examination of race-relations from a Māori point of view, shifting away from cultural nationalist assumptions and toward biculturalism in its developmental stage.

While there are a number of similarities between Ngati (1987) and Mauri, Mita is more direct in her challenge to one of the central cultural nationalist propositions that New Zealand was a racially harmonious society. The myth of New Zealand as a model for race-relations had been challenged in earlier works, such as Broken Barrier (1952), To Love a Maori (1972) and Utu (1983), with strong directive codes that racism could be overcome with a change of attitude. Mita, however, places the subject of racism in her film overtly. Characters such as Mr Semmens are encoded as holding unsavoury racist attitudes toward Māori and have been actively involved in the dispossession of Māori land. Unlike other characters in earlier works, such as Tom and Mr and Mrs Davis, who hold negative attitudes toward Māori but have the opportunity through familiarity with Māori characters to overcome these views, Mr Semmens is not redeemed in Mauri.

It is important to note, however, that “being Māori” in Mauri is not necessarily a heuristic for “good” or “being Pākehā” a code for “bad”. The encounters, events and transitions of the
main characters in the narrative reveal that being “good” or “bad” is entirely dependent on the actions of the individual. As will be discussed below, there are a number of Māori characters who are portrayed as untrustworthy and potentially detrimental to the Māori community. Conversely, there is the Pākehā character of Steve Semmens who is portrayed as one of the unsung heroes of *Mauri*. It is through the exchanges between Steve Semmens and his father that the audience is made aware of the background to Mr Semmens Senior’s antagonism to the Rapaṇa whānau, and how the same is unjustified. Some critics (Nic 1989) found the involvement of Whaea Eva Rickard and Geoff Murphy, as “overplaying outrageously as the redneck European, Mr Semmens” unconvincing. Other reviewers (Martin 1989) found *Mauri* to be an engaging work and urged viewers to embrace the “spirit of Mauri” with an “open mind”.

### 12.2 Re-examining, responding and reframing race-relations: Māori and Pākehā as co-equals on the landscape

Similarly to Ngati, re-examining New Zealand’s cultural nationalist influenced model of race-relations is a central code in *Mauri* that is clearly evident in the exchanges between the main characters. There is an overt theme of establishing Māori as co-equal to Pākehā inside the national framework. As discussed in Section 4.2 Political legitimacy and economics, Chapter Four, the enacting of this notion of power sharing between Māori and the Crown was under discussion. The theme of partnership is evident in a number of scenes throughout *Mauri*. For example, in the opening scene where a child is born, Kara insists to the Pākehā doctor that the umbilical cord is cut in accordance with Māori tradition and by a traditional implement (the shell). This scene suggests an assertion of Māori culture at an institutional level where the law of the State governs its citizens. The message contained in this scene is that the State must adhere to, or take cognisance of, Māori custom and protocol. The recognition of Māori culture, custom and protocol would underpin public social policy in the adoption of biculturalism. In the years that followed, how Māori culture, custom and protocol was recognised, and indeed, how consultation was to be conducted with Māori, would be the subject of tensions in New Zealand society. A number of these tensions can be seen in the controversy surrounding the introduction of Kawa Whakaruruahu or “cultural safety” into the national nursing programme.
In the social context that informed *Mauri*, however, Māori culture is utilised as a core point of difference between the Māori and Pākehā characters in order to establish Māori as co-equal on the landscape, and to signal those who will embrace a bicultural New Zealand or conversely, will not. Key documents such as Donna Awatere and John Rangihau’s *Puao-Te-Ata-Tu* (1986) that formed the basis of the Royal Commission on Social Policy (the April Report) presented a Māori point of view as to how the State should engage with Māori. Landmark rulings such as the New Zealand Māori Council and the Crown (1987), which found the Treaty of Waitangi was a “living document” and the Waitangi Tribunal’s decision in 1986 regarding te reo Māori, all served to underscore the social changes occurring in New Zealand society in relation to Māori culture and redress.

Culture as a point of difference is evident in a scene where Steve rides on horseback into a private tohi ceremony, where the hapu are burying the whenua (placenta) of a child. Steve’s breach of Māori protocol annoys Ramari and she declares to Steve “You were brought up here. You should know better”. This scene suggests that Steve is culturally ignorant of Māori customs and protocol, even though he has been raised locally, beside Māori and wishes to marry a Māori woman, Ramari. In this fashion, Steve stands in as a representative of Pākehā New Zealanders, who have lived side-by-side with Māori, but have little knowledge of Māori culture. What is evident here is that Steve is put in direct contrast with characters such as Bob Beaumont, Lt. Scott, Williamson and the Bennetts who are, for all intents and purposes, portrayed as Pākehā-Māori. Steve is, in some ways, similar to Tom Sullivan who is, at first, ignorant of Māori culture, but in love with a Māori woman.

It is important to note, however, that while this exchange identifies Steve’s cultural ignorance, it does not extend to excluding Steve from Māori society. When Steve marries Ramari, he attends meetings with Ramari as part of her whānau and as it transpires, he has learnt basic te reo Māori. Thus, the message is that characters such as Steve may be ignorant of Māori culture and custom, but have the ability, and opportunity, to learn. In this fashion, *Mauri* reflects *Ngati* (1987) in that one of the thematics centres on those who will embrace Māori as part of the new bicultural New Zealand and those who will be left behind.

Arguably the central theme of establishing equity of Māori law/lore with Pākehā on the landscape is best reflected in the character of Rewi/Paki. Rewi/Paki is one of the central transitional figures who reveals to the audience key events that bring the narrative to its
As it transpires in the film, Rewi/Paki has broken both Māori and Pākehā laws. Rewi/Paki has been a career criminal who, on escaping the city after a botched burglary, picks up a hitch-hiking Rewi Rapana. After a car-crash where Rewi Rapana is killed, Paki steals his identity and removes a taonga from Rewi’s neck. In this fashion, Paki has broken both Māori and Pākehā laws, and is haunted by the ghost of Rewi Rapana. In order to be healed and made free of the past, Paki must make amends with both Māori and Pākehā laws by asking Rewi Rapana for forgiveness. In the final scene, juxtaposed with the death of Kara and the journey of her spirit to Te Rerenga Wairua (Cape Reinga), a remorseful and grief-stricken Paki is arrested by Police after he confronts the real Rewi Rapana whānau’s He Taua on the beach. What is evident in this scene is the code that Māori law/lore has as much standing in New Zealand society as Pākehā law and should be recognised by all the inhabitants of the country. In effect, this scene is an expression of full tino rangatiratanga where Māori law/lore is equated with the Westminster legal system.165

The importance of Māori law/lore within New Zealand society is further developed with the character of Mr Semmens. It is revealed in the film that Mr Semmens has acquired the Rapana whānau’s land by dubious means. In an exchange between Mr Semmens and his son, Steve, which serves as an exposition of Mr Semmens’s active involvement in the dispossession and benefit of the Rapana’s loss of land, it is made explicit that Mr Semmens has acted less than honourably. Steve declares to his father “You and your council jacked it up between you” to which Mr Semmens responds “It was within the law”. Steve asserts that the taking of Rapana land by Mr Semmens and the Council was “punitive action” for an accident. In this scene, what is evident is how the State, local government and avaricious settlers have collaborated to dispossess Māori of land and resources. Steve’s denouncement shows a clear generational shift from the assumption of entitlement to Māori land within the assimilationist-integrationist New Zealand, toward a more self-reflective bicultural country willing to re-examine the loss of Māori land, resources and culture.

The character of Mr Semmens is depicted as mentally unbalanced in the film and as events unfold, there is the suggestion that Mr Semmens’s mental instability is due to the breaking of tapu when the Rapana land was acquired. As Kara says to Rewi/Paki on her deathbed, “Pākehās do not understand our tapu … even when it drives them crazy”. What is revealed in this scene is that all peoples on the landscape are subject to both Māori and Pākehā law/lore, and the mauri of the land.
12.3 Racism

In contrast to Ngati (1987), the subject of racism in Mauri is addressed explicitly, with characters representing differing attitudes in New Zealand society. In Mauri, Mr Semmens is encoded as the older Pākehā generation, who is racist, mentally unhinged and has been the recipient of the Rapana whānau’s land by dubious means. His son Steve is representative of a younger generation with different attitudes. Steve is in love with Ramari Rapana, whom he eventually marries. Furthermore, Steve embraces Māori culture and language out of his love and affection for Ramari. In this fashion, Steve plays a similar role to that of Penny Davis in To Love a Maori (1972) in that he offers the opportunity of promise in New Zealand for a new generation that holds different values and attitudes from their parents, through inter-marriage. Symbolically, the marriage of Steve and Ramari reflects the possibility of peaceful resolution between Māori and Pākehā, without the need for violence. The subject of inter-ethnic love affairs will be discussed further in Section 12.5.

The exchanges between Mr Semmens and Steve best exemplify the difference in attitudes between the older and younger Pākehā generations on the issues of race-relations and racism. When Steve encounters Mr Semmens spying on Ramari, an argument ensues. Mr Semmens declares, “She’s a spook. They [Māori] hate us. They all hate us”. Steve responds with “NO! You hate them”. What is evident in this encounter is the way in which Mr Semmens views Māori as both inferior and threatening. Steve, on the other hand, is shown to have real and meaningful relationships with Māori characters, such as Ramari and Willy Rapana. In this sense, Steve Semmens plays a similar role to Jenny Bennett and her parents, where the relationship of mutual respect and understanding is developed through familiarity and contact. Unlike Jenny Bennett, however, Steve is not depicted as a Pākehā-Māori, although toward the end of the film, he has embraced Māori culture in order to be a full member of the Rapana whānau and local community.

Moreover, when Mr Semmens unleashes his racist attitudes upon the child Awatea, the audience is made aware of Mr Semmens’s racism and lack of boundaries. Mr Semmens calls Awatea “a tar baby”, which is a racist and derogatory term and one with which she is unfamiliar. In the scene where Awatea asks Kara, “Nanny, what’s a tar-baby”? Kara responds with “the opposite of white maggot”. What this scene reveals is a changing attitude in New Zealand film toward the issue of racism. In earlier works, such as Broken Barrier (1952) and To Love a Maori (1972), the issue of racism was often minimised or the director
provided clear directions for ways in which to overcome racist attitudes. In *Mauri*, however, Māori characters respond to racial abuse by confronting racism with racism. Arguably this direct action is a product of the radical protest era and the delivery by Kara (played by Eva Rickard) gives an added weight to the line.

It is important to note that there are racial tensions between Herb (the urbanised Māori) and Steve. In a scene where Steve visits his childhood friend Willy Rapana, Willy’s friend Herb is set to attack Steve because Steve is white. Willy, however, intervenes and placates the situation by offering Steve both hospitality and protection. As will be discussed further below, it is important to note that it is Willy and the locally-based Māori who mediate the situation. Thus the antagonism of racial differences stems from the urbanised Māori outsider and not the locally-based Māori.

What this scene between Steve, Willy and Herb suggests is that ethnic and cultural differences can be overcome through inter-personal friendship. There is in this scene between Willy, Herb and Steve a reference to the attitudes that underpinned the alliance of protest movements in the 1960s, 1970s and 1980s. As discussed, the broader protest movements were based upon the politics and/or attitudes a person held, and were not necessarily dependent on ethnicity. This theme is reminiscent of the fluidity described in the protest movements of those eras where a coalition of peoples from a wide range of backgrounds opposed the State. Māori demands for redress, recognition of the Treaty of Waitangi and a review of the State’s actions and policies toward Māori were integral to the protest movements. It is important to note, however, that ethnicity was not an automatic indicator of political allegiance in the struggles. The demarcations of political allegiance based on ethnicity and culture would come later.

The were, however, very real tensions burgeoning inside the anti-Springbok Tour movement that were based on ethnicity, due to the lack of recognition of racism in New Zealand society, and the legitimacy of Māori struggles for justice and autonomy (Poata-Smith 2000, pp.76-77). The fact that people were protesting about Apartheid in South Africa, but not making links to the racism experienced by Māori in the country, became a source of frustration. There is in the scene between Steve and Mr Semmens, an acknowledgement and redress of racism experienced by Māori at home.

The fracturing of the anti-racist movement would have ramifications in the years that followed *Mauri* where the ‘personal’ would become political in that the ethnicity of an
individual would be referenced to a particular world-view. What is argued, however, is that the interactions between Willy and Steve Semmens exemplify the notion that it was the attitude (or politics of the person) that revealed political allegiance on issues of justice and racism, rather than ethnicity. In *Mauri* there are clear targets that are held responsible for the situation of Māori in New Zealand society, racism and the deterioration of race-relations. Mr Semmens, for example, represents the overt racists who hold counter views to establishing a new, just and bi-cultural New Zealand where Māori are co-equals. The primary targets, however, were the cultural nationalist attitudes of ‘old’ New Zealand and the State.

### 12.4 The State as enemy

It is argued that Mita’s strongest criticism is reserved for the State and its agents. Given Mita’s experiences with the State, it is unsurprising that such a code would be found in *Mauri*. The broadcaster, Joanna Paul (quoted in *New Zealand Herald* 2010) recalls her first meeting with Merata Mita at Television New Zealand when “She [Mita] was working on her film about Takaparawha [Bastion Point] and trying to hide her footage from the cop raids [on] her post production”. Mita had a similar experience with agents of the State while filming *Patu!* As stated by Mita, the personal cost to herself and whānau made the director query her involvement and actions in making the documentaries.\(^\text{166}\)

The importance of this thematic in *Mauri* is that it makes the work distinct from *Ngati* (1987) and films that would follow, such as *Once Were Warriors* (1994) and *Whale Rider* (2002). *Ngati* (1987), *Once were warriors* (1994) and *Whale Rider* (2002) reference, but do not explicitly address, the actions of the State. In *Ngati* (1987), for example, The Company stands in as representative for the State, but is depicted as a private corporation, rather than agents of the Crown. In *Once were warriors* (1994) and *Whale Rider* (2002), the role and actions of the Crown are somewhat absent from the narrative, which has been the subject of some criticism.\(^\text{167}\) It also places *Mauri*, thematically, in a similar narrative structure (when re-examining race-relations) as *Utu* (1983) in that it holds the State responsible for the situation of Māori and the deterioration of race-relations in contemporary New Zealand society.

What is evident is how the State is portrayed as an enemy in *Mauri* and that this is not only a central code, but also a meta-narrative. In some of the key scenes in *Mauri*, agents of the State are portrayed as untrustworthy, ignorant, abusers of power and culpable in the
deterioration of race-relations. Importantly, the State and its agents in the film are both Māori and Pākehā. It is argued that the portrayal of Māori characters that work on behalf of the State, as untrustworthy or detrimental to Māori issues raises the question of divided loyalties. This question of divided loyalties and ethnicity as a dubious marker for political allegiance is made explicit in the scenes between the young Māori police officer and the local community. The character of the young Māori police officer will be discussed further below.

The theme of the “State and its agents as enemy” is made explicit in Mauri in a number of key scenes. In one pivotal scene where Government Officials visit the local hapu to consult in the establishment of a rehabilitation centre on Rapana land, the encounter is depicted as farcical. At the powhiri (welcoming ceremony), the agents of the State are depicted as rude, insensitive, ignorant of Māori culture and custom, and only too willing to utilise dubious legislation in order to ensure positive outcomes for the Government. For example, the Minister and Government officials push through the women, who are performing the kai karanga (responding call) and elbow their way to the front of the group. In terms of Māori custom and protocol, such actions would be viewed as firstly, deeply offensive and secondly, as an act of aggression.

In traditional times, men would only lead a group onto a marae if the motivation was warfare. Otherwise, men would remain to the side of the women in the group. The actions of the Minister and the Government officials in this scene therefore, are depicted as culturally ignorant by mana whenua (local Māori) with potential ramifications in a Māori cultural context. The goodwill of mana whenua is necessary to forgive or ignore the officials’ transgressions of tikanga. This scene indicates that the relationship of Māori and the Crown has been one-sided and that Māori have made all the concessions.

Furthermore, the actions of the agents of the State are presented as tokenistic; the hui is supposed to be about consultation with local Māori, but is, in actuality, a means for Government officials to inform Māori of their intentions. As in Ngati (1987), consultation in this instance is procedural. The Crown and its agents have come to inform the local community what they intend to do. Thus, Māori are not full and equal partners with the State, but are subject to overt Crown control. The inference drawn is, that the State and its actions are to blame for the break down in race-relations.

The abusive power of the State is a theme which is revisited more than once in Mauri. In the discussions between Kara and Hemi, Hemi is hopeful that Māori can be full partners in the
running of the Rehabilitation Centre. As Hemi indicates, Māori will be participating in the rehabilitation centre as members and as such, Hemi hopes that local Māori can have input into rehabilitating Māori offenders. It is Kara however, who informs Hemi that the “Government want to run it”, which means that Māori will not be active partners in the rehabilitation of Māori offenders in the centre, but “clients”. Commensurate with this view, Māori will play a secondary and subservient role in healing members of their own community. This idea is further developed when the Minister and Government Officials inform local Māori at the hui that if Māori do not agree to the Rehabilitation Centre, the State can take the land under the Public Works Act.

What emerges from the discussions between Kara and Hemi, and the revelations of State officials, is the notion that Māori are subordinate in New Zealand society. The State may promise something in theory, but does not deliver in practice. These scenes directly reference the adoption of biculturalism as public social policy in the social context, where questions were raised in relation to the notion of “power sharing” and control of the future. As with The Company in Ngati (1987), where Sally and Iwi advocate Māori autonomy over the freezing works, the discussions about the Rehabilitation Centre make clear reference to notions of Māori sovereignty or tino rangatiratanga and the right for Māori to lead. It is important to note however, that a number of the themes in Mauri, such as the State acknowledging Māori cultural values, would be adopted in the late 1980s and 1990s through the bicultural reforms. A number of key individuals from the Māori protest movement, such as Donna Awatere, would be co-opted by the State to work as consultants and advisors on Māori policy in the bicultural reforms.

The reference to the Public Works Act has particular significance in the social context in which Mauri was produced. State actions on the acquisition of Māori land under the Public Works Act, and other legislation (for example, the acquisition of land for defence purposes) were under review. The intersection between the arts, the State and the social world was given deeper meaning through the character of Kara, played by Eva Rickard. Rickard had led the protest against the Raglan Golf Course, when Māori land had been acquired by the Crown for defensive purposes in World War II and then not returned to Māori. In this fashion, Mauri is a direct response to the cultural nationalist informed, political State directives of race-relations and its impacts on the Māori population.
The Crown’s role in exercising its power over Māori, via legislation, had come under considerable public scrutiny throughout the protest movements of the 1970s and 1980s. Key events, such as Bastion Point, the 1975 Land March and the Raglan Golf Course occupation, were centred on the actions of the Crown taking Māori land. Furthermore, actors and artists in both Ngati (1987) and Mauri were instrumental in the movements to regain and reclaim Māori land, language and culture. Arguably, in this instance, the personal was political and underscores the importance of why providing a Māori version of New Zealand society was a primary motivator in the works.

12.4.1 Friends or foe?

While there was an ambiguity in Utu (1983) based on who was friend or foe in the New Zealand wars, the foe of Mauri is quite clearly revealed as the State. Revealed in the scenes between agents of the State and the local community is the code that the State has been the main enemy of Māori, has acted less than honourably in its relationship with Māori and is primarily the cause of the present tensions regarding race-relations. As discussed, the ethnicity of an individual is not a clear marker of political affiliation or allegiance with Māori aspirations for autonomy in Mauri. Evidence of this theme can be found in the form of a young police officer (played by Temuera Morrison who is Māori), but portrayed as antagonistic toward local Māori and Māori issues. He is portrayed as sexist (when he makes sexual advances to Ramari), power hungry and with little affinity for the locals. In this instance, “being Māori” to the young Police Officer is notional and is reflected in his interactions with the Senior Police Officer when he expresses his desire to leave the community for better prospects in the city. The depiction of the young Police Officer is reminiscent of Hilda Halkyard’s comments on “how many Māori had unconsciously accepted the racist assumption of New Zealand society that Pākehā would always lead and Māori always follow” (quoted, in Awatere 1981, p.12; Poata-Smith 2000, p.76).

What is revealed in the character of the young Police Officer is how Māori cannot assume the support of people who are Māori and work for the State. The young Police Officer is depicted as an internalised racist who views the local Māori community as inferior and, in some instances, an obstacle to his career advancement. In a key scene where the Minister and Government officials are at the hui for the rehabilitation centre, Rewi/Paki states to the young Police Officer, “can’t you try being Māori today”? Thus, the young Police Officer is revealed in this exchange to be allied with the State and not interested in notions of Māori autonomy.
The young Police Officer views the capture of Rewi/Paki as primarily a goal to advance in the Police Force, which is placed at odds with the actions of the older Police Officer. The animosity between the young Police Officer and the older Police Officer as well as the local Māori community is reciprocal. The distaste with which local Māori view the young police officer is best exemplified when he drives past the children, who whakapohane (bare their backsides at) him. Furthermore, the young Police Officer is used as a form of comic relief. In this fashion, the young Police Officer shares similarity with the character of Dr Greg Shaw in *Ngati* (1987). The difference, however, is that, unlike Dr Greg Shaw who is culturally ignorant but willing to learn, the young Police Officer is culturally aware, but uninterested.

What this scene suggests is that the ethnicity of an individual does not necessarily equate to having the best interests of the group at heart. Rather it is actions which denote “friend” or “foe”. Furthermore, a subtle and significant code in the portrayal of the young Police Officer is that leadership of Māori cannot be decided by the State and through positions of authority one holds in State institutions. Māori must determine leadership, in this instance and as will be discussed in the section on gender, the leader of the local Māori community is quite clearly Kara.

The untrustworthiness of the young Police Officer is underscored with the capture of Rewi/Paki. Poignantly, in the scene where Paki is arrested, it is the older, ethnically ambiguous police officer, who comforts Paki in his grief. The older police officer, who has been in the area for 20 years, embraces Paki and performs a hongi. It is the younger and obviously Māori Police Officer, who places the handcuffs on Paki and arrests him. In this fashion, *Mauri* shares commonality with *Utu* (1983) in that the cultural customs and protocols are observed between the older police officer, and Rewi/Paki. If Wi Kuki Kaa has played roles that make personal sacrifices for the good of the nation, then characters played by Anzac Wallace have represented the physical sacrifice. Arguably, Rewi/Paki is sacrificed in *Mauri* for the “good of the nation”, but also for a bicultural view of the nation state, where all that inhabit the landscape are subject to the laws of both Māori and Pākehā. The notion of “sacrifice” in *Mauri* is a key theme that will be analysed in Section 12.5.3, Men as sacrifices.

12.5 Cultural authentic/cultural degenerate – the rural-urban divide

As discussed throughout this thesis, one of the plot devices used in films to examine the relationship between Māori and Pākehā is the rural-urban divide. As discussed, films such as *Broken Barrier* (1952), *To Love a Maori* (1972) and *Ngati* (1987) have used this dichotomy
to ascribe certain traits to characters in order for the audience to draw particular conclusions about actors in the works. As do Broken Barrier (1952), To Love a Maori (1972) and Ngati (1987), Mauri utilises the rural-urban divide to provide a social commentary about Māori issues inside the nation state, and posit ways forward for race-relations, and national harmony.

The rural-urban divide engenders the notion that rurally-based Māori are more authentic than urban-based Māori. This rural-urban divide has long historical roots in New Zealand and centres upon notions of Māori authenticity and decline. Mauri continues this dichotomy with urbanised Māori portrayed as corrupted, degenerate and untrustworthy. The conclusion drawn in these depictions is that the urban experience has affected “essential” Māori goodness and is responsible for the decline of Māori.

As outlined in Chapter 11, Ngati (1987), Melanie Wall (1997) described both Ngati (1987) and Mauri as using contemporary stereotypes of Māori (“quintessential Māori”) by setting their works in the recent past, and in a more “traditional” rural setting. While the cultural authentic/cultural degenerate, rural-urban divide and good Māori/bad Māori dichotomies have, however, been in operation for some time, Walls’s comments need some consideration. Clearly, Ngati (1987) and Mauri do continue the pattern of framing Māori into a cultural authentic/cultural degenerate dichotomy to make social comment on race-relations and social concerns of the Māori social body. As argued in Ngati (1987) these stereotypes of quintessential Māori are not new, but have long historical roots that are evident in the earlier works of Broken Barrier (1952), To Love a Maori (1972), Utu (1983), Ngati (1987) and Mauri. Mauri does continue the rural-urban divide, where the Rapana Whānau, who remain in their traditional and tribal setting, are portrayed as more connected to Māori culture than their urban-based counterparts. This theme can be seen in the character of Herb, who is depicted as racist toward Steve, in a scene where local Māori come to the aid of Steve and offer him hospitality. Further, Herb leads Willy Rapana to his death in a gang-war for leadership on their return from the rural area to the city. Herb is depicted as an untrustworthy character, which is made explicit by Ramari when she declares, “I wouldn’t trust Herb as far as I could kick him”.

The character of Willy Rapana is placed in direct contrast to and, as events unfold, competition with Herb. Willy is portrayed as a man straddling the rural-urban divide, still connected to his whānau and continuing his familial responsibilities even though he lives in
the urban centres. Willy Rapana is introduced to the audience on his return from the city where he plays a care-taking role with people and in the upkeep of the whānau’s urupa. Willy’s companions whom he brings with him from the city, including the untrustworthy Herb, best illustrate this theme of crossing the rural-urban divide. The reason for Willy’s urban location is due, in part, to the loss of Rapana Whānau land to Mr Semmens. It is clear from Willy’s encounters with Kara, his whānau and friends in the area, that he would prefer to remain at home.

The urban centres and urbanised or disconnected Māori, such as Herb are portrayed as corruptive and corrosive elements with regard to Māori tradition and cultural continuity. Arguably, the character that displays the corruptive forces of the urban experience is Rewi/Paki. As events in the film unfold, the audience is made aware that Rewi/Paki’s life in the urban centres has been one of degeneracy, crime and sadness. It is only when Rewi/Paki returns to the rural areas and is embraced by the Rapana Whānau that he can come to terms with his past and his redemption takes place.

The clearest example of this theme of urban dislocation and disconnection is when Rewi/Paki goes to make amends to Rewi Rapana and is confronted, on the beach, by a ghostly haka party that directly challenges him. Bruce Babington (2007, p.233) suggests this scene is a metaphor for the “unresolved modern problematics of a warrior culture in transition”. There are, however, other factors to consider. Given Mita’s activism, politics and the move toward biculturalism, it can be argued that the haka scene symbolises an ancient culture being revitalised, where the director is urging urbanised Māori, such as Rewi/Paki, to embrace the same as part of their lost heritage. The urbanisation/traditionalisation theme is constructed as part of Rewi/Paki’s “decline” and redemption. It can be seen in this scene that Mita is drawing upon the historical trope of the ancient world of the Māori, juxtaposed with the corrupt urbanised Māori, in order to provide a directive that for Māori to survive the “modern” world, Māori must embrace, not ignore, culture.

It is important to note that the reconnection of Māori to culture was posited as a cure for Māori over-representation in the negative social indices. In this fashion it is not so much a “warrior culture in transition” that is in question, but Mita’s advocacy for urbanised and dislocated Māori such as Rewi/Paki to embrace Māori culture as a way to conquer the ills of urban degeneracy. Similarly to Greg Shaw in Ngati (1987) and his return to Kapua, Rewi/Paki finds a Māori world waiting to embrace him, once he has made restitution. Unlike
Greg, however, Rewi/Paki’s disconnection is not from culture, because he proves himself to be familiar with Māori custom and protocol. Rather, Rewi/Paki’s disconnection is more spiritual in that he has broken tapu and has to make amends with both Māori and Pākehā laws.

In this fashion, Mauri does share thematic commonality with earlier works where rurally-based Māori were vested with essential goodness and urban-based Māori were depicted as degenerates. What is argued is that Mita is using this rural-urban divide to comment on the alienation of Māori from land and culture and not necessarily notions of “goodness”. One of the key theometrics in the use of the rural-urban divide is “loss” which is reflected in the “loss” of land (to Mr Semmens and the State) and people (Willy, and the dwindling population of Te Kaha). Those who may serve as kaitiaki in the future, such as Willy, are living in the urban centres and as events transpire, die there. With the loss of people and potential kaitiaki to the city centres, an aging rural-based population (Hemi and Kara), cultural attrition, continuity and survival are portrayed as endangered. It is through the depiction of loss to the community in Mauri that core issues are revealed to the audience. Moreover, juxtaposed with the theme of “loss” are the notions of redemption (Rewi/Paki), re-examination (Steve and Mr Semmens), reconciliation (Steve and Ramari, Rewi/Paki and Kara) and healing (Kara and Rewi/Paki). The metaphor is that once redemption, re-examination and healing have occurred, reconciliation and a new bicultural New Zealand are possible.

Given, however, the social context in which Mauri was produced and the themes of redressing the past and providing a Māori point of view of New Zealand history, society, politics and race-relations, the position taken in this thesis is that these are inversions of cultural nationalist depictions of Māori stereotypes. What is argued is that Mita is utilising cultural nationalist informed depictions of Māori to make comment about redressing the past and advancing ways forward. This can be seen in the themes of redress, reconciliation, racism, notions of Māori sovereignty and directives which construct the State as, historically, the primary enemy of Māori. The notion of “responding” and correcting mistakes of the past can be found in Mita’s comments above, where the director indicated that there is a burden on Māori filmmakers to respond to images about Māori. Whether this constitutes a perpetuation or the establishment of new stereotypes, or a response to previous stereotypes in an attempt to correct past depictions, is entirely debateable.
12.6 Gender: Māori women as leaders, inter-ethnic love affairs, contested masculinities and Māori men as sacrifices

Primarily *Mauri* is a female-centric film where the women hold power in the community and as keepers of cultural continuity. There is a return to the concept of contested masculinities and inter-ethnic love affairs, but these two notions have been reconfigured to be commensurate with more contemporary views. The mana of Māori women revolves around Kara who is the central figure, leader and focal point of the whānau. Members of the whānau always return to Kara and she is the holder of the tribal lore, wisdom and culture. Furthermore, the future leadership is entrusted with Māori women through the characters of Ramiri and the child, Awatea. What this suggests is that women are encoded in *Mauri* with ensuring cultural continuity, resolution and survival of Māori.

There are two issues that need consideration in the depiction of women in leadership roles in *Mauri*. The first is the reference to the leadership roles Māori women played in the protest movements and the second is the framing of Māori women in a ‘traditional’ or cultural domain. As discussed, Māori women played a key role in the broader protest movements of the 1970s and 1980s, and in particular the 1981 Springbok Tour. Key protests such as the 1975 Land March (led by Dame Whina Cooper), 1978 Raglan Golf Course protest (led by Whaea Eva Rickard) and the 1981 Springbok Tour saw Māori women in active leadership roles in New Zealand society. In his analysis of the role of women in the protest movements, Poata-Smith (2000, p.71) notes the high profile that Māori women gained through involvement in the anti-racist, Māori sovereignty and Springbok Tour movements:

> In the protests in Auckland organised by The Mobilisation to Stop the Tour (MOST), high profile Māori protestors formed the core of the third squad, Patu, which was acknowledged as the section most likely to breach police lines. Thirty-three of its thirty-seven marshals were women and this contributed to the image of Māori women as the vanguard of militancy.

Merata Mita’s documentary *Patu!* would take its name from the Patu squad of the Springbok Tour and it is argued that there is a direct association in *Mauri* with the active role Māori women played in the protest movements. As discussed, Eva Rickard, a high profile and controversial public figure in New Zealand society in the 1970s and 1980s plays the main character, Kara in *Mauri*. The added weight of having someone of Rickard’s status play Kara
in a film focusing on re-examination, reconciliation, redress and race-relations strongly links the contemporary protest movements with events occurring in the social context when *Mauri* was produced.

The setting of *Mauri* in the ‘traditional’ rural area of Te Kaha invites consideration of the role of Māori women in the cultural domain. A number of high-profile Māori women had been vocal in their criticisms of the patriarchy in traditional Māori society. The question of Māori women in leadership roles and Māori cultural tradition had been raised in relation to both Whina Cooper and Eva Rickard. Hilda Halkyard, Hana Jackson and Titehwai Harawira, leading members of Ngā Tamatoa, articulated the difficulties, and barriers facing Māori women in active leadership roles. Hana Jackson (quoted, in Awatere 1982, p.25) noted that Whina Cooper “took a lot of flak from men” and further, that a number of men said that “no one would follow the Land March because it was led by a woman”. In a similar vein, Titewhai Harawira, who remains to this day vocal in her opposition to the lack of speaking rights for women on the marae, indicated that the restrictions placed on Māori women speaking on the marae proved to be counter-productive when organising the 1975 Land March. Harawira (quoted, in Awatere 1982, p.38) stated:

*The Poukai in Waikato was a serious challenge. Out of my own tribal area. The take was more important than whether we should be allowed to talk because we were women, so we just did. And those Ngā Tamatoa men in Wellington they said: ‘Who the hell do you think you are. Just a bloody woman to come down here and tell us what to do’.*

(see also Poata-Smith, 2000, pp.59-82)

It is argued that the depiction of Māori women in active leadership roles in *Mauri* is a response to the tensions related to ‘traditional’ Māori society and women’s place in culture arising from the protest movements. Kara is portrayed as the central figure of the film, the community, Rapana whānau and acknowledged leader. This is evident in Kara’s interactions with the State and its agents, and Rewi/Paki’s seeking advice, support and redemption through Kara. Furthermore, Kara is depicted as leading opposition to the Rehabilitation Centre in the tokenistic parameters set down by the State.

Similarly to *Ngati* (1987), however, Māori women hold a quiet form of power in *Mauri*. For example, Kara does not assert her speaking rights on the marae, but is displayed as active
behind the scenes. Her direct responses are reserved for the racism Awatea encounters with Mr Semmens and her obvious displeasure with the cultural ignorance displayed by the State officials.

The character of Kara is portrayed as an older woman in the 1940s who entrusts leadership of the community to the figures of Ramari and Awatea. Like Nanny Flowers in Whale Rider (2002), Kara vests her hope for leadership with the younger generation of Māori women. In this fashion, cultural continuity and leadership is firmly located with women. As Peters (2007, p.113) states, “at the heart of Mauri … Mana wahine Māori gives assertion to a Māori identity in the film. Their relationship alludes to the creative presence of mauri as a life force”. It is argued that the role of Kara, as an older and more reserved woman in Mauri, references the evolution of the more assertive tasks that Māori women, such as Ramari, would play in the future. One of the reasons why Māori women are entrusted with leadership and cultural continuity is because a key thematic in Mauri is the sacrifice of Māori men. This will be discussed further in Section 12.5.3, Māori men as sacrifices.

12.6.1 Inter-ethnic love affairs
There is a return to the use of an inter-ethnic love affair to re-examine and make comment on race-relations in Mauri through the development of a love triangle. While there were suggestions of a love triangle in earlier works, such as Rewi’s Last Stand (1940), the love triangle that develops between the characters of Ramari, Rewi/Paki and Steve adds an extra dimension. In Rewi’s Last Stand (1940) Ariana, for example, was forcibly removed by Tama Te Heu Heu from the arms of Bob Beaumont. In Mauri, Ramari willingly oscillates between her two suitors and binds them altogether through the birth of her with Rewi/Paki - a child that will be raised by Ramari and Steve. It can be seen in the interactions between Ramari, Rewi/Paki and Steve that Ramari holds the power to determine who will win her hand.

Although Rewi/Paki is in love with Ramari, in an act of chivalry he turns Ramari away from himself and toward the wealthier and more stable, Steve. Primarily, Rewi/Paki steps aside and allows Ramari to marry Steve, not because Rewi/Paki does not love Ramari, but rather because he feels he is not worthy of her. Conversely, in the relationship between Steve and Ramari it is apparent that she holds the power. From the outset, Steve’s intentions of marrying Ramari are clear and it is she who is depicted as reluctant. It is, however, Ramari who makes the final decision on the relationship with Steve when it is revealed that Rewi/Paki will not marry her, even though she is aware of Rewi/Paki’s feelings toward her.
Ramari is depicted as an inversion of earlier female characters, such as Ariana in *Rewi’s Last Stand* (1940) and Rawi in *Broken Barrier* (1952). While Ariana was portrayed as a victim of circumstances and her desire was to remain with Bob Beaumont, Ramari is portrayed as preferring Rewi/Paki, but settling for Steve. It is argued that this thematic is both a direct reference to and inversion of, notions of “marrying up” or women being used as a vehicle to give birth to an integrated New Zealand society through the marriage of Māori and Pākehā. This is clearly evident in the scene where Ramari and Steve marry. When Mr Semmens, in an attempt to stop the marriage, dies on the wedding day, Rewi/Paki declares “Ramari has just struck gold”. It is important to note however, that this attitude does not stem from either Steve or Ramari, but observers. Steve appears to have a great deal of affection for Ramari, including raising the child of Ramari and Rewi/Paki as his own, even when fully cognisant that he is not the biological father. In his interactions with Ramari, it is made evident that the power in the relationship, as to whether it continues or ends, rests with her. In a scene where Ramari informs Rewi/Paki that the child is his, Rewi/Paki asks if Steve is aware of this factor. Ramari replies “There are no secrets between Steve and I”. Moreover, after the birth of Ramari’s child, Steve is shown at the local marae where he has learnt basic te reo Māori and is familiarising himself with local tikanga and kawa. There is a metaphor in Steve’s transition from the culturally ignorant (when he interrupts a tohi ceremony) to someone who is embracing Māori culture. In this fashion, Steve is portrayed as marrying “in” to Māori society, as opposed to Māori women marrying up (Rawi) or the potential to birth a new nation based on assimilationist-integrationist values (Ariana), marrying down (Penny to Tama) or marrying out (Greg Shaw’s mother). Symbolically, Steve, marrying “in” to Māori society, reveals that the true inheritor of the new bicultural New Zealand is Ramari and Rewi/Paki’s child who will be familiar with both cultures, supported by Pākehā cognisant, and fully aware of the child’s true heritage.

12.6.2 Contested masculinities
As indicated above, the character of Steve is one of the unsung heroes of *Mauri*. Steve learns te reo Māori, marries Ramari against his family’s wishes and defends Māori against his racist father. It is important to note that Steve challenges the acquisition of the family farm from the Rapana Whānau and speaks out against the injustice. The addressing of injustice has real consequences for Steve, as he is the heir to the family farm. None of Steve’s family attends the wedding, but he is resolved to marry Ramari regardless of the opinions of his family.
Further, Steve raises Ramari and Rewi/Paki’s child as his own, when he is fully aware of the fact that he (Steve) is not the biological father. It is evident in the film that Steve cares more for Ramari than she does for him, but he is portrayed as a genuine character with a deep attachment to his wife and Māori neighbours. In this fashion, Steve is portrayed as a harbinger of hope in the new bicultural nation in terms of redressing the past, seeking reconciliation and making amends in the relationship between Māori and Pākehā.

While key events centre on the love-triangle between Steve, Ramari and Rewi/Paki, it is surprisingly without antagonism. In this fashion, Steve and Rewi/Paki are portrayed as men who are civilised competitors for the affections of Ramari. In a crucial scene, Steve helps Rewi/Paki to evade capture by the Police. There is antagonism over Steve and Ramari’s relationship from Rewi/Paki, but it is explored through the interactions of Ramari and Rewi/Paki. Thus, the conflict between Steve and Rewi/Paki takes place with third parties and is not directly depicted in Mauri as occurring between the men.

The only obvious tension between the two men comes in an exchange where Rewi/Paki states to Steve that “one day that boy will have to know who his father is” to which Steve does not verbally respond. Prior to this exchange however, Steve and Rewi/Paki had shaken hands, and Steve had wished Rewi/Paki all the best for the future. While it is evident that there are tensions in Mauri, they are not easily categorised into “racial” or “gender” conflicts. For example, there are tensions between local Māori and the State, Māori characters and Mr Semmens, Māori women and Māori men, Māori men and other Māori men, Māori men and Pākehā men. Primarily, the tensions are dependent on events and interactions between characters.

Characters in Mauri do contest land and women, but as outlined above the women in the film are encoded with power. Thus, women are active agents and not objects. In terms of land, in a scene, which is almost a replay of Utu (1983), where Mr Semmens (played by Geoff Murphy, the director of Utu and partner of Mita) orders the child Awatea off his land, Awatea responds in the same way Te Wheke did by saying, “he says it is his land”. While Mr Semmens is representative of the power struggles between the descendants of settlers and Māori over land, his son Steve wishes to make amends for the injustices, including raising a bicultural child. Moreover, the death of Mr Semmens at the wedding of Ramari and Steve is used as a resolution in the film. Mr Semmens dies trying to stop the inter-ethnic marriage of his son and Ramari, who represent a new partnership of the nation. At his demise, Mr
Semmens remains, on the surface, unrepentant for his attitudes, but he is characterised as being driven mad through his internalised guilt and the breaking of tapu. In this fashion, *Mauri* shares commonality with *Utu* (1983) in sacrificing radical positions for the good of the nation. The metaphor is clear in that the death of Mr Semmens paves the way for the development of a new bicultural New Zealand away from the older cultural nationalist generational attitudes.

12.6.3 *Māori men as sacrifices*

While Mr Semmens can be seen as a symbolic sacrificial figure, one of the striking features of *Mauri* is that it is primarily Māori men who are sacrificed. It is suggested that this is an inversion of the recurring pattern where Māori women are sacrificed in order to convey directives in film. For example, characters such as Ariana and Kura were sacrificed for their ambiguity in choosing one side over the other or not declaring their allegiances fully and having conflicted loyalties. In *Mauri* however, it is the men of the Rapana Whānau who are sacrificed. Men are sacrificed by the State (Mr Rapana Senior and Rewi/Paki), Willy in the urban centres and the real Rewi Rapana making his way home. Willy Rapana is the promise of hope and potential sacrificed in the urban centres. This is evident in the scene where Kara experiences the moment of Willy’s death, at the hands of Herb, upon his return to the city. There will be no return for Willy, except to be buried in the whānau urupa which he tended only days before.

It is argued that women are encoded with cultural continuity and survival because Māori men in *Mauri* are depicted as bearing the full force of the State and the worst effects of urbanisation. A clear example of this is Rewi/Paki, who is sacrificed to the State and its institutions in order to highlight the importance of both Māori and Pākehā law. Rewi/Paki is representative of the healing arch contained in *Mauri*, in that he finds the strength to face his transgressions and redress both Māori and Pākehā laws, only after he has confessed his crimes to Kara. Unlike Mr Semmens, Rewi/Paki takes the opportunity to make amends in both Māori and Pākehā contexts, even when it means giving up his freedom and Ramari. While the personal pain experienced by Paki in this moment is evident to the audience, there is also the chance of redemption for Paki and forgiveness, as indicated by the actions of the older Police Officer.
Conclusion
What have been examined in *Mauri* are the influences on Māori subjectivity and representation in the move away from cultural nationalist depictions of New Zealand society toward a bicultural view of the nation. Thematically, *Ngati* (1987) and *Mauri* share commonality in their narrative structures and subject matter in that they re-examine or respond to race-relations in New Zealand from a Māori point of view. In this fashion, *Ngati* (1987) and *Mauri* are not so much a clear demarcation between “old” and “new” forms of cinema, but an inversion of the nationalised race-relations narrative informed by assimilationist-integrationist codes, rather than Māori as full partners in New Zealand society. Essentially, both *Ngati* (1987) and *Mauri* offer the promise of an alternative New Zealand society, where Māori are co-equals, in accordance with the promises made in the Treaty of Waitangi and under the auspices of biculturalism.

It is argued that neither film is radical thematically, politically, socially or in tone and content. The films are subversive, but *Ngati* (1987) has been described as “deceptively gentle” and *Mauri* contained a “healing arch” in order to resolve differences about race-relations without the need for “violence”. There may be subtle and indirect calls for *tino rangatiratanga* in the works themselves, but the films themselves are restrained in tone. Rather, the political, social, cultural and historical significance attached to both films is because of the time in which the works were produced, the people that made them, and the advancement of the notion of Māori as full partners in New Zealand society at a time foreshadowed by civil unrest. The direct association of the radical and subversive elements attached to the works is due to the films being the first directed by Māori and/or indigenous peoples to provide a Māori point of view on race-relations, and the involvement of key figures in the protest movements namely, the two directors, and Tama Poata and Eva Rickard.

What is argued is that *Ngati* (1987) and *Mauri* form a core part of the critical dialogue about race-relations, and the shift from the “old” (cultural nationalist) to the “new” (bicultural). Key thematics such as the re-examination of race-relations, redressing the past and using the Treaty of Waitangi as a nation building exercise are evident in the works. Indeed these themes are somewhat unsurprising, given that Barclay and Mita have both expressed sentiments about reconciling the past to move forward and become “one nation”. Moreover, both Barclay and Mita’s contributions to issues of social justice and changing how New Zealanders viewed race-relations, have been well noted. Given the importance placed on
race-relations and national harmony in the works, it is advanced that both works do not constitute a clear rupture from the nationalised race-relations narrative, but active engagement.

It is important to note, however, that Māori film-makers are bound by the politics of funding and reception. The constraints on making Māori-centric or indigenous stories have been noted by both Mita and Barclay. While both filmmakers sought to bring Māori stories to the screen, they were bound within a complex set of power relations that required them to conform to guidelines, principles, ideological underpinnings and fiscal demands. Barry Barclay has been highly critical of such constraints, indicating that Māori films are never in the shape of the original, but have to conform to the dominant societal structures before bringing the work to screen (Martens 2007, p.76). In this fashion, when descriptors are applied to works that declare the same “emphatically Māori” analysts should be cognisant of the pressures placed upon filmmakers to negotiate the power relations involved and conform to particular dominant societal views.

What is undertaken in the next chapter is an analysis of the film, *Once were warriors* (1994). If the politics of reception, funding and constraints upon artists to conform to particular dominant societal views about Māori subjectivity were ever in question, then *Once were warriors* provides a clear example of how the same can influence an adaptation before it is brought to screen. As argued, *Ngati* (1987) and *Mauri* have been informed by the socio-political ideology of biculturalism in its developmental stage. *Once were warriors* (1994) however, is informed by the two world-view model of biculturalism and in particular, Māori cultural nationalist propositions about Māori subjectivity and race-relations.
Chapter 13: Once were warriors (1994)

Introduction

This chapter examines the influences of the two world-view model of biculturalism on understandings of Māori subjectivity and race-relations in the film *Once were warriors.* What is engaged with in this chapter is the social context which informed *Once were warriors*, the referencing of the cultural authentic-cultural degenerate dichotomy, the rural-urban divide, notions of cultural alienation and distance and an analysis of gender. There are three main threads in the narrative: the relationship of Jake and Beth, their children Nig, Boogie and Grace, and the impact that the destructive nature of Jake and Beth’s relationship has on the whānau. In this fashion, the relationship of Jake and Beth can be seen as a modern re-telling of the creation traditions of Ranginui and Papatū ānuku. It is argued that these three main threads are utilised to explore the situation of Māori in contemporary New Zealand society and make social commentary on how Māori should overcome social illness within the auspices of the bicultural/two world-view model, and Māori cultural nationalist propositions. Such actions are, in turn, characterised as being of benefit to the nation.

As indicated in Film case study 7, the politics of representation had considerable bearing on the work. Arguments such as “who” had the right to present or (represent) Māori-oriented narratives and what forms those representations should take had an impact on the storyline, funding, production and distribution. There are crucial differences between the novel and the film which, arguably, had more to do with the anticipated reception of a work focusing on the destruction of a Māori family as a result of alcoholism, domestic violence, rape and suicide. The cultural nationalist politics of the novel’s author, Alan Duff, are on record as are his thoughts in regard to placing the onus on Māori for social failings and resolutions built around personal responsibility. In the film, however, key thematics in the work are reconfigured to reflect the two world-view model of the socio-political ideology of biculturalism and Māori cultural nationalist propositions of how Māori can overcome social problems.

While there is little reference in the film to the history of settlement in New Zealand, the urbanisation of Māori, the protest movements, the Treaty of Waitangi, the neoliberal reforms and race-relations, these factors are key influences in the depiction of the Heke Whānau’s
narrative. It is argued that *Once were warriors*, both the novel and film, is engaged in a critical dialogue about race-relations and where Māori are, or should be, situated within the same. The differences between the film and novel can be attributed to the differing views inside the Māori population on ways forward for Māori to overcome social ills that are informed by either cultural nationalist propositions or bicultural ones. In essence, the legitimacy of constructing social problems that are experienced universally as “Māori” issues is not under discussion, just the methods of resolution and how to alleviate the same within a race-relations framework.

13.1 Social context

Prominent in the social context which informed *Once were warriors* was the Treaty reconciliation process when the socio-political ideology of biculturalism had bifurcated into what is termed “the two world-view model”. Analysis of race-relations within the two world-view model was based upon the notion that Māori and Pākehā were distinct ethnic and cultural groups and indeed, lived in “two separate worlds”. As discussed, the construction of Māori and Pākehā into the two world-view model (best exemplified in John Rangihau’s Māoritanga and Pākehātanga diagram) engendered a binary set of politics where claims were made on behalf of each group. A number of dominant themes would arise in the bicultural and Māori cultural nationalist literature, centring on the structural organisation of Māori society that advanced a more traditionally based model. Fundamental differences between the two populations were attributed to world-views, beliefs and cultural values, where the importance of revitalising Māori culture, addressing the impact of colonisation and settling historic Treaty claims were granted heightened salience. Central to the argument was that the acknowledgement of the above would foster and maintain harmonious race-relations via reconciliation and the Treaty settlement process.

Since the late 1980s, public social policy had adopted bicultural and Māori cultural nationalist propositions as a way in which to alleviate the social disparities occurring in the Māori population. As outlined, the Fourth Labour Government had come to power facing two crises: race-relations and economics. Biculturalism was adopted as a way to negotiate race-relations and neoliberalism underpinned the economic policies of the Government. Both policies would have a significant impact on the Māori population and New Zealand society as a whole.
When the Fourth National Government came to power in 1990, they focussed on working with iwi, the ‘traditional’ model of Māori society, when settling historic Treaty claims. While Claim 424, the “fisheries case” would raise questions about whether the Crown should incorporate modern forms of Māori structural organisation into the settlement process, the Government showed a preference for negotiating with iwi. Urban Māori Groups would take successive actions through the Courts which would ultimately prove unsuccessful. As of today, Treaty of Waitangi claims are settled with iwi, the super structure of Māori society.

The discussions regarding the “traditional” (iwi) or “modern” (urban) form the backdrop to Once were warriors. The director’s codes, of embracing a more traditional mode of Māori organisation and Māori culture as a way in which to overcome adversity, are clearly evident in the work. For example; Beth’s return to her whānau and taking in the homeless Toots as a whangai; removing herself from domestic violence and alcoholism by leaving Jake and taking the children; Boogie learning to channel his anger into a constructive and positive outlet through kapa haka; and in the final resolution of the film where Beth makes the distinction between the noble past of Māori (once were warriors with mana and pride) and Jake as a slave. Similarly to Ngati (1987) and Mauri (1988) in the characters of Greg Shaw and Rewi/Paki, Māori culture is portrayed in the film as something that is waiting to be embraced as part of the characters birthright, personal development and eventual healing. For those characters such as Jake, however, the rejection of Māori culture sees him abandoned and alienated.

These conflicting and competing views about Māori subjectivity, Māori structural organisation, social concerns of the Māori population and the future direction of the country via race-relations are evident in the film. As Stephen Turner (1999, p.134) notes:

For women it is Beth’s story rather than Jake’s … For Māori the implicit return to Māori values is played out in the story of young Boogie [and Beth] … For white New Zealanders the social problems involving Māori in New Zealand society are ultimately attributed to the Māori themselves …

It is important to note that in the New Zealand context, many reviews about Once were warriors advanced political views of Māori society which had a local ethnic-specific basis (Turner 1999). In the international reviews of the film, however, one critic espoused the view that the film’s subject matter of domestic violence could be transported anywhere (Null 1999). It is an interesting observation on how local politics can reveal deep-seated attitudes
toward societal ills occurring in the Māori population that are framed by long historical attitudes toward Māori in New Zealand society. The international reviewer’s comments advocate a transcending of the local and ethnic in order to conceptualise the subject of domestic violence as a worldwide phenomenon.

While the subject of race-relations is not explicitly addressed in the film, as indicated by Turner’s comments, it remains a key thematic in an analysis of Once were warriors. In this fashion, the nationalised race-relations narrative is a paradox in that it is a key subtext in the film, but not a subject. It can be seen, however, that core tenets of the bicultural and Māori cultural nationalist frameworks are evident in the work. For example, Māori culture was posited as a central cure for Māori societal ills within biculturalism and by extension, the reconciliation of Māori and Pākehā. Beth’s actions in the resolution of the film, endorse contemporary views about Māori subjectivity and how culture can be used as a vehicle for social problems being experienced inside the Māori population. In essence, Once were warriors is framed by the socio-historical context and endorses the State’s political directives regarding Māori, and race-relations.

13.2 Cultural authenticity and cultural degeneracy

As the title suggests, the cinematic Once were warriors references and valorises the ancient, traditional and pre-contact past of Māori. In this fashion, Once were warriors invokes the cultural authentic and cultural degenerate stereotype of Māori, in order to show the decline of contemporary Māori in New Zealand society. In this fashion Once were warriors embraces Pitt-Rivers’ (1924, pp.48-65) declaration that Māori had “all the vices and none of the virtues” of the ancestors. It is argued that the film depicts the fall of Māori from a noble or culturally-romanticised people to the more contemporary urbanised degenerate, in order to make social commentary on race-relations in New Zealand society. Primarily the directive is for Māori to reconnect and regain the nobility of the ancestors in order to function in “modern” society. Thus, instead of being “Once were warriors”, Māori are urged to be modern warriors in the urbanised environment, curing contemporary social ills by embracing a noble and pre-contact past.

One of the strongest metaphors in the film of the fall from grace of Māori is the name Heke, which has particular significance in the New Zealand context and is the surname of the central characters of Once were warriors. In New Zealand, the name “Heke” is synonymous with the Ngapuhi chief, Hone Heke. Arguably, Hone Heke performed one of the most
famous and symbolic protests in opposition to British settlement, encroachment and breaches of the Treaty of Waitangi. Between 11 March 1845 and 11 January 1846, Heke was one of the principal instigators in the Flagstaff war, which took place at Kororareka (Russell, Bay of Islands) (Belich 1988; Vaggioli 2000, Original Italian publication 1896). Led by Heke, a coalition of Northern Māori challenged and defeated the might of the British Empire, which resulted in the Governor suing for peace.

What is suggested is that notions of cultural authenticity and degeneracy underpin these reference points, in the title of both the film and novel, with the use of the Heke name. The symbolic adoption of “Heke” as the family name serves to remind the audience of the historical figure of Hone Heke and to draw a contrast with the anti-heroic figure of Jake “the Muss”. While it is revealed in the film that Jake is the descendant of taurekareka (slaves) and not the famous Hone Heke, it is argued that this is to characterise Jake as a ‘faux’ warrior, in order to make the distinction between ‘real’ or traditional warriors and the urbanised degenerates. In this fashion, fake warriors such as gangs, Jake and his associates are portrayed as impoverished imitations of true Māori warriors and exhibit the worst excesses of violence without self-discipline and control. The distinction between true and false notions of warriorhood will be discussed in the section on Gender, but the exposition of Jake as a descendant of slaves provide the rationale for his antagonism toward Māori culture and in particular, the reaction of Beth’s family toward his familial heritage. The inter-class distinctions between Jake and Beth will also be discussed more in depth in the section on Gender.

It is argued that the Heke family are the extreme representatives of what happens to Māori in the urban centres. In this fashion, Once were warriors continues the theme discussed in earlier works of depicting the city as a modern day kai tangata (eater of humanity) of Māori, where Māori lose their essential goodness. Once were warriors is, however, the acute example of the dichotomy of rural and urban-based Māori, but more importantly, it allows an examination of “traditional” and “modern” Māori from contemporary bicultural and Māori cultural nationalist-informed standpoints.

The notion of traditional as “authentic” Māori is one of the central tenets of bicultural and Māori cultural national frameworks, formed through broader discussions in the 1990s. In particular, key areas of focus centred on causal explanations for the over-representation of Māori in the negative social indices in comparison to non-Māori (or Pākehā). Within these
discussions, Māori social disparities were characterised as a result of the colonial project, the loss of land and culture. The “cure” posited to alleviate or transform the social problems of Māori society in contemporary times was to reclaim, revitalise and re-traditionalise the Māori social body. While none of these issues are explicitly addressed in the film, the audience, as indicated by Turner’s comments, would draw the connection from events in the social context. The direction in Once were warriors, however, is clear: Māori must embrace their traditional heritage and culture in order to survive the modern world.

The narrative becomes self-perpetuating, Māori social problems are framed into a lack of culture and tradition, and the cure is reconnection. It is important to note that Māori social disparity was used as a justification for assimilationist-integrationist policy in the Hunn Report and referenced in the film To Love a Maori (1972). In a similar vein, Māori social disparity is utilised in Once were warriors to provide a cautionary tale and dystopian view of Māori in the urban centres in order to direct Māori to embrace bicultural and Māori cultural national propositions of how to effect Māori equality in New Zealand society. Both positions are based upon the notion of cultural deficit and the “failure” of Māori to thrive in the modern world.

As discussed, the Māori population had been encouraged to the urban centres as a result of State policy and key groups, such as the Māori Women’s Welfare League, were set up to provide support for the influx of Māori into the cities. While at the same time Māori and Pākehā were engaged in a process of reconciliation and constructing New Zealand society into a two world-view model to examine race-relations, a disproportionate number of Māori would lose employment due to State policy through the neo-liberal reforms. The notion of Māori unemployment, for example, is referenced through the character of Jake. Upon introduction to Jake and Beth, the audience learns that Jake has lost his job and no explanation is provided for this, except when Mavis Tatana comments at a party that Jake had taken days without leave. The audience is left to draw its own conclusion that Jake has lost his employment due to his own failings, rather than at a time when New Zealand society had a high unemployment rate largely due to government policy. In this fashion, Māori social disparity and urban degeneracy is depicted as primarily a Māori “problem”. In turn, the themes contained within the film urge a Māori “solution”, based upon the propositions of biculturalism and Māori cultural nationalism.
13.3 The Rural-urban divide

Notions of the authentic and degenerate based upon the rural-urban divide have been a recurrent theme in New Zealand films that situate authentic Māori in the heartland, rural areas and degenerates in the urban centres. It is important to note that Duff set his novel in the fictional Two Lakes, which was in fact Rotorua, one of the homes of traditional Māori culture and performance. In this fashion, Duff was subverting the notion of the dichotomy of rurally-based Māori as essential and authentic, and urban-based Māori as degenerates. The film, however, resituates Once were warriors in the urban centres of South Auckland to reinforce the message that urban-based Māori have been corrupted by the influences of the cities. In this fashion, the film embraces the cultural authentic and cultural degenerate dichotomy in order to make moral claims about the plight of urban Māori and, by extension, reinforce the contemporary proposition that the urbanisation and alienation of Māori has contributed to Māori social disparity.

As discussed, however, at the time of filming Once were warriors Māori had been a primarily urban-based population for a number of decades. Although the rural-urban stereotype of Māori has been utilised as plot device by a number of directors to ascribe certain characteristics to actors through location, in actuality, the “divide” is a lot more fluid. For example, many tribal areas of Māori are in the urban centres. Ngāti Whatua hold mana whenua in the Auckland isthmus, Ngaiterangi in Tauranga Moana, Tainui in Hamilton, Te Ati Awa in Wellington, Kai Tahu in Christchurch and Dunedin. As such, the notion that there is a strong distinction between urban and rural Māori based on traditional tribal territories becomes somewhat ambiguous. Furthermore, the highest income-earners in the Māori population live in the city centres and many cultural groups, such as Ngāti Poneke, are urban-based (Ministry of Women’s Affairs 2001). What this suggests is the continuation of a popular myth in the cinematic record, reinforced in the film Once were warriors in order to make moral claims that fit with contemporary views of how to effect and maintain harmonious race-relations.

It is important to note, however, that Once were warriors has had a significant impact on popular culture in New Zealand society. It is not unheard of for people to describe their background as “once were warriors” which has now become synonymous with Māori, poverty, alcoholism and domestic violence. In this fashion, Once were warriors has crossed the rural-urban divide and now refers to the above set of characteristics.


13.4 Cultural alienation

While the film considers the subjects of domestic violence, child neglect, rape and alcoholism, the subtext is that of cultural alienation. It is this theme of alienation that is posited as an explanation as to why the Hekes are in their predicament and also, as a possible way to overcome their degenerate lifestyle. The theme of alienation is evident when Jake shows an antagonism toward Māori culture by repeatedly referring to it as “that Māori shit”. It is, however, the eventual reconnection of Beth with her whānau and culture, after the death of Grace, that gives her the impetus to change her environment. In this fashion the theme of “culture” plays a pivotal role in *Once were warriors*, but primarily in its absence and then reconnection.

The subject of alienation from culture and the importance of a secure Māori identity have formed a core part of causal explanations about why Māori are over-represented in the negative social indices. Cultural alienation and/or culture as a cure had strong currency in New Zealand society and underpinned public social policy (Cram, Pihama, Jenkins & Karehana 2002; Durie 1994b; Jackson 1987-1988; Te Puni Kokiri 1992; Pere 1988). As discussed in Chapter Six, Section 6.1. Māori cultural nationalism, there are a number of common themes in the literature that are attributed in part, to the loss of culture and the alienation of Māori from traditional tribal support structures. As evidenced in the film, the Heke family exhibit an extreme form of alienation from Māori culture which is best illustrated where Grace is reading a story to her younger siblings about Māori myths and legends. One of the children asks Grace “what’s a taniwha”? While this scene is intended to underscore the cultural dislocation of the Heke family, it raises questions as to its validity. *Once were warriors* was published in 1990 and the film made in 1994. At this time, most New Zealand school children would have been taught Māori myths and legends at primary school. What this scene improbably sets in place is the notion that the Heke family suffer an extreme form of cultural alienation in the urban centres which is beyond the bounds of most New Zealanders.

It is important to note, however, that the theme of cultural alienation or culture as a cure was not evident in the novel but is a key thematic in the film. This is evident in the resolution where Beth is reconnected to her whānau and culture and Boogie is saved from a life of crime by embracing his Taha Māori in a State institution. In comparison, Jake refuses his culture and remains a slave to his anti-social behaviour. In essence, *Once were warriors* is what
Marie and Haig (2006, pp. 17-21) describe as a “rescue and reunite mission” for urbanised Māori based upon the cultural authentic/cultural degenerate dichotomy, and the fall of Māori from grace. Commensurate with this view, by embracing culture and Te Ao Māori (the ancient world of the Māori) the current social problems facing the Māori population will dissipate. Those characters such as Jake, who refuse to be rescued or reunited via culture, are abandoned.

Where once Māori culture and tradition were constructed as significantly detrimental to modernisation in assimilationist-integrationist policies, culture and tradition as rehabilitative vehicles have become core components of biculturalism and Māori cultural nationalism. These types of frameworks, however, characterise Māori as problematic and detrimental to the nation and the cure of Māori social ills as crucial in the reconciliation process and new bicultural New Zealand. By extension, if Māori social disparities can be overcome by reconnecting Māori to culture and tradition, then the impact of the colonial project can be resolved and the nation will heal the fractures in its race-relations. While this may be a worthy sentiment, such characterisations place Māori in a vulnerable position in terms of State intervention.

As discussed, the alienation of Māori from land, resources, culture, language and traditional tribal structures was as a direct result of State policy. In contemporary times, it is State policy that advances re-traditionalisation and culture as core components for Māori to overcome the impacts of its own previous policies. Depicting Māori culture as the central, restorative cure of historical and social problems that are experienced worldwide, without acknowledgement of the role that the State has played, places an expectation on Māori culture that is both unrealistic and unjust.

13.5 **Cultural distance and the two-world view model**

One of the striking features of *Once were warriors* is that the film exhibits the notion of cultural distance. As discussed, the relationship of Māori and Pākehā, as a nationalised race-relations narrative, has been crucial in constructing myths about the nations. Primarily these national myths have been built on the international and national profile that posited New Zealand as a “model” for racial harmony, and as having the “best race-relations in the world”. As argued in Chapters Four and Five, there has been a reframing of New Zealand’s race-relations. In this fashion, biculturalism has engendered its own national mythmaking, namely, that Māori and Pākehā are constructed in binary opposition and live in two separate
worlds. One of the bi-products of the two world-view model is the notion of cultural distance evident in both *Once were warriors* and *Whale Rider* (2002). As a result, the relationship between Māori and Pākehā, which had been central to earlier works, is notably absent in the film.

This can be seen in the roles that Pākehā characters play in *Once were warriors*. The Police, Judge (played by director/writer/actor, Ian Mune), Court Officials and a Social Worker, who symbolically wears a “bone carving” (to denote her cultural sensitivity but is inept in her understanding of the social realities of Boogie Heke’s life), are Pākehā. There is, however, little meaningful interaction between Māori and Pākehā characters. Primarily, Pākehā characters play distant, judicial and authoritarian type figures as counterparts to the criminal Heke whānau.

The depiction of Māori and Pākehā as “two distinct cultures” and living in two separate worlds directly references the two world-view model. While the key thematic of race-relations is not explicitly addressed in the film, it still remains a central reference point in *Once were warriors*. By drawing on the two world-view model in this fashion, the notion of cultural distance serves a dual purpose. Firstly, it underscores the cultural alienation of the Heke family from both Māori and non-Māori society, and secondly, presents the work as an “insider” view of a sector of Māori society to denote a form of ‘realism’ or authenticity. At the time *Once were warriors* was made, there were challenges inside the Māori population regarding the structural organisation of Māori, best exemplified in the Wai 424 or the Fisheries case. Primarily, these debates centred upon the arguments around the legitimacy of the traditional (iwi) and modern (urban) form of structural organisation. Urban Māori Authorities (UMA) argued for recognition via the Treaty settlement process because the majority of Māori lived in the urban centres and outside their traditional tribal areas. These issues were and are still in dispute inside the Māori population, but successive court cases and State policy have affirmed iwi as the legitimate structure of Māori within the Treaty framework.

Given the marked changes between the novel and film, it is suggested that the future direction of Māori is clear in the cinematic account. There are strong directive codes for urban Māori, such as the Heke family, to reconnect with and embrace culture and tradition. Those that do not, such as Jake, remain in an environment fuelled by anger, alcoholism and unsavoury behaviour. When making moral claims and imparting directive codes to the audience about
race-relations, one of the common themes is transformation. Whether transformation is through a change of attitude (Tom in *Broken Barrier* 1952, the Davis family in *To Love a Maori* 1972, Greg Shaw in *Ngati* 1987, and Steve Semmens in *Mauri* 1988) or sacrificing certain elements in society (Te Whēke and Colonel Elliot in *Utu* 1983, and Mr Semmens Senior and the freedom of Rewi/Paki in *Mauri* 1988), the aim is to provide clear pathways to maintain harmonious race-relations and effect national harmony. In this fashion, *Once were warriors* shares common ground with earlier works, but is reworked to reflect more contemporary bicultural views. This theme is evident in *Once were warriors* where, through the death of Grace, Beth changes her circumstances by reconnecting with her Māori cultural heritage and embracing her traditional rural-based whānau.

Given the key absences of Pākehā, of historical accounts of Māori land loss and alienation and of State policy prescriptions as explanations as to the cause of Māori social disparities in the film, the destiny of Māori is depicted as entirely within the group’s own grasp. In essence, this is the version of *tino rangatiratanga* that Tamahori is advancing to the Māori population through the film. Commensurate with this view, all Māori have to do is embrace a ‘traditional’ model of Māori social organisation and reconnect with culture, in order to have a form of personal Māori sovereignty. Importantly, this Māori societal model is the framework legitimised by the State as evidenced in current public social policy documents and the Treaty of Waitangi settlement process. It also removes the State, its policies and actions, as contributors to the deterioration of Māori society and places the onus on Māori.

### 13.6 The State as friend and ally

Arguably, one of the central features in the film is the absence of social comment on the complex set of reasons as why Māori are urbanised, impoverished and susceptible to corrupting influences in the city centres. Primarily, the State is depicted as a potential ally of Māori and New Zealand society by facilitating the reconnection of alienated Māori to culture and tradition. This is best illustrated in the scene where Boogie becomes a ward of the State and is introduced by the Māori social worker at the Boy’s Home to parts of Māori culture, such as haka and the taiaha. It is important to note that the Department of Justice has key programmes such as “Taha Māori” which target Māori offenders as a form of rehabilitation to reconnect alienated Māori to culture. In this fashion, *Once were warriors* shares commonality
with *To Love a Maori* (1972) where State policy was advanced as a “way forward” for the nation and to save vulnerable Māori, such as Riki, from a life of crime.

What is ignored, however, are the factors of institutional racism, historical State policy and Rogernomics, which have contributed to the situation of urbanised Māori such as the Hekes. It is important to note that institutional racism and the State were key targets in the protest movements of the 1960s, 1970s and 1980s. The State and its agents were portrayed as significant antagonist in films, such as *Utu* (1983), *Ngati* (1987) and *Mauri* (1988). In *Once were warriors*, however, the State is depicted as a ‘friend’ to alienated Māori through its programmes and agents. For example, the Māori social worker acts as Boogie’s kaiako (leader/teacher) by acculturating him in *tikanga Māori* - something his own urban-based whānau have not done. Thus, the metaphor is that “culture” and a secure Māori cultural identity is essential to the welfare of Māori and if alienated Māori are not taught their own culture, then the State will ensure programmes and teachers are available to do so.

In this fashion, core elements of the protest movements that sparked the re-examination of race-relations, the history of New Zealand, the Treaty settlement process and implementation of biculturalism are deferred in the film for an analysis of cultural alienation and reconnection through the destruction of a whānau. It is argued that *Once were warriors*, as influenced by biculturalism, shows New Zealand has come full circle in its race-relations policy. Similarly to the film *To Love a Maori* (1972), *Once were warriors* utilises State policy to affirm its directive codes to provide ways forward for Māori inside the national framework.

### 13.7 Gender: contested relationships

At the centre of *Once were warriors* is the relationship of Jake and Beth Heke, which has a significant impact on the events of the film. One of the recurring themes is the conflict between Jake and Beth which leads to domestic violence, verbal abuse, alcoholism, child neglect and, ultimately, child rape. What maintains Jake and Beth’s relationship is their powerful sexual attraction to each other and in this, their relationship can be seen as a modern day re-telling of the creation tradition of Papatūānuku and Ranginui. Both narratives centred on intense sexual relationships that resulted in child neglect and ultimately, separation to ensure the survival of their offspring.

One of the central issues in the conflict between Jake and Beth is the theme of class and, in particular, Māori social status in a traditional tribal context. Beth, for example, is a high-born
Māori woman and was “puhi” (chosen one) of her people. Conversely, Jake was low born and descended from slaves. In a powerful scene where the exposition of their different backgrounds emerge, Jake tells his children, “your mother was beautiful, pride of the fucking tribe and this old black arse comes along and steals her away. And you know where I come from kids? A long line of slaves. Fucking slaves”. Because of Jake’s low-born status and the disapproval of Beth’s whānau, he is alienated from traditional Māori society and as events unfold, also from wider, mainstream New Zealand. The disapproval of Beth’s whānau of Jake is made explicit when he states that he “wasn’t good enough” and that “I’d like to see those wankers call Jake the Muss that now”.

Jake is unemployed, living in a State housing sector in South Auckland, alcoholic, violent, neglectful in the welfare of his children and abusive to his wife. In essence, Jake’s behaviour is portrayed as the epitome of the anti-social, underclass of impoverished Māori. While Beth Heke in Duff’s novel was more an enabler or co-conspirator with Jake, the filmic version of Beth is portrayed as a more sympathetic character. Due to the dynamics in the relationship between Beth and Jake, Beth and the children are characterised as being at the whim or mercy of Jake. In essence, Jake dominates the family with his anti-social behaviour and the imminent threat of violence.

13.7.1 The idea of mateship

Jake’s “family” or social structure is with his mates at the Pub. In this way, Jake references Apirana Taylor’s poem “Sad Joke on the Marae” in that the pub is his marae and the fist is his taiaha. This depiction of the “pub”, as Jake’s defacto marae, is used to make comment on Māori in the urban environment and the preferred “traditional” social groupings of Māori society. When Beth returns to her marae with the Heke children for the tangihanga of Grace, Jake is placed in direct contrast and shown drinking in the pub with his friends. What these juxtapositions suggest, is Tamahori is giving strong directorial codes that traditional Māori society is “healing”, while urbanised social groupings are destructive.

Jake’s preference for his male friends references the “man-alone” or “sociocentric” tradition in New Zealand, where men prefer the company of other men and women are depicted as antagonists or interferers in the mateship between men. As McDonald (1998, pp.82-83) notes, the intrusion of Jake’s actual family and in particular, Beth, in the pub always results in some form of conflict. In this fashion, the character of Jake is framed as the “man-alone” type outlaw in the urban environment where the pub and his friends are deemed to be “male
territory”. Women are depicted as interrupters\textsuperscript{188}, ciphers (accompanying their men) or entertainment (Mavis Tatana singing which results in a pub fight between Jake and her antagonist). What emerges from these interactions is what McDonald (1998) terms a “gendered conflict” that places the central relationship between Jake and his friends in direct contrast with events in the familial home.

It is important to note, as McDonald indicates, it is the familial home that is the place of extreme gendered conflict between Jake and Beth (McDonald 1998, pp.82-83). Moreover, Jake’s drinking and pub family intersects and impacts upon his actual family with disastrous consequences. For Jake his family home is a continuation of his pub life where he brings his mates home to drink and party. The parties and alcohol consumption perpetuate a cycle which inevitably results in domestic violence between Jake and Beth. The children are neglected or become \textit{de facto} adults in the Heke household. Grace and Boogie become the babysitters of the younger children, even though it is clear both need guidance from their parents. Boogie, for example, is about to go to Court and has asked for Beth to accompany him. Due to the domestic violence that Jake inflicts the night before, Beth cannot accompany Boogie to Court and he is sent into State care.

The children are witness to all the behaviour and there is a sense that the cycle of alcohol abuse and violence will be perpetuated by the next generation. This is best illustrated by Nig who discovers Grace cleaning up the debris from the night before. Nig says to Grace, “there’ll be plenty of time for you to clean up after drunken fucking parties” and when she asks what he means, Nig explains, “when you get married … It’s just the way things are”. While Nig’s comments are said in jest, it implies that Grace’s life will be similar to Beth’s with a drunken and violent husband. Thus, there is the theme of futility in the endless cycle of poverty, alcoholism and abuse, which springs from Jake and Beth’s conflicted relationship.

The converging events stemming from the conflicted relationship of Jake and Beth become a catalyst for change. Firstly, when Boogie is sent to a State home because Beth could not accompany him to Court and secondly, when Grace is raped by Jake’s friend, “Uncle Bully”. There is a sense in these scenes that Jake’s alcoholism and pub family takes priority over his actual family. Jake places his own interests and mateship above the needs of his family. In a scene where Jake has hired a car to visit Boogie in the Welfare Home, he stops for a drink with his friends at the pub. As one drink becomes two, it becomes clear that Jake is not returning so that the family can continue onto see Boogie. When Beth tries to intervene and
asks Jake to leave his pub, an argument ensues. It is left to Beth to inform Boogie via the telephone that the family will not be coming, which leads him to channel his anger into a haka.

In a chilling scene where 13 year old Grace is raped by the sinister and predatory friend of Jake’s, Uncle Bully, the rapist directs Grace to “keep her mouth shut” about the violation. To this end, Grace does remain silent, save for writing of the event in her diary. Given the family dynamics of the Hekes, Grace does not confide in her mother, father, siblings or best friend, Toot. After the rape, Grace runs away first to Toot, where she tries to flee from the violation through drugs and when she misconstrues a gesture of friendship from Toot as an offer of sex, Grace spends the day in the city. Grace returns to the Heke family only to be confronted by Jake, his pub family and her rapist. Grace is instructed to kiss her rapist and when Grace refuses, Jake becomes violent with her until Dooley intervenes. Ultimately, after the rape of Grace by Uncle Bully, the isolation, the aggression of her father and the futility of her situation, Grace commits suicide by hanging herself from a tree.189

The interactions of Jake and his pub family reveal Māori men in a state of arrested development where drunken exploits take the place of meaningful friendships. This is best illustrated in the character of Uncle Bully who is one of Jake’s core “mates”, but is revealed to be a predatory child rapist that Jake has invited into his home. In this fashion, Tamahori is providing strong directive codes that “mateship” in this type of environment is destructive to Māori men, Māori society and to New Zealand as a whole.

13.7.2 Contested masculinities

In Once were warriors as a film and novel, one of the dominant themes is that the majority of Māori men are portrayed as aggressive and violent. The principal male characters bond through alcohol, partying and violence where reputations or proficiencies with the fist carry currency in the social environment. In this fashion, the film places Māori men as central detractors to civilisation and the future of the nation. Jake is the anti-hero of the story and is encoded in a contradictory fashion as both the villain and a sympathetic character. Jake is the “leader” of the pub and has a reputation for fighting. Jake’s reputation as a “hard man” casts a long-shadow over his children and when the eldest son, Nig, joins a gang, he brings kudos as the son of Jake “the Muss”.
Conversely, the younger son Boogie is constructed as the hope for urbanised and alienated young Māori men. He has been taught his culture by accredited agents of the State and as a result, has been given both culture and discipline. The reframing of Boogie into a positive character can be seen in the exchange between Nig and himself at the house after Grace’s tangi. When Nig encourages Boogie to get a Ta Moko, Boogie replies “I wear mine on the inside”. In this fashion Boogie is asserting that he carries his culture and discipline inside of himself and does not need the external trappings to declare his allegiance. There is in this scene a distinction between “real warrior” status and false. For example Nig gained his Ta Moko through his association with the gang which is depicted as a faux modern inversion of Māori social structures and in turn a corruptive influence on, in particular, young Māori men. Conversely Boogie reconnected with his culture through the State mechanisms in order to curb his risky behaviour. The comparison between Nig and Boogie serves to set in place a distinction between what is representative of “true” or “real” warrior culture and advances the theme that it is Boogie who is the legitimate heir of the noble warrior tradition.

There is also a reworking of the theme of Māori male aggression which has long historical roots regarding the acceptance of ordinary violence in Māori society (Hokowhitu 2004, pp. 259-84; Thompson 1997, pp. 109-19). The gang, for example, that Nig affiliates to is represented as a *de facto* urbanised-tribe, requiring a violent initiation and his acceptance into the gang is based upon his father’s aggressive reputation. In comparison to Nig, Boogie’s aggression is channelled into his positive reclamation of culture and therefore, he is portrayed as a more authentic character than Nig. It is evident in this comparison between the lifestyle paths of the brothers that the director is making social commentary on the aggression of Māori men in contemporary New Zealand society and positing positive, and negative ways forward.

What are seen in the exchanges between Nig and Boogie are strong directive messages in the film on what is the best course of action for young Māori men in order to channel their “warrior aggression”. Although Nig is a sympathetic character, his lifestyle is potentially detrimental to society, whereas Boogie is constructed as using his “natural” Māori male aggression for the “good of the nation”. The film does not challenge the myths associated with Māori male aggression and Māori society, but rather embraces the same. Barry Barclay (Murray 2007, p.97) was concerned about the reconstruction of modern notions of “warriorhood” that arose from *Once were warriors* (1994). In particular, Barclay was
concerned how the film purported to be a social document of “warrior culture” in contemporary Maori life.

Arguably, one of the strongest directive codes about Māori men’s aggression is evident in the scene when Grace is found hanging. At a time when fists, aggression and anger will not change one’s circumstances, Jake and his Pub family are shown to be impotent. It is left to Beth and Dooley, who is the least aggressive of Jake’s friends, to take action and cut Grace down from the tree. It is suggested that this scene is an examination of the nature of masculinity, whereby the men with a reputation for fighting and action are shown to be inert in the face of a tragedy. This theme is further reinforced when Jake goes to return home and witnesses the tapu lifting ceremony at the house, which has been instigated by Beth. Beth’s whānau are in attendance, as are tohunga and supporters of Beth. Upon seeing this, Jake leaves the scene and does not return to the house. Thus, what is referenced in this scene is that male aggression is both compensation and a cover for emotional immaturity.

It is important to note, however, that there is an ambiguity in the gendered conflict between Māori men and women, and the uses of violence. While it is apparent that Beth, Grace and her children are victims of Jake’s domestic violence and/or his threats of violence that hang like a pall over the familial domain, there are instances where women use men’s violence to exact revenge. This is best illustrated in the scene where Beth takes Grace’s diary to Jake at the Royal Tavern. The diary reveals that Grace was raped by Uncle Bully before her suicide. Beth takes the gang-initiated eldest son, Nig, into the pub with her to act as protection against Jake. When Jake becomes aggressive and violent toward Beth, Nig stops him and urges Jake to read the diary. What ensues is a grievous physical assault on Uncle Bully as revenge, and retribution for Grace’s rape. While there is some form of “street justice” in Jake’s assault on Uncle Bully, it is argued that Beth used Jake’s propensity for violence to exact immediate revenge. At the end of this scene, Beth leaves Jake permanently and returns to her new life.

13.7.3 Māori women: femme fatales, victims, sacrifices, sex objects and agents of change

Māori women play an important, ambiguous and contradictory roles in Once were warriors. For example, Māori women are portrayed as sex objects, victims, sacrifices and agents of change. It is important to note that Māori women are depicted as active agents in the bad behaviour of the men and are portrayed, at times, as complicit in the domestic violence. One
of the more ambiguous characters is Mavis, Beth’s best friend. Upon discovering Beth has been beaten severely by Jake, Mavis asks Beth if it was as a result of “one hell of an orgasm”. What is revealed is that Mavis is minimising the obvious result of domestic violence that has been committed by Jake on Beth. One could argue that Mavis’s behaviour exhibits coping strategies in the face of horror, but she starts drinking with Beth on the morning of Boogie’s Court appearance and actively advances the idea that alcohol consumption will help Beth overcome her problems. It is Mavis who regales Beth with tales of Jake’s fight in the pub and in this fashion, Mavis is depicted as an ambiguous and untrustworthy character. In this sense, Māori women characters are portrayed as covertly endorsing, participating in or enabling the unsavoury behaviour of the men.

When Jake assaults Beth at the house party, party-goers leave in a hurried fashion. No-one intervenes to stop Jake and only one Māori woman denounces Jake’s violent assault on Beth. While in the process of making the adverse comments to Jake, the woman is forcibly removed from the house by her partner. The lack of intervention and public denouncement in this scene can be interpreted in a number of ways. The two offered for analysis are the acceptance of domestic violence as part of the lifestyle and also the crisis of silence that allows the perpetrator to escape censure from his peer group, and punishment from the Police. The acceptance and silence in relation to domestic violence can be seen in the encounter with Grace and Nig the day after the assault. When Nig sees blood on the walls and asks Grace “who did the prick smack over?”, Grace does not immediately respond. Nig deduces that the victim must have been his mother and calls Jake “the fucking bastard”.

Conversely, Māori women are also portrayed as the hope for social change. After Grace’s death, Beth returns to her whānau and cultural roots, puts her children first and leaves Jake. She takes in the homeless Toot who was Grace’s best friend and invites him to live with them and become part of the newly reconstituted Heke whānau. In this fashion, the theme is for Māori women to take responsibility for their social ills and become active agents for change. This however, references notions about gender roles and women as the “civilising agents” or reformers of men (see Phillips 1996; Porter and MacDonald 1996).

The character of Grace is the ultimate transformational agent, sacrifice and harbinger of change in the film. She is portrayed as innocent, intelligent, kind and compassionate. Grace tries to create a sense of family for the Hekes as espoused by Nig with “I should have been there for you … You were always there for us” when they are Te Whānau Pani at Grace’s
tangi. Grace is portrayed as the hope of the Heke family, but after the rape, her world collapses. What can be seen here is a recurring pattern in the cinematic accounts where Māori women offer the promise of progress, but are sacrificed to instigate social change. In this way, Once were warriors draws on films such as Rewi’s Last Stand (1940) and Utu (1983), where Māori women characters with potential, such as Ariana, Kura and Grace are used as sacrificial characters to prompt social change. In Once were warriors, however, it is Beth who initiates the social change after Grace’s death and makes positive changes for herself and the remaining children. In the final scene, Beth references the title of the film to Jake when Jake is exposed as a somewhat pathetic character who realises Beth is leaving and will not be returning. In this fashion, Beth is portrayed as a modern Hine Titama who, in the worst of circumstances, becomes the ultimate harbinger of change and evolves into Hine nui Te Po. Although there are distinctions between the novel and the film, both vest their hope for social change with Beth as representative of Māori women.

There are a number of central codes in these scenes which reference bicultural and Māori cultural nationalist propositions in terms of race-relations and advancing ways forward for Māori society. As discussed, Māori women, such as Beth, are depicted as the hope for social change in the sub-sector of Māori society that experiences cultural degeneracy. The way forward is clear and that is for Māori to embrace culture and reconnect with their whānau, hapu, iwi and/or retraditionalise. For example, in Cram, Pihama, Jenkins & Karehana’s (2002, p.135) Evaluation of Programmes for Māori adult protected persons under the Domestic Violence Act 1995, colonisation, the destruction of traditional ways of life and the debasement of Māori culture are advanced as key arguments as to why Māori women are over-represented in the negative social indices of domestic violence. The reconnection and re-traditionalisation of Māori society, based upon Māori cultural values, is advocated as a fundamental principle through which individuals can overcome adversity and social ills. Symbolically, when Beth embraces her whānau and cultural heritage after Grace’s death, she becomes the exemplar of Māori cultural nationalist principles.

It is important to note, however, that Beth has the ability to reconnect with her whānau and culture. As in Ngati (1987) and Mauri (1988), Māori culture and heritage is depicted as waiting to be embraced by individuals who choose to do so. This notion of “place” has significance in films such as Ngati (1987), Mauri (1988) and Once were warriors. Characters such as Greg Shaw, Rewi/Paki, Herb, Steve Semmens, Beth and her children are all entitled
to a place in Māori society and in bicultural New Zealand. While some characters such as Rewi/Paki must make amends in both worlds in order to heal, they are still afforded a place.

Beth, as a “puhi”, comes from the rangatira classes of traditional Māori society and as such, she, and her children have a place in the whānau, hapu or iwi. Richard Alleva (1995, p.16) describes Beth as coming from a “free class” of warriors. In this fashion Beth is free to choose to leave the tribe with Jake and also to return with her children and to take her place. While Beth’s journey home is an uplifting and powerful metaphor in terms of how women experiencing domestic violence can break the cycle by using culture as a cure, there is a strong directive code about the place of Māori in the bicultural two-world view model.

Beth’s cultural reclamation ensures that she has a place in both the Māori world, in terms of Māori cultural nationalist principles and also in the new bicultural New Zealand.

Conversely, Jake is a character who is literally left without a place. As the descendent of slaves and through his rejection of Māori culture, Jake has no place waiting for him to return to. Due to his separation from Beth, the family home is out of bounds and he is, to all intents and purposes, homeless. Jake, as depicted in the film, is unemployed, homeless, alcoholic and violent, and alienated from wider mainstream society. The metaphor is clear: there is no place for Jake in either the Māori or Pākehā worlds in the two world-view model of New Zealand society.

**Conclusion**

What have been examined in this chapter are the influences of the two world-view of biculturalism and Māori cultural nationalist propositions on understandings of Māori subjectivity, and race-relations in the film *Once were warriors*. As argued, the key thematic of race-relations still informs contemporary understandings of Māori-Pākehā relations, even when the same is not explicitly addressed in the film. The film engages in a critical dialogue about Māori (or the place of Māori) and race-relations in New Zealand society. These themes are evident in the film and influenced by ideas circulating in the social context of the time, namely, Māori cultural nationalism and the two world-view model of biculturalism. There is a strong link between contemporary State policy, about the causal explanations of social disparities occurring in the Māori population and potential solutions to those problems, and key thematics in *Once were warriors*. The solution to these problems
centre on the advancement that Māori must embrace culture and retraditionalise, in order to thrive in the modern world. In essence, the film urges Māori to adopt the core tenets of Māori cultural nationalism contained within the two world-view model of biculturalism. In this fashion, *Once were warriors* shares similarities with earlier works such as *To Love a Maori* (1972) which explicitly uses state policy to support the legitimacy of its arguments in directing how Māori *should* function within New Zealand.
Chapter 14: Whale Rider (2002)

Introduction

This chapter examines the influences of the two world-view model of biculturalism on Māori subjectivity and race-relations in the film *Whale Rider.* What is engaged with in this chapter is the social context which informed the film, the referencing of the cultural authentic-cultural degenerate dichotomy, the rural-urban divide, notions of cultural alienation and distance, and an analysis of gender. The main narrative in *Whale Rider* centres on Paikea Apirana, a young Māori woman of Ngāti Konohi on the East Coast of the North Island of New Zealand, in her quest to be recognised as the hereditary leader of her people. Paikea’s story focuses on the relationship between herself and her grandfather, Koro Paka, Nanny Flowers, her absent father, Porourangi and her Uncle Rawiri.

The gendered subject in *Whale Rider* is a key thematic in the film where, to become the recognised leader of her people, the main character of Paikea “…is fighting over a 1000 years of patriarchal [Māori cultural] tradition” (Caro 2003). Implicit in such descriptions is firstly, that Māori culture and tradition is patriarchal and sexist, and secondly, that gender conflict plays a central and important part in the film. As Brendan Hokowhitu (2007, pp.22-30) notes there is a direct correlation in the majority of film reviews with Māori culture, tradition and sexism. While *Whale Rider* was well received by the majority of film reviewers and audiences, there were still criticisms from inside the Māori population about the work. As Merata Mita (2010) noted, the film caused considerable consternation inside Ngāti Porou in the way the story depicted its people and traditions.

The gender aspect or “universal story of female empowerment” (Mottesheard 2003) situates *Whale Rider* within the “marginalised collective subject” in order to bridge the ethno-cultural political divide and to establish commonality with other groups that have historically been oppressed. As outlined in the filmic case study, the director went to great lengths to seek and gain endorsement from Witi Ihimaera and the people of Ngāti Kanohi in order to make the film. The focus on “gender” has been interpreted as an example of tensions between the “ancient world” of the Māori and the “contemporary world of [gender] politics” (Ansen 2003, p. 59; Hokowhitu 2008, p.130). *Whale Rider,* however, draws upon a frame of reference fuelled by recent debates in the social context about women’s rights inside the Māori cultural
domain and also exhibits similar sentiments to Māori women contributors who seek restoration of the place of Māori women in a traditional cultural context.  

In this fashion Whale Rider stands inside and outside the bicultural two world-view model of New Zealand society. The work presents New Zealand society in the two world-view model and challenges one of the dominant views about Māori women and leadership, but also characterises the same as “generational” or as a limited perspective of “tradition”. In Caro’s view, the film was about “leadership” or, in her own words, “I was more interested in raising the question of what makes a great leader and how these qualities show up in the heart, mind and spirit of a young girl” (Stukin 2003). The film presents strong directive codes in exploring the generational “gap” in attitudes toward leadership in ‘traditional’ Māori society and thematically shares commonality with To Love a Maori (1972) in the final resolution of the film which posits attitudinal change, but inside Māori society for the good of the nation.

14.1 Social context

In the eight years between Once were warriors (1994) and Whale Rider the social context of New Zealand had seen a number of fundamental changes in Māori-Pākehā relations. Some of the larger Treaty of Waitangi claims such as Tainui (1995) and Ngāi Tahu (1998) had been settled. In 2000 the Privy Council upheld the 1998 High Court and 1999 Court of Appeal decisions in the Fisheries case that effectively legitimised iwi as the partner of the Crown, and shut urban Māori authorities out of the Treaty of Waitangi settlement process. Throughout the 1990s Māori and allied groups would protest against the National-New Zealand First coalition’s economic and social policies of selling State owned assets and the way in which the Crown sought to discharge its Treaty duties within a $1 billion cap (“the Fiscal Envelope”). There were a number of high profile protests including: Mike Smith’s attempt to cut down the lone pine on One Tree Hill in 1994 (the year Once were warriors was made) because it was a monument to a “dying race” (which was a reference to Isaac Featherstone’s sentiments outlined in Rewi’s Last Stand 1925 and 1940); the occupation of Pakaitore (Moutua Gardens) in Whanganui, in 1995 where the statue of John Ballance was beheaded (New Zealand Herald 2000); and Benjamin Nathan’s attack on the America’s Cup in 1997 as part of the Tino Rangatiratanga Liberation Organisation served to keep the issues of Māori sovereignty (America One 1997), Treaty settlement and race-relations at the forefront of national consciousness. The infamous “Hone” Carter incident where National Party Member
of Parliament of the then Far North (now Northland), John Carter, posed as a Māori caller to fellow National MP, John Banks’s radio programme, characterising all Māori issues as both an attempt to undermine or “bludge” off Pākehā, provides evidence that racial tensions were not one way. Similar sentiments to Carter’s can be found in Stuart C Scott’s work *The Travesty of Waitangi: Towards Anarchy* (1995) as a response to Māori and Treaty issues that referenced hearsay conversations of unnamed Māori characters duping unwitting Pākehā in the Treaty settlement process.

In 1999, The Labour-Alliance Coalition came to power with the first elected woman Prime Minister, Helen Clark, at the helm. Clark defeated National’s Jenny Shipley who had ousted former National Party leader, Jim Bolger, to become New Zealand’s first female Prime Minister. The Labour-Alliance Coalition would bring Joe Hawke (Bastion Point), John Tamihere (Waipareira Trust) and Whaea Tariana Turia to parliament. Turia had been one of the leaders of the Pakaitore (Motua Gardens) protests and in the years to come would play a significant role in shaping Māori politics.

Historically, the Helen Clark Labour-led party had lost the Māori seats in 1996 to the Winston Peters-led New Zealand First party, effectively ending the Labour-Ratana Alliance for the first time in nearly 70 years. In 1999, however, Labour would regain the Māori seats from New Zealand First and lead the Labour-Alliance Coalition. The Labour-Alliance Coalition would also change economic and social policy direction from neo-liberal policies to what was termed the “Third way” which was more interventionist. One of the new Government’s flagship policies, that sought to close the economic and social “gaps” between Māori and non-Māori, was “Closing the Gaps”. This policy would be disbanded in the wake of Don Brash’s 2004 Orewa speech that tapped into “mainstream New Zealand’s” resentment of Māori “privilege”.

As outlined, the 1999 election was an historic event in that the two major political parties, National and Labour, were both led by women. The rise of women to positions of power in New Zealand society would be seen with the Prime Minister, the appointments of Dame Silvia Cartwright as Governor General (2001-2006), Dame Sian Elias as Chief Justice of New Zealand (1999) and Margaret Wilson as Attorney General (2002) and Speaker of the House (2004). The prominence of women in high-profiled and public roles would engender notions of “girl power” and be viewed as gains from the feminist movements in relation to gender equity.
Juxtaposed with the rise of women into political positions was controversy regarding the speaking rights of women at annual Waitangi Day celebrations of nationhood. As outlined, throughout the 1990s and into the 21st Century, Waitangi Day would be a focal point for discontent and protest in relation to the Treaty settlement process and race-relations. In the 1990s, Waitangi Day would become the focus of tensions between Māori cultural traditions and women’s rights. In 1998 Jenny Shipley, the then Prime Minister, had attended a Waitangi Day ceremony and been allowed to speak on the marae. Later on in the same day, Helen Clark, who was at the time Leader of the Opposition, had been present at another ceremony and attempted to speak, but was interrupted by Titewhāi Harawira. Harawira argued that Clark should not be afforded the right to speak on the marae before Māori women, which reduced Helen Clark to tears (Thompson 2004; Radio New Zealand 1993, C1337).

The controversy surrounding this incident was replayed on national television and radio, both at home and abroad. The Clark-Harawira exchange brought the issue of women’s speaking rights into the public domain where some defended Harawira and marae protocol on the grounds of culture and spirituality, while others criticised Māori custom as being regressive, and backward. One person who challenged Māori to “get into the 21st Century” was the then Minister of Māori Affairs, Dover Samuels (Thompson 2004). The infamy of the Clark-Harawira exchange continues to shadow Waitangi Day commemorations and continues to be a topic of discussion in contemporary times (Television New Zealand 2009).

While the incident between Clark and Harawira served to bring the subject of speaking rights into the public domain, Harawira was somewhat demonised for her actions, and her message was lost. Harawira was not denying the right of women to speak or defending the protocol of Ti Tii Waitangi marae. Indeed, Harawira was challenging the right of non-Māori women to be afforded speaking rights before Māori women and her main target was those who set and maintained the protocol.

It was this social context that informed the film Whale Rider. A film focussing on ‘an against the odds story’ of a young Māori woman “fighting 1,000 years of tradition”, in order to embrace her destiny and become leader of her people, appeared timely. Given the recent and ongoing tensions between culture, tradition and gender roles in “traditional” Māori custom at a time when women had shattered the glass ceiling in terms of public social roles, the film appeared topical.
14.2 Bicultural nationalism in a two world-view model

If *Once were warriors* (1994) was the dystopian cautionary tale of Māori inside the national framework, then *Whale Rider* offers the utopian promise of harmony inside the nation-state within a bicultural framework. Moreover, the film was also foreshadowed by the impact of *Once were warriors*, a point that Caro (Mottesheard 2003) made explicit “The other best known film about the Māori culture [is] *Once were warriors* …”. Similarly to Keri Hulme’s *the bone people*, *Whale Rider* was advanced as a form of biculturalism that Māori and Pākehā alike could embrace. The collaborative effort between Caro *et al* in bringing *Whale Rider* to the screen with the approval of the author Witi Ihimaera and Ngāti Konohi has been given symbolic meaning in the bicultural relationship of Māori-Pākehā relations. Kylie Message (2003, p.88) makes this explicit when stating, “because of this attention to local community and resourcing, *Whale Rider* embodies a new wave of national New Zealand cinema… that is regarded as being both bicultural and significant in both local and international contexts”.

Bruce Babington (2007, p.229) notes the bicultural thematic which he terms “two-culture” filmmaking and suggests that the name change of Kahu in the novel to Paikea in the film, is in order to draw the association with the term “Pākehā”. This argument, however, is not entirely convincing in that the audience would have to be seeking the direct association and connection. Babington’s comments may be drawing on the theme of “universalism” in an “against the odds story”, but they also reflect a local-ethnic specificity when, according to the reviews, the reception has been one of general acceptance of ‘us’ as a bicultural nation. It is suggested that the use of Paikea, an ancestral name of Ngāti Porou, is to draw upon the ancient and traditional world of Māori culture, and to lay claim to authenticity. This theme of authenticity is made explicit by Caro in her comparisons of *Whale Rider* and *Once were warriors* (1994). “A film like Whale Rider is equally truthful [to *Once were warriors*] perhaps more so, to the Māori experience; Māori people respond to Whale Rider because it’s a film they understand” (Message 2003, p.88).

In essence what Caro is advocating is that *Whale Rider* is a more ‘authentic’ depiction of Māori life and social experience for the majority of the Māori population than *Once were warriors* (1994). Similarly to *Once were warriors* (1994), however, the Māori way of life depicted in *Whale Rider* also presents a minority view of the Māori population. These discussions on “authenticity”, regarding “real” social experience, gives weight to Barry
Barclay’s concerns of films (such as *Once were warriors* 1994) being used as “social documents” and purporting “to depict contemporary Māori existence” (Murray 2007, p.97).

The notion of “us”, as a bicultural nation, or in what form biculturalism is conceptualised and depicted in the film, raises a number of factors to consider. Similarly to the vision of biculturalism contained within *the bone people*, the thematics in *Whale Rider* centre on “hope” and offer the promise of resolution between Māori and Pākehā in a period when the relationship had become fraught with tension. Whether the bicultural view contained within *Whale Rider* is entirely convincing or not has been the subject of some discussion. Brendan Hokowhitu (2007, pp. 26) found the “bicultural theatre” contained therein as “tokenistic” and “fantasies”.

As noted by a number of analysts and reviewers, *Whale Rider* avoids and removes controversial aspects of New Zealand history such as settlement, neo-liberal reforms, the Treaty settlement process, the broader protest movements, Māori activism, causal explanations of Māori social disparity and tensions in race-relations (Braddock 2004; Flicking 2003; Hokowhitu 2007, p .26). Similarly to *Once were warriors* (1994) and in direct opposition to *Broken Barrier* (1952), *Utu* (1983), *Ngati* (1987) and *Mauri* (1998), the film is designed not to make audiences too uncomfortable about race-relations. A sentiment once used to describe the author of *Whale Rider*, Witi Ihimaera’s literary work.

Rather, the film, as Babington indicates, has strong universal appeal as an underdog story about “girl power” and a generational gap in attitudes toward gender, tradition and culture. What is argued is that by focussing on the topical subject of gender and the association of sexism in “traditional Māori” society, the film offers a form of common ground in the utopian promise of national harmony via the vehicle of race-relations. Wise (2009, p.133) likens an appeal to the “universal” as a way in which issues of discrimination (including racial) can be deferred in terms of national cohesion.

**14.3 Bicultural nation building through avoidance and cultural distance**

While criticisms can and have been levied at the director for avoiding certain subjects, it is important to note that Witi Ihimaera had clear distinctions about the relationship between Māori and the Crown, and the relationship between Māori and Pākehā. In an interview in 2004, Ihimaera highlighted the subject of race-relations by claiming:
The problem is people think of it as one debate. But it’s two dilemmas … There’s the relationship between Māori and the Crown, which for as long as the tribunal process lasts, is a legal one, and therefore adversarial … That needs to be addressed quickly … But the relationship between Māori and Pākehā is quite separate … That’s going along quite well.

(Watkin 2004, pp. 19-21).

What is problematic with Ihimaera’s view, however, is that race-relations have been somewhat defined by the issues the film avoids for nearly two decades. This appears to be the strong directive code in the film, that only in the absence of the more controversial or tension filled subjects of New Zealand’s history can the nation truly be “bicultural”. In this fashion, Whale Rider shares commonality with all films analysed in this thesis, in that the sub-text of the nationalised race-relations narrative, is that only when the same are resolved will the nation-state be harmonious.²⁰⁰

Ihimaera’s view of New Zealand society was based upon cultural differences or “two treasures” independent and strong, a quick resolution to the Treaty settlement process, and “korero and mana” (Watkin 2004, pp. 19-21). In other words, Ihimaera is advancing the nation building exercise through the Māori cultural nationalist/bicultural two world-view model of race-relations. If, however, this is the relationship between Māori and Pākehā envisaged by Ihimaera and evident in Whale Rider then the same is best described as “distant”. For example, there is no meaningful interaction between Māori and Pākehā characters in the film and Pākehā play roles in their functional absence as minor support characters such as the hospital staff in the opening scene and are largely removed from the screen. The only significant relationship between a Māori and non-Māori character is between Porourangi and his German fiancée, Anna.²⁰¹

By removing non-Māori and focussing on the “Māori world” inside the bicultural framework, what is depicted is a private cultural moment regarding attitudes toward gender and leadership that are made public. In this fashion, Whale Rider shares commonality with Utu (1983) in the exchange between Wiremu and Te Wheke that shows there are restraints, limits and structures inside Māori society that can contain those who hold potentially harmful attitudes toward harmonious race-relations in the nation-state. Unlike Utu (1983), however, the final resolution is one of happiness where love and the miraculous overcome all the
barriers. As will be argued, Koro’s attitude toward gender, leadership and tradition are depicted as detrimental to both Māori, and New Zealand society.

In terms of race-relations, it is argued that the film reinforces the overarching Māori cultural nationalist and bicultural premise that the primary concern of the Māori social body is the preservation, maintenance and survival of culture. As Braddock (2004) notes the film defers an examination of the broader political and historical factors of the social position of Māori and race-relations in favour of an exploration that Māori need to reconnect through culture. According to Braddock (2004) “the prevailing outlook promoted by this layer is that an understanding of the social position of Māori – their past, present and future – must be presented as a search for lost “origins” and “identity”. Similarly to Once were warriors (1994), the fortunes of Māori are characterised as “Māori” problems that must be overcome with “Māori” cultural solutions.

In this fashion Whale Rider becomes a search for “lost origins and identity” and reminiscent of Marie and Haig’s (2006, pp. 17-21) observations of a “rescue and reunite mission” as a way in which Māori society can overcome problems in the present. This “rescue and reunite mission” of disenfranchised Māori can be seen in the metaphor of the “waka taua”, which is firstly used to denote a people who have lost their way, and secondly, as a symbol of unity. There are a number of significant metaphors regarding the use of waka in Māori traditions and culture. The one emphasised here is the use of waka in its broader sense as a vessel or a vehicle for transformation. The waka taua in Whale Rider was started as a hopeful project by Porourangi to celebrate the birth of Paikea and her twin brother. Following the deaths of Paikea’s mother and brother, however, the waka is left to decay.

In this sense, the waka taua becomes symbolic of a whānau torn apart by grief and also signals that an opportunity to go forward as “a people” is left to decay on the beach through the failed leadership of Koro. In the resolution of Whale Rider, the waka is presented as a unifying symbol which unites the community as evidenced by the participation of Porourangi, Rawiri, Paikea and Koro, as well as both men and women from the Whangara community, powering the waka toward a hopeful future. Paikea makes the reunification theme explicit with the statement “I know that our people will keep going forward – together, with all of our strength”. What emerges, however, is the key code that Māori society can only be rescued, reunited and move forward as a people via the agency of culture. Thus, “culture” becomes
the integral link or bind between the people and is, as Hokowhitu (2008, p.59) describes, an indication that “the self-determination of Māori is entirely within their own grasp”.

14.4 The generation gap and culture, as the central point of Māori society

Cultural continuity is depicted as the central point of Māori society and the binding force that holds the people together. This theme is best exemplified in the scene where Koro uses a broken rope as a metaphor for whakapapa, as he explains to Paikea what unites Māori. In this scene there is a hint of Paikea’s destiny, when she binds the rope and starts the outboard motor. The preservation of Māori culture is a principal element in Whale Rider and how culture is to be maintained and continued underpins some of the key encounters between characters. This is evident in the exchanges between Koro, Nanny Flowers, Paikea, Rawiri and Porourangi who represent social forces, transitional figures and at times, “reactionary foils”. Arguably, the character who best represents a reactionary figure is Koro, who symbolises the conflict between preserving “culture” and his personal views of “tradition”. The audience is made acutely aware of Koro’s views on “culture” and “tradition”, especially in relation to hereditary leadership and gender.

While the subject of gender will be discussed in a separate section of its own, it is argued that the themes of “culture” and “tradition” are presented in the film as an examination of the different attitudes toward leadership in Māori society between the young and the old. In essence, “a generational gap” represented through the exchanges between Koro on one side, and Paikea, Porourangi, Rawiri and Nanny Flowers on the other. The use of the generational gap to explore notions of Māori cultural tradition was identified by Merata Mita (2010) who stated:

*The director made the film [Whale Rider] into an inter-generational conflict story, so we had a young girl pitted against the koroua and we had that judgmental thing about the idea of progress or the filmmaker’s idea of progress.*

In this fashion, Whale Rider shares commonality with To Love a Maori (1972) that highlighted a generational gap in perceptions and advocated an attitudinal change on issues such as class, gender and race-relations in order to maintain national harmony. Similarly, Whale Rider advances a shift in Māori society toward the subject of gender and Māori women’s leadership roles in the cultural domain. Māori are being urged, through strong directive codes, to re-evaluate tradition for the good of the nation.
Mita’s comments in relation to the inter-generational conflict are evident in the encounters of Paikea, Nanny Flowers, Porourangi, Rawiri and Koro. Koro is the hereditary leader of his community and the grandfather of Paikea. Koro was desperate for a male heir to continue the line of his whānau and to assume the mantle of leadership. At Paikea’s birth, her mother and twin brother die, and in defiance of his father, Porourangi (the father of Paikea) gives Paikea her significant tipuna name. As a result of the death of Paikea’s mother and twin brother, Porourangi has left the community and become a resident artist in Germany. Upon Porourangi’s return, what emerges in the scenes between himself and Koro is that Porourangi has fled his leadership role. This is best exemplified when Koro declares to Porourangi, “You got the privileges, but you also forget, you’ve got the obligations”. It is, however, Koro’s weight of expectation and view of tradition that has engendered Porourangi’s departure and reluctance to return.

As events transpire, Porourangi’s visit is brief and he has decided to take Paikea to Germany with him. On Porourangi’s departure with Paikea, Koro embarks upon the plan of finding another male leader from the young boys of Paikea’s generation. It is significant that Koro ignores the generation of his second son Rawiri and seeks a young male heir from the wider community. In this fashion, Koro seeks to mould the youth into an image of his own version of Māori tradition, excluding both Rawiri’s generation and women. The young males are brought into a wananga to be taught “the old ways” by Koro. It emerges in this scene, however, that some of Koro’s teachings from the past are at odds with the social standards of contemporary times. This can be seen when Koro is teaching the young boys the haka and he states that warriors used to hit themselves until they “bled”. While Koro is trying to invoke the ancient past to inspire passion in the youths, the haka is now used for largely ceremonial purposes and it is rare for young boys to be expected to draw blood at practice.

Koro is depicted as having fixed and static ideas about culture and tradition, even in the face of overwhelming evidence that his perception of leadership is incorrect. This theme is best exemplified when, even although it is apparent to the community and the audience that the next leader of the community is destined to be Paikea, Koro fails to recognise the signs of her now obvious destiny. In the scene where Nanny Flowers places the niho paroa (whale tooth) in Koro’s hand, when Paikea has ridden the whale out to sea, Koro still asks the question “which one”? Nanny Flowers responds with, “what do you mean, which one”? 
In this fashion Koro is encoded as a “foil” or reactionary figure of a time that has passed, whereas the younger generation of Rawiri and Paikea represent the future or how Māori society should be in the 21st Century. Paikea is aided in her quest to become leader by her grandmother, Nanny Flowers, her uncle Rawiri and his friends. While *Whale Rider* has been constructed as a film which examines the intersection between culture, tradition and gender, it is argued that the work defers to an exploration of generational attitudes to leadership. A deeper analysis of key themes in the film reveals that it is the younger generation of Māori men who teach Paikea her tikanga and culture, in opposition to Koro. It is Rawiri, for example, who teaches Paikea the taiaha to a standard where she beats the promising Hemi in battle. When Rawiri is teaching Paikea the taiaha, she receives encouragement from Rawiri’s male friends who state, “go little girl”. Thus, what is revealed on screen is that the younger generation of Māori men have attitudes to a wide raft of issues that differ from those of the men of Koro’s generation.

Further, Koro’s treatment of Paikea is equated with his attitudes toward Rawiri. When Nanny Flowers and Rawiri arrive at the hospital to find Paikea’s mother and twin brother dead, Nanny Flowers encourages a bond between Rawiri and his niece. Koro can be seen performing the karakia over the dead baby boy, while Nanny Flowers places baby Paikea into young Rawiri’s arms. Young Rawiri asks Nanny Flowers, “What is wrong?” To which she responds, “Same old story. Not good enough for him”. Young Rawiri asks “Did he start that early with me”? Nanny Flowers responds “You’re a man. You can handle it”. It can be seen in this exchange that Koro is a difficult character, who is insensitive in his attitude towards others and rationalises his actions under the guise of hereditary leadership, culture and tradition. What is revealed in these encounters between Koro and other characters is the metaphor that blinkered leadership with regard to tradition and culture are key detriments to Māori society. This is evident in the absence of Porourangi, the heir apparent to the leadership role and the neglect of Rawiri and his generation, as well as Paikea. It is argued that this is the director’s appeal to Māori society to re-evaluate tradition by vesting hope for the future in the younger generation.
14.5 Cultural authentic/cultural degenerate: the index of exemplar and Māori cultural nationalism

As discussed throughout this work, there has been an ongoing pattern of encoding Māori characters in film in a dichotomy of rurally-based and urbanised Māori to indicate ‘authenticity’. This dichotomy is characterised by the representation of rurally-based Māori as authentic and urbanised Māori as “corrupt”. If Once were warriors (1994) depicted the ills of urbanised Māori, Whale Rider presents rurally-based Māori, as the traditional keepers of Māori culture, in a state of decline or cultural decay. Primarily the film presents cultural decay and community loss of direction as outcomes of Koro’s failed leadership. For example, Paikea’s uncle Rawiri and his friends are depicted as consumers of drugs and alcohol, and are portrayed as the idle unemployed. A number of young men spend their days playing pool rather than contributing to the community, which Koro laments. Although the conclusion could be drawn that the depiction of Rawiri and his friends is a subversion of the rural-urban divide, on closer examination what emerges are similar themes to Once were warriors (1994) regarding the importance of traditional Māori culture.

In this fashion, Māori culture is depicted as the core component of Māori society in overcoming social problems occurring in the Māori population. Culture as central to the Māori social body has been a central tenet of Māori cultural nationalist propositions and public social policy regarding the transformation of Māori society. Contained within the Māori cultural nationalist discourse is that a strong Māori cultural identity is essential in overcoming the adverse affects of colonisation, as are the revitalisation and maintenance of culture. What is presented in Whale Rider is that rurally-based Māori, or the traditional keepers of culture, are under threat from within. The threat to the death of Māori culture is best exemplified in the overt concerns of Koro in finding younger men to fulfil central traditional roles. These themes are conducted at the interpersonal level between the interactions of Koro and characters such as Porourangi and Rawiri. For example, it is the younger generation of men who participate in risky behaviour, such as the consumption of drugs and alcohol or in the case of Porourangi, have departed the community.

The older generation, represented by Koro, is portrayed as trying to keep Māori traditions and culture alive, and fearful that what is being overseen is the death of Māori culture. It is, however, attitudes toward tradition and culture best exemplified by Koro that are shown as key detriments and barriers to revitalising tribal life. In this fashion, the index of exemplar
that is contained within the bicultural two world-view model and Māori cultural nationalist aspirations for the revitalisation of Māori culture is presented as being challenged from inside the Māori population by “traditional leadership”. Ironically, it was the subject of “traditional leadership” as a key deterrent to Māori society that was the subtext to Alan Duff’s novel *Once were warriors* (1990). In *Whale Rider*, however, the director is urging change from within but in a way that maintains the status quo, where culture remains the primary concern of Māori society, but with a modification in notions of tradition and leadership.

This is evident in the scenes where Koro acknowledges Paikea as the destined rangatira and leader of Whangara, and the reunification of the community. In this fashion, *Whale Rider* shares commonality thematically with *Utu* (1983). If the director of *Utu* (1983) was advocating sacrificing Te Wheke’s radicalism for the good of the nation and progressive race-relations, then *Whale Rider* is advancing similar notions in relation to Koro’s reactionary conservatism. The metaphor is clear in that in order for “two independent cultures” to reach a common destination together then attitudes toward gender, leadership, culture and tradition have to change.

### 14.6 External threats and modernising Māori

If *Ngati* (1987) was an alternative time-line that diverted the impact of urbanisation, arguably, *Whale Rider* can be seen as a cautionary tale of what could happen to Māori society if the culture is not kept alive through a re-evaluation of tradition. It is important to note that one of the major attractions away from the rural heartland in the film is the idea of the international or global. This theme is best reflected in Porourangi, the leader in waiting, rejecting his familial and cultural obligations for an independent life in Europe. What emerges is the theme that Māori traditions and culture are in competition with, or under threat from, a number of internal and external forces, which have an impact at the local level. While the internal threats have been discussed above, there are a number of key themes about the potential threat of the international contained within the film.

In the film the international is brought to the local by way of Porourangi’s life abroad and the inter-marriage between Porourangi and his German fiancé, Anna. Porourangi is a Māori artist abroad and unbeknownst to Koro is involved with Anna who is carrying his child. The relationship of Porourangi and Anna is revealed in the scene where Koro has brought Paikea’s teacher, Miss Parata, home as a potential partner for Porourangi. As Porourangi is showing slides of his art and life abroad, the intimate image of himself and Anna is revealed
on screen. There are two issues in these scenes which need examination. Firstly, there is the juxtaposition of Koro’s choice of partner for Porourangi and secondly, Porourangi’s relationship with the international Anna. Koro’s choice of partner in Miss Parata, represents a local ethnic specificity preference over inter-ethnic love affairs, whereby Porourangi may remain in the Whangara community and take up the mantle of leadership.

Porourangi’s relationship with Anna however, raises the possibility that Porourangi may be lost forever to the global village. This theme is evident when Porourangi returns to take Paikea overseas to form a new family and life with himself, and Anna. In the resolution of the film, a heavily pregnant Anna is depicted on the shores with the Whangara community watching the waka taua power through the water.

What is revealed in this scene is that the global has been brought to the local and that the newly strengthened Whangara Community, through the recognition of Paikea as leader, is secure enough to embrace the international. While the film does not resolve where Anna and Porourangi will live, the possible threat or the lure of the international is minimised by the presence of the pregnant Anna in the midst of the Whangara Community. In this fashion, the Māori cultural nationalist proposition about the importance of a secure Māori cultural identity is highlighted as being able to overcome adversity in the modern world.

Hokowhitu (2007, pp. 22-30; 2008, pp. 115-41) draws an association with the theme of the ‘modern’ in Whale Rider and enlightenment values, Western norms and the advancement of Māori culture in Homi Bhabha’s notion of a “third space”. While there are certainly elements in Whale Rider of these themes and ideas, the position taken in this work is that the importance of maintaining culture and heritage is reinforced throughout the film. Examples include: Rawiri teaching Paikea the taiaha and regaining his passion for culture where he proceeds to change his lifestyle by losing weight and getting fit; Paikea performing all the cultural rituals in order to fulfil the requirements of leadership; Porourangi’s artwork that is based on Māori culture; the boys performing a haka to Paikea when she is riding the whale and leading the whales out to sea; and the newly completed waka taua, once a symbol of cultural decay, but now an emblem of cultural unity.

It is argued that one of the key thematics in Whale Rider is the sanctity of “culture” in its preservation through innovation and the restoration of the place of Māori women. What the director is urging is the maintenance of culture, custom and tradition. Like Beth Heke, the Apirana Whānau become the exemplars of Māori cultural nationalism in the film in that a
secure Māori cultural identity within the bicultural two world-view model can withstand any adversity, including a re-evaluation of tradition and a relationship with the international. Furthermore what is presented in the film through the relationship of Porourangi and Anna is the argument that Māori already have a relationship with the international and are a core part of the global village.

In this fashion, Whale Rider stands inside and outside Māori cultural nationalism and the two world-view model. It maintains that culture and a secure Māori cultural identity will transform Māori society, but critiques generational notions of tradition complete with a reactionary figure and happy final resolution. Arguably, Whale Rider inverts the Māori whakatauki of Māori “walking backwards into the future, our eyes fixed on the past” by advancing through the eyes of Koro, that the future and past is right in front of him in the figure of his granddaughter, his sons, Anna and prospective grandchild.

14.7 Gender: The Return of the Noble Savage

The construction of the Māori male as friend, love interest, aggressor or warrior-savage, detractor to progress, antagonist, potential for promise, sacrifice, reactionary figure and noble savage has been played out in various guises throughout the films analysed in this work. The depiction of the Māori male has been used in a contradictory fashion that references both Māori male violence, within notions of contested masculinities, and also the homo-centricity in the relationships of men. As discussed, the quintessential and iconic image of Māori masculinity is that of the Māori male warrior-savage that had been given a contemporary reworking in the film, Once were warriors (1994).

In Whale Rider, there is a return to the noble savage best exemplified by Rawiri, the second-born and overlooked son of Koro and Nanny Flowers. Given the success and high profile of Once were warriors (1994) and the pop-cultural impact of Jake “the Muss” in New Zealand society, it is argued that the character of Rawiri stands in direct contrast to figures such as Jake Heke. Rawiri is depicted as caring, supportive, whānau-oriented, proficient in the taiaha and cultural customs and the leader of a group of friends who is present (unlike Porourangi) and well-respected in the Whangara community. This is evident in the exchanges between himself and Nanny Flowers, when Nanny Flowers approaches him firstly to help nurture the infant Paikea and then to help train Paikea as the leader in waiting. Koro also acknowledges Rawiri’s standing in the Whangara community when he concedes that the exhausted group trying to return the whales to the ocean will try one more time if Rawiri asks them.
While it is revealed that Rawiri has lost his way and is using drugs and alcohol recreationally, he does not descend into violence or destruction like Jake Heke. Although Rawiri is not depicted as suffering geographical cultural alienation like Greg Shaw, Rewi/Paki and the Heke whānau, his detachment from culture is attributed to Koro. Rawiri’s aimlessness is portrayed as a result of neglect and the absence of nurturing by Koro. Symbolically, Rawiri’s reclamation of culture comes via the possibility of a change in leadership and a new direction in helping Paieka fulfil her destiny.

It is through his bond with and support of Paieka that Rawiri regains his passion for culture in opposition to Koro. In this sense, Whale Rider shares commonality thematically with Ngati (1987), Mauri (1988) and Once were warriors (1994) in that culture and heritage are waiting to be embraced by those who choose to do so. Arguably, the character of Rawiri appears to be used as a transitional figure to actively reduce the threat of Māori male violence best exemplified by Jake Heke in Once were warriors (1994) by showing that cultural attachment can constrain the warrior. This is best exemplified in one of the most charming scenes in Whale Rider when Rawiri, surrounded by alcohol and friends, and urged by his girlfriend, picks himself up off the couch and reclaims the taiaha to tutor Paieka.

What is referenced in the character of Rawiri is the noble warrior savage trope where Māori masculinity can be harnessed for the good of the nation. As discussed in Utu (1983) and Once were warriors (1994), there have been strong directorial codes regarding “warrior-savage” characters such as Te Wheke and Jake the Muss who have to be sacrificed or rejected for the good of the nation. What transpires with Rawiri in Whale Rider is that the nobility of the warrior is to act as a transcendent figure for Māori cultural tradition, in that he supports the leadership of women, which will ease the tensions between both cultures about the gendered subject.

14.8 Mana Wahine – genderising the indigenous
At the time of the release of Whale Rider the subject of women’s speaking rights had gained particular prominence in New Zealand Society. The tensions centred on the rights of women, and the right to cultural practices that had gender specific roles. In essence, what took priority in New Zealand society - the right to gender equality or the right to culture and tradition accepted in its own terms? As argued, the director of Whale Rider is referencing key issues in the social context in order to advocate a way forward to negotiate tensions about gender, tradition and culture. In order to analyse the subjects of Māori women and
leadership, *Whale Rider* draws upon one of the dominant assumptions about the social position of Māori women in contemporary New Zealand society namely, that culture takes precedence over issues of gender.\(^{216}\) Commensurate with this perception is that Māori women were, and are, actively excluded from leadership roles because Māori society is patriarchal (see Ka'ai, Moorfield, Reilly & Mosley 2004; Walker 1992). Koro makes this explicit in the scene where he is holding a wananga for the first-born sons of the community and urges them to “hold their dicks”. The metaphor is clear in that the penis is the symbol of the young boys masculinity and privilege in ‘traditional’ Māori society.

The subject of gender, or what Linda Tuhiwai Smith (1999, p.151) terms, “genderising indigenous debates” is used to locate Paikea against a male-dominated tradition, represented by the figure of Koro. The promotional material constructs Paikea as “heroic” in attempting to overturn 1000 years of patriarchal Māori “tradition”. As discussed, Api Mahuika challenged the view of Māori women as wholly subordinate to men in terms of leadership and disproved the claim based upon examining his own tribal history, namely that of Ngāti Porou. Significantly, the account of Paikea which *Whale Rider* draws upon, is from the tribal traditions of Ngāti Porou. What *Whale Rider* is referencing is the sexual-dualist model of Māori society, framed by the concepts of tapu and noa which engendered the belief that Māori women were contaminants in Māori spiritual practices.\(^{217}\) These elements are evident in the scene where Paikea is excluded from the *taumata* and *wananga* because of her gender and then accused by Koro of breaking the tapu when she and Hemi fight on the marae.

The emphasis on gender and its association with Māori culture and tradition in *Whale Rider* constructs Māori culture in binary opposition with feminist aspirations. It is argued, however, that there has always been contestation inside the Māori population about Māori women’s issues\(^{218}\). Donna Awatere’s influential ‘Māori Sovereignty’ (1982; 1984) articles in *Broadsheet* advanced the view that Māori women had more in common with Māori men than “white women” or, by extension that ethnicity and culture overrode issues of gender.\(^{219}\) Yet, gender issues or concerns about the place of Māori women in Māori culture can be found in the literature of the protest movements of the 1970s, 1980s, 1990s and beyond.

The central premise of Donna Awatere’s Māori Sovereignty articles was that Māori men and women must work together in order to effect change and overturn the effects of colonisation. Commensurate with this view, “differences” regarding gender in the Māori population could
be deferred because “culture” (and commonality) is what binds Māori society and cultural survival should be afforded priority. As indicated in the literature, however, granting priority to cultural restoration does not equate to an outright dismissal of gender issues in Māori society. Rather, a number of Māori women have been advocating for the acknowledgement and return of the rights of women in a pre-contact, traditional tribal context. As Geraldene Peters (2007, p.105) notes, regarding the rights of Māori women in culture, that:

*Pākehā (European) feminists have in the past interpreted this [speaking rights] call as a statement about the extent to which sexism is embedded in marae protocol when, as commentators such as Kathie Irwin have suggested, it has been rather more a question of redistributing traditionally assigned gender roles.*

The emphasis on ethnic and cultural “commonality” and the restoration of gender balance (mana tane/mane wahine) is evident in the scene where men and women are paddling the waka in harmony. This scene serves a number of purposes, but mainly it reinforces the idea that transformation of “traditional” gender roles in Māori society has to be reconciled with culture. Although genderising the indigenous may have been the intention of the director, the film elides some of the sub-themes regarding the construction of Māori women in contemporary society, and reinforces the majority of Māori cultural nationalist propositions, namely that culture is of central importance to Māori society.

The exclusion of Paikea from cultural practices on the basis of gender is not, for example, characterised as a human rights issue which underscored the landmark Sandra Lovelace v Canada [1977-1981] (the right to enjoy First Nation (Indian) culture under art.27 of the International Civil and Political Covenant). One of the key thematics evident in the film is that it firmly locates Māori women’s central place as being in the cultural domain and advocates that tensions regarding Māori cultural customs be alleviated in Māori cultural terms.

### 14.8.1 Mana tane/Mana wahine and the cultural context

While there has been much discussion about the patriarchal elements of Māori society, Caro (quoted in Stukin 2003) highlighted the ‘matriarchal’ qualities with the comment:
... Māori are also profoundly matriarchal ... Elderly women are considered treasures within the culture. It is extraordinarily clear that women are the ones who make sure things go according to plan and that they are immensely powerful.

The debates between the patriarchal and matriarchal nature of Māori society reveal a cultural relativist approach to issues of gender power in cultural customs in practice. In this fashion Caro is, as indicated by Braddock (2004), utilising an identity politics framework to both criticise gender in cultural practices, and also to urge an understanding of different notions of power. These themes are evident in the character of Nanny Flowers who exhibits personal power over Koro in the private sphere, but not in public. In an argument with Koro, Nanny Flowers reminds Koro that she and not he is the boss of the kitchen. Furthermore, Nanny Flowers observes to Paikea that, “he’s not the boss of me. I just let him think he is”.

This can be viewed as an expression of women’s power or different types of power, but these scenes construct Māori women’s social roles in the private cultural sphere, where the public domain is left to men. In this fashion, Nanny Flowers’ role is located firmly within the familial and/or kin-group setting where she exercises her personal power behind the scenes. While one could draw the conclusion that Nanny Flowers exemplifies the proverb of Māori women leading from behind, there are strong directive codes for Māori women to find their voice and speak out. As evidenced in the film, Nanny Flowers often displays more wisdom and foresight than Koro, but will not censure Koro for his behaviour in public until Paikea is on the back of the whale.

Although Nanny Flowers is sympathetic to Porourangi, Rawiri and Paikea and the way they are treated by Koro, she abides by Koro’s decisions as the rangatira of the community. Nanny Flowers offers moral and private support to the trio, but not public. It is argued that the role of Nanny Flowers also gives weight to the thematic of the generational gap in Whale Rider. As evidenced in a number of key scenes, Nanny Flowers reminds Paikea of her strong matrilineal whakapapa as a descendant of Muriwai, tacitly endorses Paikea’s quest for leadership (when Paikea takes a seat usually reserved for men on the taumata), directs Paikea to Rawiri in order to learn her tikanga and provides a strong presence in Paikea’s life when Koro is absent.

What is evident in these scenes is that Nanny Flowers gives Paikea her full endorsement as the next hereditary leader, but will not break tikanga in accordance with her own views of cultural tradition. In this fashion, Whale Rider stands inside the Māori cultural nationalist
narrative in relation to gender tensions inside Māori society by urging the restoration of gender balance, but is conducted within a framework that takes cognisance of the cultural context.\textsuperscript{21} In essence, \textit{Whale Rider} is not strictly “progressive” or “modernist”, although the film can be interpreted that way, but rather advocates a return to a more “traditional” model of Māori society.

Arguably, Paikea herself best exemplifies the importance of the resolution of gender tensions within the cultural dimension. As noted by Braddock (2004) and Hokowhitu (2007; 2008) Paikea’s claim to leadership is based upon her hereditary lines of whakapapa which allude to the inter-class distinction inside Māori society. Similarly to Takiri, Ariana, Rawi and Beth Heke, Paikea comes from the rangatira class of Māori and it is only through her lines of descent that she can assert her right to leadership. The high status of Paikea continues the pattern of framing Māori women’s subjectivity and experience in terms of “exceptionalism”. In this instance, Paikea is characterised as extraordinarily exceptional in terms of her right to lead through her whakapapa, manifest destiny and miraculous ability to commune with nature that leads to the restoration of gender balance in the cultural domain. The happy resolution at the end of the film where the community is in harmony is commensurate with Māori cultural nationalist propositions, including the gender critique contained within that narrative.

It is important to note however, that \textit{Whale Rider} depicts a minority view of the actual social living conditions of Māori women in contemporary New Zealand society. As outlined in Section 6.6. Māori women, Chapter Six, four out of five Māori women live outside their traditional tribal networks and support structures, and inhabit the most vulnerable group in society across all populations (Ministry of Women’s Affairs 2001). As a result, the vision of the ‘authentic’ Māori experience contained within \textit{Whale Rider} is outside the social realities of most Māori women. It is argued that what has been submerged within the Māori cultural nationalist and bicultural narrative is the place of Māori women in society. It is for this reason that a distinction between the three interweaving links of the cultural, political and social is urged when examining Māori women’s issues in contemporary analyses.

\textbf{Conclusion}

As argued, \textit{Whale Rider} is not so much an examination of the universal triumph of female power, but a reinforcement that the central place of Māori women is as part of the cultural domain. This is evident as the film locates Māori women in a cultural context, but ignores the material conditions of Māori women (and Māori society) in contemporary times. It has
been argued that the film is informed by Māori cultural nationalist and bicultural aspirations ascribed to Māori women and Māori women’s roles inside “traditional” Māori society albeit with an appeal to make an attitudinal shift in notions of traditions regarding gender. One of the key thematics contained within *Whale Rider* is that it urges a change from inside the Māori population regarding Māori women and leadership, but maintains the status quo where cultural issues are granted salience as the central concern of the Māori social body. What is highlighted is the Māori cultural nationalist assumption that culture is the central concern of the Māori population and the retention of cultural traditions will, in effect, engender the transformation of Māori society. This view is commensurate with the two world-view model of biculturalism and of race-relations. What is over-written is a particular ideological position which minimises a number of core tensions occurring inside the Māori social body regarding the social concerns of the group, structural organisation and race-relations. In essence, the film is engaged in a critical dialogue about race-relations that is informed by contemporary understandings of Māori-Pākehā relations, even when the same is not explicitly addressed in the works.
Chapter 15: Conclusion

The hypothesis of this thesis was to examine the claim that films post-1985 signalled a fundamental shift in the representation of Māori subjectivity. In order to investigate such a claim, this work has drawn together three strands for analysis: the social, political and historical, to provide an overview of the changing discourse of race-relations. As argued, the major claim made in this work is that there is no clear rupture in the films but a continuous response and/or reworking of race-relations that reflect more contemporary standpoints. As outlined, what is often described as a demarcation between “old” and “new” forms of cinema, reflects the State adopted socio-political ideology of biculturalism/the two world-view model, in which to negotiate race-relations.

The Māori-Pākehā relationship or what John O’Shea once termed New Zealand’s “essential drama” has formed a core part of the nation building exercise and country’s mythology. The importance of race-relations is found in the sub-text of all films examined in this work, namely, that for the nation to truly be harmonious, the relationship of Māori and Pākehā must be resolved. Even when the subject of race-relations is not explicitly addressed in the works (Once were warriors 1994 and Whale Rider 2002), the examination of the country’s national dilemma has been a continuous and key thematic of Māori-Pākehā interactions and Māori subjectivity, depicted on screen.

In this fashion, the films form an important socio-historical and political narrative in their relationship with and response to State defined directives, regarding race-relations. As outlined in the filmic case studies, there are not only causal relationships between contemporary State policy prescriptions and the works produced, but the films exist in a linear-historical relationship to each other. The directorial responses to not only one another through the films, but also about race-relations, suggest a continuing critical dialogue, where each generation applies their own perspective to the “national dilemma”. By adopting a chronological approach to the films, what emerges is that the narratives in the works function, in a socio-historic context, alongside the State’s directives, as cultural and political accounts of race-relations.

As Merata Mita (2010) once noted, the value of films is in their impact over time. The films analysed in this work have provided an overview of the influence of a nationalised race-relations narrative on understandings of Māori subjectivity. From notions of extinction, to the justification of assimilation and latterly, bicultural underpinnings, the key thematic of
race-relations remains as a crucial reference point in understanding the relationship of Māori and Pākehā. Representations, interpretations, films and artists are not divorced from the ideological and social conventions in society. Indeed, many artists have highlighted the underlying ideologies, audience reception and State policy prescriptions, as structural constraints that need to be negotiated when bringing the work to the screen.

The examination of historical accounts regarding attitudes, beliefs, ideas regarding Māori subjectivity and race-relations in film, allows analysts the opportunity to examine the continuous patterns that frame Māori. For example, the uses of the cultural authentic/cultural degenerate dichotomy, rural-urban divide, inter-ethnic love affairs, notions of enlightened exceptionalism, noble sidekicks and contested masculinities, to signal particular standpoints in the works. Whether directors embrace the dominant views of race-relations (*Rewi’s Last Stand* 1925/1940, *To Love a Maori* 1972, *Once were warriors* 1994 and *Whale Rider* 2002), challenge the same (*Broken Barrier* 1952, *Utu* 1983), respond, rework or re-imagine the Māori-Pākehā relationship (*Ngati* 1987, *Mauri* 1988), the influence of the essential drama remains.

Historically, notions of Māori subjectivity have been vulnerable to external pressures. State policy and legislation have been used to determine membership to the Māori ethnic group, Māori structural organisation, the social concerns of the Māori population and Māori identity in ways that conform to the State’s view. Policy prescriptions and legislation have been advanced to both the Māori and general populations as beneficial to the nation in terms of national cohesion through race-relations. The Foreshore and Seabed Act (2004) and discussions around its proposed successor, the Marine and Coastal Area (Takutai Moana) Bill (2010) are contemporary examples of how the State is prepared to create specific legislation that overwrites Māori interests in the name of harmonious race-relations.

Ideas about groups are not always benign, nor do they arise in a vacuum. They do, however, have real consequences and effects on people. Through State policy and legislation, the Māori population have experienced the loss of land and resources, cultural alienation, the structural collapse of Māori societal organisation, and have been pressured to conform to particular ideological models that are defined by the State. While the State’s strategic aim has been to maintain national cohesion through harmonious race-relations, as outlined in this work, the State’s own policies, practices and actions have laid the platform for dissent between Māori and Pākehā.
In contemporary times, Māori subjectivity is influenced by the State sanctioned socio-political ideology of biculturalism/the two-world view model and a dominant voice inside that narrative, namely, Māori cultural nationalism. While biculturalism was implemented to negotiate, engage and analyse race-relations, away from its predecessor, cultural nationalism, the framework has engendered its own set of problems. With the construction of the bicultural/two world-view model, race-relations have centred upon the cultural and ethnic differences of Māori and Pākehā, in order to develop some form of mutual understanding, and reconciliation. Bicultural understandings and the Treaty of Waitangi settlement process were supposed to foster a better and more harmonious form of race-relations. All evidence, however, points to the contrary.

The tensions between the Māori and Pākehā populations have not decreased with the adoption of biculturalism. Protest and dissent, not just between groups, but also inside the Māori population have continued. In the eight years between the release of Whale Rider (2002) and today, key events such as Don Brash’s Orewa speech (2004), the Foreshore and Seabed Act (2004), the hikoi (2004) in response to the Foreshore and Seabed Act, the formation of the Māori Party (2004) (due to the Foreshore and Seabed Act), the “terrorist” raids on Tuhoe (2007) and the Marine and Coastal (Takutai Moana) Bill (2010), indicate that tensions remain under the bicultural framework.

Currently, in order to engage with notions of Māori subjectivity, analysts must negotiate with bicultural understandings and the dominant view of Māori society; Māori cultural nationalism. Identified in this thesis are three interweaving threads in the Māori cultural nationalist narrative, namely, the cultural, social and political dimensions of Māori society that need further examination. Each of these threads is intertwined and used to reinforce Māori cultural nationalist assumptions about the Māori social body. It is argued that these three threads need to be viewed as interlinking and overlapping, but are equally important meta-narratives in the competing views of Māori subjectivity. In essence, this is where “difference” inside the Māori population is found and each dimension needs investigation in its own right when theorising Māori subjectivity.

According to the empirical evidence, the Māori cultural nationalist view of Māori society represents a minority view of the Māori population. For example, the majority of Māori do not live in an iwi-centred model. In this fashion, Māori cultural nationalist propositions exclude more Māori than includes in its framework. It is not, however, the intention of the
writer to construct more mythologies about Māori society. “Location” does not indicate a particular political position for or against Māori cultural nationalism. Rather, it is an indication that a primary assumption of the discourse, that Māori live in a traditionally-based model of Māori societal organisation, is not borne out by the actual social living conditions of the Māori population.

It is important to note, that notions of Māori subjectivity, Māori organisation, concerns of the Māori social body, Māori cultural identity, structural inequalities and the rights of Māori women have always been contested subjects within the Māori population. Currently, contested views inside the Māori group centre on: the Treaty settlement process, the adoption of Māori cultural nationalist propositions to underpin State policy, the preference of iwi as the Crown’s Treaty partner (as the “authentic” model of Māori structural organisation), the growing inequalities within the group and the place of Māori women inside the cultural domain and in society. These strands of the narrative are competing perspectives that need further examination and challenge contemporary, bicultural/Māori cultural nationalist assumptions about Māori subjectivity.

15.1 Strengths, limitations and further areas of research
The thesis has adopted an interdisciplinary approach which has both strengths and limitations. One of the strengths of adopting an interdisciplinary approach is that it allows the examination of a subject matter by drawing upon a number of theoretical and methodological frameworks. The use of the interdisciplinary allowed a wider form of investigation by incorporating aspects of Māori and Indigenous Studies, sociology, cultural studies, literary theory, social policy, representational and narrative theory in its examination. Conversely, one of the limitations of this thesis is the interdisciplinary approach undertaken to the subject matter. In any interdisciplinary work, there is the potential for criticism that the analysis does not encompass particular theoretical standpoints or methodological frameworks that are undertaken in specialist fields. While this is certainly relevant and important to all academic work, the writer views this as an invitation to specialists to undertake research work of their own on the subject matter.

There are, for example, key areas where further research would be beneficial to a number of disciplines. This thesis is a large work and covers a significant period of time. Throughout this process, limitations of time and word constraints have seen, unfortunately, some areas of
analysis omitted or curtailed. Areas of research that are highlighted for further investigation, but are not limited to, are listed below:

1. A critical feminist approach to the factors that influence the construction of Māori women’s subjectivity in contemporary times. A useful subset of this analysis would be an annotated bibliography of contributors to the Mana wahine discourse, as well as an historical account of the changing shape of Māori women’s feminist critiques since the adoption of Māori cultural nationalist propositions;

2. An analysis of inter-ethnic love affairs and contested masculinities as constructed relationships in the nation building exercise. In particular, the focus on the use of cultural stereotypes and the notion of “enlightened exceptionalism” contained within this narrative. An investigation into what factors Māori are “transcending” would be an important contribution to a number of fields;

3. An analysis of the cultural authentic/cultural degenerate dichotomy that is grounded in race theory. An investigation into the theoretical underpinnings of the “idea of race” contained within this dichotomy would be an important work in the area of race, race-relations and anti-racism; and

4. An analysis of the multi-cultural strands to the nationalised race-relations narrative. In recent times, films such as Tongan Ninja (2002), Sione’s Wedding (2006), No.2 (2006) and The Tattooist (2007) have provided an added dimension to the “essential drama” of New Zealand society that needs further exploration.

While conducting this research, the writer has become acutely aware of the lack of biographical records of directors, artists, key figures in the Māori protest movements and historical accounts of significant groups in New Zealand society. For example, biographies of people such as Rudall Hayward, Ramai Hayward, John O’Shea, Geoff Murphy, Merata Mita, Tama Poata, Wi Kuki Kaa, Syd and Hana Jackson, John Rangihau, Paora Kotara and many other history makers, are projects that need to be undertaken. The writer understands that Stephen Turner is in the process of completing a biography of Barry Barclay and looks forward to reading the final product.

Moreover, an historical account that is solely focussed on Ngā Tamatoa is an omission in the literature that needs addressing. While there are accounts of Ngā Tamatoa’s role in New Zealand history, they are spread across a wide range of disciplines and works. A larger project devoted to Ngā Tamatoa, key figures in the movement, the roles, actions, motivations
and influence of the group in bringing Māori rights to wider attention, would be a significant
contribution to New Zealand’s history. Furthermore, there are little historical accounts of the
Māori and Black women’s feminist movements in New Zealand society. The history of the
Māori and Black women’s feminist movements is almost an oral history that needs recording
for the future.
Film case study 1: Rudall Hayward and Rewi’s Last Stand (1925/1940)

Rudall Hayward (1900-1974) is considered the pioneer of New Zealand filmmaking in a career spanning 50 years. In the course of Hayward’s career, he made seven feature films and numerous documentaries, along with education and travel works (New Zealand Film Archive 2000). Rudall Hayward’s contribution to New Zealand film has been significant and important (Horton 1972, pp.3-4; Russell 1971, pp.52-53; Sklar, R 1971, pp. 147-54). In 2005, Rudall Hayward was ranked at number 90 of the top 100 New Zealand history makers. Thus, Rudall Hayward and his cinematic accounts have made a significant mark on New Zealand film and have shaped popular accounts of New Zealand’s national identity.

Primarily, Hayward set out to place New Zealand stories on screen. Throughout the course of Hayward’s career, his films focused upon the relationship between Māori and Pākehā. It is significant that Hayward’s last feature film, To Love a Māori (1972), returned to an examination of Māori-Pākehā race-relations in New Zealand society and broke the last cinematic taboo in New Zealand film. Hayward’s early works set the platform in examining the relationship of Māori and Pākehā in a nationalised race-relations narrative in film.

Most of Hayward’s cinematic creations were produced on a “shoe-string” budget which has given impetus to Hayward’s legendary status as a director. When writing of Hayward, Robert Sklar (1971, p.147) states “The average film fan is probably aware of the difficulties these men faced in the Hollywood system, but none of them had to overcome, as Rudall Hayward did, the lack of funds, of equipment and of a professional community”. In this fashion, Hayward the director was himself a “pioneer” and the flaws in his early works have generally been viewed in a sympathetic light (see New Zealand Film Archive 2000; The Hayward Historical Trust Incorporated 1990; Martin and Edwards 1997; Perkins 2001). Arguably, this is due to Hayward having devoted most of his career to presenting New Zealand-oriented films which explored the Māori-Pākehā relationship on screen with little financial backing and support. There have been criticisms of the codes embedded in Rewi’s Last Stand, such as the “noble savage”, the portrayal of women as “objects”, the melodramatic nature of the film and the stilted or “hammy” acting of the players on screen (Edwards 1989). The work itself, however, stands in a favourable light, especially when compared to other accounts of the time.
Rewi’s Last Stand (1925/194): national mythmaking

There are two versions of Rewi’s Last Stand: the first silent film was made in 1925, and the 1940 version was remade with sound. The 1940 version is the most well known account of Rewi’s Last Stand and has become a seminal work in New Zealand film for its historical value and subject matter. Rewi’s Last Stand is one of the oldest historical accounts of “our stories” through the visual form. Although other films, such as The Birth of New Zealand, would precede Rewi’s Last Stand, Hayward’s work would be deemed seminal insofar as it focused on Māori as real subjects in the 1930s. Hayward himself had been involved with The Birth of New Zealand, which gave accounts of key national moments, such as Captain Cook’s “discovery” of New Zealand, the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi and the first “Māori” War. The title of The Birth of New Zealand suggests a link between the controversial film made by the “father of American films”, D.W. Griffith entitled Birth of a Nation (1915) (Blythe 1994, p.37; Drew 1986).

Rewi’s Last Stand was considered to be of national importance which is evident in the comments made at the opening in Wellington by the British Documentary Filmmaker, John Grierson. Grierson proclaimed it to be more “… important that New Zealanders should have produced that film, than that they should see a hundred films from Hollywood … a nation had expressed itself” (The Hayward Historical Trust Incorporated 1990 p.16). Upon release in 1940 Rewi’s Last Stand however, would struggle to find an audience. Commentators have drawn the link between the lack of connection by an audience with the film and its release in wartime New Zealand in 1940 (Blythe 1994, p.31). This factor needs consideration, however, as Griffith’s work was released to American audiences in wartime and was a box-office success. In 1948 the film was severely edited in London to fulfil the quota requirements. Originally the work was 9000 feet long (35mm), but reduced to 6000 feet and is now the only copy left of the film (The Hayward Historical Trust Incorporated 1990, p.15).

Rewi’s Last Stand has been described as New Zealand’s first epic feature film (Martin and Edwards 1997), and it was made in the genre of the American Frontier. Within this genre, historical epics of this time such as Rewi’s Last Stand and The Birth of New Zealand (1921) were presented, as James Cowan (1983) claimed, of “… lives on the border”, and invariably lived “on the edge of romance between the two races … always on the skirts of settlement”.

(Edwards 1989). Rewi’s Last Stand has become popular as a cinematic record with successive generations because of its historical value as an early New Zealand film.
These types of films fall into the melodramatic and historical tropes which were crucial in constructing accounts of the birth of the nation.\textsuperscript{226}

Both versions of \textit{Rewi’s Last Stand} are indebted to the historian James Cowan and his account of the invasion of the Waikato by the British during the land wars of the 1860s (Cowan 1983, Reprint of edition first published 1922-23 edn). Cowan was a significant figure in New Zealand, where his writings influenced the way in which New Zealanders perceived their history. As an historian, Cowan is viewed as more sympathetic in his attitudes toward Māori than that of most of his contemporaries. Similar to a number of writers, Cowan had a reputation for romanticising early Māori life and traditions, as well as the settler history of New Zealand.\textsuperscript{227} Much of Cowan’s earlier writing about the frontier contains implicit assumptions about the “decline” of Māori society in the face of superior settlers.\textsuperscript{228} As Bruce Babington (2007, p.57) notes, Hayward shared Cowan’s “official mythology” of building a “chivalrous past for the new nation [and] the celebration of burgeoning national identity through the distinctiveness of Māori material, the invocation of pioneer destiny crossed with ambivalent admiration for the supposedly disappearing Māori ...”.

The sentimental limitations of Hayward and Cowan’s views would be noted by Michael King (1983, p.518), but upgraded for more contemporary views of national qualities of the “good hearted, practical, commonsensical and tolerant” pioneer in King’s \textit{The Penguin History of New Zealand} (2004). While it is widely held that Hayward and Cowan were national mythmakers, it is as Bruce Babington, highlights an ongoing process. It is argued that particular views of history have served “a contemporary function” and influenced the nationalised narrative of New Zealand, albeit in ways that fit with the social mores and values of the times in which the works took shape.

In this fashion, \textit{Rewi’s Last Stand} provides an interesting example of the intersection between history and art as they relate to the construction of a national identity for New Zealand in the 1920s and 1940s. James Cowan was particularly interested in the development of a popular culture in New Zealand because he considered it was in this genre that “patriotism flourished”. In Cowan’s view, films provided a useful vehicle in portraying “New Zealand stories” on screen in order to foster patriotism and an essential national identity.
The Battle of Orakau Pa: Rewi Maniapoto’s “last stand”

Both the 1925 silent version and the 1940 account of Rewi’s Last Stand draw on similar themes, such as the significant historical event of the Battle of Orakau Pa (1864) in the Waikato. Orakau Pa or “Rewi Maniapoto’s last stand” was the last major conflict between Māori and Pākehā in the 19th Century with regard to Māori independence and land. Although James Belich argues that the resistance of Rua Kenana was the “last shot fired” in the New Zealand wars, the last major war in the 19th Century between Māori and colonial soldiers was the battle for the Waikato (The New Zealand Wars 1988). In relation to the settler-pioneer theme in films from this period, the setting at the time of the Waikato war is important because it is here where the battle for power between Māori and the Settler-Government was finally settled.

In both versions of Rewi’s Last Stand, Hayward sought to weave a film around a fictionalised love story situated against the backdrop of war in the Waikato. In the 1925 version the love-story is oriented from the point of view of two English settlers, Ken Gordon and Cecily. The first silent version of Rewi’s Last Stand initially focused on life in Auckland at the time of the Land Wars in the 1860s. In the 1940 version, the film falls into the historical romance allegory that uses inter-racial love affairs as a fulcrum for race-relations (Babington 2007, p.158), referencing Martin Blythe’s description of the “national dilemma”. Rewi’s Last Stand (1940) is based around the inter-ethnic love affair of Bob Beaumont and Ariana (a “half-caste” Māori woman). The fictional characters in each version of the film fulfil the role of participants and observers of the events, which provided the audience a bridge over which to engage at the human-encounter level with the film.

The silent first version of Rewi’s Last Stand falls into the category of frontier films more easily than the second version because it is a narrative constructed through the eyes of settlers in establishing a place in New Zealand. The original film was 8000 feet of celluloid and unfortunately only limited sections remain today because the surviving footage is heavily decomposed. Of the sections remaining, the New Zealand Film Archive holds footage showing Ken Gordon’s enlistment, the Farewell Ball for the 40th Regiment, Takiri and the village at Wairaka, Rewi Maniapoto addressing his people, and various battle scenes. As little remains of the original footage of Rewi’s Last Stand, the main evidence of differences between the 1925 and 1940 films has to be drawn from the synopsis of the original film, which has survived in the film archives.
Rewi’s Last Stand (1925) Synopsis

This synopsis is drawn from the New Zealand Film Archive:

The winter of 1863 found the settlement of Auckland in constant fear of being wiped out by hordes of Māori rebels from the King Country. Sir George Grey, England’s Pro-Consul, has been sent out to handle the Colony’s momentous problems. Dr Wake, an Auckland surgeon, and his daughter, Cecily, meet a young Englishman named Kenneth Gordon, newly arrived from England, and the two young people became fast friends. When the Waikato war assumes large proportions, Gordon, ever thirsting for adventure, joins Von Tempsky’s Corps of Forest Rangers. At a farewell ball, given in honour of the departure of the 40th Regiment for the front, Gordon is drawn into a quarrel by one Colonel Greig, a dissolute Army Officer, who is a rival for Miss Cecily’s hand. Greig has certain knowledge pertaining to Dr Wake’s past life, and uses it as a lever to press his suit for Miss Cecily’s hand. Ken Gordon leaves for the front without seeing Cecily, and is attached to Colonel Grieg’s division as despatch orderly.

When Gordon strays from camp in order to meet Von Temsky and McDonnell, who have gone out to spy on Paparata Pa, Greig has the boy posted as a deserter. In his wanderings through the bush, Gordon rescues Takiri, a Māori maiden of high birth, who has leapt into a torrent in order to prove her bravery. Gordon and Takiri, the Māori maiden, are captured by a war party and taken to Wairaka, in the heart of the Māori country. He is kept prisoner by the Māoris, and is told he will be killed if he attempts to escape, but when the war drifts further south and the villages are emptied of their men, Gordon watches for an opportunity. He is planning to escape when Takiri informs him that her little brother Rangi has strayed from camp, and the two go off in search of the boy. The trail leads through the bush to Kihikihi, where a war party is building the fortifications of the famous Orakau Pa.

At the Pa, Gordon is brought before Rewi Maniapoto, the great chieftain, who, enraged at the Pākehā’s appearance, has him bound up and thrown into a rua (dugout) to prevent the boy from escaping with information to British lines. For three days the battle rages, and when finally the Māoris make their glorious dash for freedom, Gordon is liberated and endeavours, with Takiri, to regain the British lines, but Takiri is shot and dies in Gordon’s arms. He buries her in the bush, and is endeavouring to reach the British camp at Te Awamutu when he is discovered by a picket of Māori horsemen, who pursue the fugitive. He finally evades them and reaches Te Awamutu camp, where is placed under guard for deserting to the enemy,
but the intervention of Von Tempsky and the evidence of a Māori prisoner save him, and he is reunited with Cecily.

**The re-making of Rewi’s Last Stand (1940)**

Hayward’s rationale for remaking *Rewi’s Last Stand* (1940) was to portray New Zealand’s history accurately on screen. The two versions of the film, however, differ markedly in plot, theme and tone, and as such, the second version is not so much a “remake” as a “re-do”. The issue of authenticity was a factor Hayward had faced some criticism regarding *The Te Kooti Trail* (1927), where his portrayals of Ringatu followers had become embroiled in controversy. When faced with the challenge of accuracy and authenticity by Ringatu followers, Hayward had responded, that he had not used anything that was not based upon “historical fact”. Hayward was supported by the Christchurch Star (1927) which admonished in its editorial:

> … the censor is not responsible for historical accuracy, and even if he were it might be inadvisable to go to the Māori race for an opinion on the Māori war that could be placed in better perspective by the white settlers and their descendants.

Perhaps the most revealing statement in relation to the intersection between history, authenticity and popular culture was made by Hayward himself. In the face of censure from Ringatu followers, Hayward (quoted in The Sun 1927) drew parallels with the situation of Native Americans and Māori by asking “what would have been the position in America if the Government had forbidden the taking of Indian pictures, which have been the mainstay of their industry, as Māori pictures are to New Zealand”. Hayward’s comments suggest the perpetuation of myths were acceptable when presented in the cinematic form.

What is problematic, however, is when popular culture such as *Rewi’s Last Stand* is presented as “history” under the auspices of authenticity. Hayward, however, may have been one of the first filmmakers in New Zealand to present “history” in this fashion, but he would not be the last. The selected historical accounts on which Hayward based both versions of *Rewi’s Last Stand*, focused on establishing settler history by reinforcing the superiority of Britain over Māori as a noble, but defeated foe. As discussed in the body of the chapter on *Rewi’s Last Stand*, events resulting from Orakau Pa were far from settled. At the time the first version of *Rewi’s Last Stand* was in production, descendents of Rewi Maniapoto were still resisting incorporation into the national framework, as a result of events at the Battle of Orakau Pa.
Rewi’s Last Stand (1940) Synopsis

Rewi’s Last Stand (1940) was produced and distributed by Frontier Films and the Te Awamutu Historical Society. The synopsis of the 1940 version of Rewi’s Last Stand is drawn from the original promotional material of the film and is as follows:

The story begins in April, 1863. As the local Māori people watch, the Reverend Morgan and his family pack their belongings to leave Te Awamutu and travel to Auckland. The heroine, Ariana, is part of the family, and she is going with them. Their friend, a young trader, Bob Beaumont, tells Mr Morgan that the Maniapoto are keeping all children of Māori descent. We learn that Ariana’s mother was Maniapoto, her father a schooner captain.

Ariana is rolled in a mat and put on the back of the cart. At the place where the family sets up camp, we become aware of a romantic attachment between Bob and Ariana. They walk by the river, and are attacked by Māori warriors. Bob has a taiaha fight with Tama Te Heuheu, and is defeated. Ariana is captured.

Bob rides to Auckland. Governor Grey suggests that Bob join the Forest Rangers. Bob arrives at camp, and Corporal Ben Horton gives him an idea of life with the bush fighters. Ben has traded at Kawhia. Bob finds that Ben has a coin similar to the one Ariana wears around her neck.

Bob is sent as a dispatch rider to the Maniapoto and Ngati Awa. He skirmishes with Māori patrols, but rides through. The people of a Māori village on the Waikato River are making preparations for battle. Ariana joins in the communal life with singing and games. Bob manages to talk to Ariana. They are chased down the river by warriors in a war canoe, but escape. Ariana decides to remain with her people.

The Challenge Fortress is built. We see the earthworks being dug. British troops, including the Forest Rangers, attack the Fortress. Bob Beaumont and Ben Horton are among the attackers. Ariana is inside the fort with the defenders. Rewi Maniapoto directs the defence. One of the Māori warriors creeps through the British lines to get water. Bob and Ben see him, but let him through. Bob recognises him as Tama Te Heuheu, his Taiaha opponent.

The Māori defenders are asked to surrender, but Rewi Maniapoto replies: “Friend, I shall fight on against you. Āke, Āke, Āke”. They are then asked to send out the women and children, but one of the women answers, “If the men are do die, the women and children must die also”. The Fortress is stormed. A group of Māori defenders runs through the fog.
Soldiers give chase on horse-back. Tama Te Heuheu fights a rear-guard action to protect Ariana. He is killed.

Ariana is wounded and lies in the bush near the river. Bob and Ben find her. They look at her wound and shake their heads. Ariana’s and Ben’s coins match. He is her father. Ariana is happy to have found her father” (The Hayward Historical Film Trust Incorporated 1990 pp.8-12). The film ends with the death of Ariana attended by Bob Beaumont and her father, Ben Horton.

**Cast**

Ariana Ramai Te Miha

Robert (Bob) Beaumont Leo Pilcher

Rewi Maniapoto Rauriti Te Huia

Tama Te Heuheu Henare Toka

Ben Horton Stanley Knight

Brigadier General Carey John Gordon

Sir George Grey A.J.C. Fisher

General Cameron Colonel J.D. Swan

Rev. John Morgan Selwyn Wood

Mrs Morgan Phoebe Clarke

The Morgans’ Daughters The Miss Potts (Twins)
Film case study 2: John O’Shea and Broken Barrier (1952)

The film *Broken Barrier* was produced by the filmmaker John O’Shea (1920-2001) in 1952. O’Shea was a key figure in New Zealand filmmaking with a career which spanned 50 years. He mentored some of New Zealand’s most well-known talent in the film industry, including Merata Mita, Barry Barclay, Gaylene Preston, Jane Campion and Sam Neill. John O’Shea was one of the founding members of Pacific Films in 1950 and was active in the establishment of the Wellington Film Society, the New Zealand Film Commission, and Film Archive. He has also been credited with “almost single-handedly” keeping the notion of independent filmmaking alive in New Zealand until the establishment of the Film Commission (Barclay, Dennis, Preston, and Williams 2002). From 1940 to 1970, only three local made New Zealand films were produced: *Broken Barrier* (1952), *Runaway* (1964) and *Don’t Let it Get You*, (1966). Jonathan Dempsey O’Shea directed all three.

Similarly to Rudall Hayward, O’Shea’s ability to make films on a shoestring budget was renowned, which meant that in comparison to overseas productions, the quality of locally-produced films could be regarded as basic. Up until the late 1960s, New Zealand films were still shot using non-synched sound cameras, which necessitated a sound dubbing session later on (Martin and Edwards 1997, p.52). O’Shea and Pacific Films supported their creative endeavours by producing newsreels, commercials, training films, sponsored and industrial films, sport and road safety pictures, and documentaries. Due to the lack of an actual film-training school, Pacific Films served as a training ground for those in the industry, which included some of the most significant artists in New Zealand (Barclay, Dennis, Preston, and Williams 2002). The influence and commitment of John O’Shea to New Zealand filmmaking and the arts cannot be overstated.

O’Shea was committed to New Zealand filmmaking and also exploring what he believed to be the essential drama of the country: the relationship between Māori and Pākehā. The influence of American culture in the 1950s and the international focus on New Zealand from abroad which did not recognise contemporary New Zealand society, were issues that motivated John O’Shea in developing a local industry. The comments made by George Bernard Shaw in his visit to New Zealand in 1934 had a lasting impact upon John O’Shea. Shaw recommended the creation of a local film industry or, he warned “you will lose your souls without even getting American ones” (cited in Barclay, Dennis, Preston, and Williams 2002). In O’Shea’s view, without a local film industry containing drama and feature films,
the country would lose its own sense of identity and existence. Therefore, it is fitting that *Broken Barrier*, the first New Zealand film to feature the contemporary situation of Māori and the subject of racial discrimination, was made by John O’Shea.

The film critic Gordon Mirams illustrates the tensions between the local and international depiction of New Zealand, especially in the development of national identity. In 1945 Mirams claimed that if there was such a thing as “New Zealand culture” it was “to a large extent the creation of Hollywood” (Mirams 1945). Mirams’ claims were prompted in part by the lack of local content in the cinema produced by New Zealand. If ‘New Zealand culture’ was, however, as Mirams states “a Hollywood creation”, it was one largely rejected by cinema-going New Zealanders, as James Cowan attested to. While New Zealanders were preoccupied with Hollywood creations, films featuring New Zealand material were largely ignored or even derided (Phillips 1996, p.229).

There can be no dispute, however, about the lack of local content produced at home for New Zealand audiences. Although New Zealanders were frequent consumers of films from 1940 to 1970, only three local productions were made as discussed above (Dennis and Bieringa (eds) 1992, p.222). This is not to say however, that New Zealand did not feature in films in the international context or was not used as a setting for “star vehicles”. Films, such as *Green Dolphin Street* (1947), for example, were set in New Zealand and used local iconography, such as Māori warriors. These films, however, were very much the production of Hollywood and *Green Dolphin Street*, for example, was filmed on location in a production stage at MGM Studios.

The international interest in New Zealand, whereby the country was used as a remote and exotic setting for filmmakers, engendered a dichotomy between the global and local depiction of the nation. It is suggested that the depiction of New Zealand in 19th-century stasis or as a backdrop in Hollywood productions is a code embedded in *Broken Barrier*. This factor is best illustrated in the publicity material for *Broken Barrier*, which declared: “MAKE NO MISTAKE, *Broken Barrier* IS NOT a documentary – a featurette – or a Tourist Travelogue” (Dennis and Bieringa (eds) 1992, p.222). Unfortunately, the cinematic shots of the landscape in New Zealand blurred the claim by the publicists for the distinction from the tourist features (Dennis and Bieringa (eds) 1992, p.206). In fact, the cinematic shots reinforced the tourist image of New Zealand.
Broken Barrier is, however, a seminal work in that the subject of racial discrimination in New Zealand society had not been depicted on screen and the issue was constrained within the ideal of harmony between the “races”. Whereas Rewi’s Last Stand (1940) focussed on the promise of progress through unity and amalgamation, Broken Barrier examines the underbelly of racism in 1950s New Zealand. It is suggested that Broken Barrier is a response to issues arising in the social context of New Zealand in the 1950s. Films such as Rewi’s Last Stand (1940) continued to portray Māori in a 19th century stasis. As John O’Shea (O’Shea 1996, in Dennis and Bieringa, pp.16-17), the director of Broken Barrier, wrote:

In the 1920s and the 1930s, Rudall Hayward set a tone of benevolent paternalism in his dramatic films about the Pākehā settler and loyal soldier fighting the brave and often chivalrous Māori. The Te Kooti Trail and Rewi’s Last Stand were noble, clear-cut and sympathetic glimpses of pioneer times with characters and events viewed through a Pākehā prism. The post-War Broken Barrier was clearly less sympathetic towards the Pākehā, taxing him with bigotry and intolerance, while portraying its Māori characters with respect and some understanding.

In another social context, when biculturalism superseded assimilation-integration as official State policy in how to construct race-relations, John O’Shea would apologise for the sentiments contained within Broken Barrier. O’Shea (1999, p.65) described the film as “…warmed by the dying embers of a sentiment that saw Māoris as “noble savages”, and of its “idyllic but not very convincing ending” where Tom and Rawi return to New Zealand’s heartland in an attempt to escape the racial discrimination they encounter in the city (Babington 2007, p.90).

**Synopsis: Broken Barrier (1952)**

This synopsis is drawn from Helen Martin and Sam Edwards’ text, *New Zealand Film: 1912-1996*, 1997 and the New Zealand Film Commission’s catalogue.

Broken Barrier is the story of Tom Sullivan, a cynical freelance journalist, and Rawi, the Māori woman he meets and falls in love with. While writing a series of articles on Māori life in the rugged North Island country of New Zealand, Tom is befriended by a Māori family who offer him a job on their farm, where he falls in love with their daughter, Rawi. Her parents oppose the relationship, and he starts to discover the differences in the two cultures.
Finally, a quarrel results and Rawi returns to the city to continue her career as a nurse. Their romance resumes when Tom follows her there; however, his family and friends raise a barrier against her. The racial discrimination, coupled with Tom’s unflattering articles about Māori, once again drives them apart.

Tom goes off to the timber country, and in a stirring climax is saved from a raging forest fire by the sacrifice of a Māori friend. Tom is reconciled with Rawi and in their marriage is seen the hope of better understanding between the races.

**Cast**

Rawi  Kay Ngarimu  
Tom  Terence Bayler  
With: Mira Hape, Bill Merito, George Ormond, Lily Te Nahu, Dorothy Tansley, F.W. French.
Film case study 3: Rudall Hayward, To Love a Maori (1972)

To Love a Maori was the made by the director Rudall Hayward in 1972 and produced by Rudall and Ramai Hayward Film Productions, the company owned by Hayward and his wife, Ramai. To Love a Māori is often credited as New Zealand’s first feature film to be made in colour (Martin and Edwards 1997; O’Shea 1996). To Love a Maori was the last feature film to be made by Rudall Hayward in a career which spanned half a century. Rudall Hayward died in 1974 while promoting To Love a Maori (Martin and Edwards 1997, p.56).

It is fitting that Hayward’s last film, To Love a Maori, was a call to “stir our national conscience” on the issue of race-relations and racial prejudice (NZ Film Archive, F14678). The subject of race-relations was important to the Haywards, which is borne out in this film. Primarily, the Haywards were concerned with the position of Māori youth in New Zealand society. In Ramai Hayward’s view, the New Zealand Government had a responsibility to teach Māori language and culture to Māori children in schools. The Haywards were interested in education and had made a number of educational documentaries during the course of their careers (Sklar 1971, pp.147-154). As is discussed in the chapter on To Love a Maori, there is an element of the directors using film to play an “educators” role to the New Zealand public on race-relations.

Although the film is a fictionalised encounter-narrative set in 1960s New Zealand, it is also described as a “dramatic documentary” in the opening sequence of the film. Similarly to Rewi’s Last Stand, there is a blurring of fiction and reality in To Love a Maori, where Hayward is presenting the film as an authentic account of New Zealand’s race-relations in the 1960s and 1970s. In his review, Geoffrey Webster (1972) writes that the film had the “bright ring of truth” regarding social problems and race-relations. The notion of authenticity has been a key thematic in cinematic accounts based on Māori and Pākehā interactions, but ultimately, To Love a Maori is a fictionalised encounter narrative that strives for social realism.

There is an explicit “propagandist” code in To Love a Maori, which is evident in the promotional material about the film and which is reflected in Webster’s (1972) film review:

> Fundamentally, it is a movie with a message. Its propagandist purpose, within the context of a simple love story, is never disguised. Indeed, the emphasis on a substantial element of hypocrisy and smug self-deceit in the familiar assertion that New Zealand is almost wholly without racial prejudice, could be criticised as
overdone. Mr Hayward has set out to stir our national conscience.

(Webster 9 February 1972; NZ Film Archive Reference No: F14678).

It is argued that the interactions between Māori and Pākehā on screen have been primarily “propagandist”, but unlike other directors, Hayward was explicit about his objectives. The “propaganda” in such inter-ethnic films, however, has been multi-faceted in that not only was it to stir the “national conscience” of mainstream New Zealand society, but also to give strong directives to the Māori population to remain inside the national framework.

*To Love a Maori* is the first New Zealand cinematic record to depict an inter-ethnic love affair between a Māori man and European woman, which was one of the last social taboos to be broken in New Zealand film. The breaking of the last social taboo reflects the influences of the cross-currents of the 1960s, when social mores between generations were being challenged. In this regard, *To Love a Maori* is a seminal work and subversive in the way it examines the nexus between race-relations and changing ideas about national identity. That is, the film challenges racial discrimination by highlighting attitudes in New Zealand society, but also urges the maintenance of national harmony.

**Synopsis: To Love a Maori (1972)**

This synopsis is drawn from Helen Martin and Sam Edward’s *New Zealand Film, 1912-1996* (1997, p.56):

*Tama, a bright and capable school leaver from a rural settlement, decides to leave home and head for the city, Auckland, where he will qualify as a mechanic by attending the technical institute for trade training. He is accompanied by Riki [his brother], who has difficulty at school and is not felt to be ready for city life. The boys stay with relatives in the city and while Tama does well and falls in love with a Pākehā girl, Penny, Riki is attracted by the flash clothes and the decadent lifestyle of Fancy. The story of Tama’s success is dramatically enlivened by the gradual change in Penny’s parents’ opposition to their friendship, while Riki increasingly flirts with crime until he realises the error of his ways and joins the army.*

**Cast**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Actor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tama</td>
<td>Val Irwin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penny</td>
<td>Marie Searell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Davis</td>
<td>Desmond Lock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Davis</td>
<td>Sybil Lock aka Sybil Westland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deidre</td>
<td>Pam Ferris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fancy</td>
<td>Robin Peel Walker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Muru</td>
<td>Toby Curtis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs Muru</td>
<td>Olive Pompallier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raki/Riki</td>
<td>Rau Hotere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tina</td>
<td>Connie Rota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matangi</td>
<td>Matangi Kingi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butch</td>
<td>Peter Sharp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Lukers</td>
<td>Vincent Sharp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Thompson</td>
<td>Tom Newnham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tama’s Aunty</td>
<td>Ramai Hayward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hinerangi</td>
<td>Hinerangi Deller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td>Harold Kissin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglar</td>
<td>Tony Blackett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglar</td>
<td>Tairongo Amoamo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanic</td>
<td>Courteney Bradley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barber</td>
<td>Phil Shone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori Girl</td>
<td>Helen Hart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardener</td>
<td>Peter Benson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Film case study 4: Geoff Murphy and Utu (1983)

Utu was directed by Geoff Murphy and produced by Utu Productions in 1983. Murphy had come to prominence in New Zealand with his films Wildman (1977), Dagg Day Afternoon (1977) and Goodbye Pork Pie (1981). Goodbye Pork Pie had been a hugely significant popular and commercial success in New Zealand, taking $1.5 million at the box-office, which was comparable to the local takings for Hollywood blockbusters such as Star Wars or Jaws (Murphy 1992). Utu followed on from Murphy’s success with Goodbye Pork Pie at a time when there was a proliferation of New Zealand films, documentaries and television series (driven partly by changes in tax law). Through the lobbying of John O’Shea, the New Zealand Film Commission was established in 1978. The NZFC provided Government support of New Zealand’s films and some of the notable New Zealand works produced in the 1970s and 1980s were: Skin Deep (1978); Sons for the Return Home (1979); Pictures (1981); Goodbye Pork Pie, (1981), Smash Palace (1981), Among the Cinders (1984), Leave All Fair (1985), The Quiet Earth (1985), Ngati (1987) and Mauri (1988). Considering that only three films had been made in the period 1940 to 1970, the above production of works was a significant achievement in the history of the New Zealand film industry. Geoff Murphy was the partner of Merata Mita, the latter an accomplished director in her own right. Mita was a consultant for Utu and played the part of Matu. Geoff Murphy continues to make films both nationally and internationally. His most recent contribution was the film Spooked (2004), which was based upon Ian Wishart’s best-selling novel, The Paradise Conspiracy (1995).

Utu has been invariably described as a “Western” and an epic. The New York Times reviewer, Lawrence Van Gelder (1984) wrote that “Utu is suffused with respect for Māori customs and with regret for the excesses of colonists and Māori alike that elevate it beyond conventional adventure into a sort of lament played against a landscape of almost paradisiacal beauty”. As will be discussed in the chapter, Utu is a re-examination of New Zealand’s race-relations at a time when the subject was fraught with tension. It is fitting that Van Gelder references the landscape because it is argued that this is one of the key thematics in the work, where Murphy was highlighting the “landscape” and challenging the cultural-nationalist myths of a civilized settlement upon it. In this fashion, Murphy references Hayward’s earlier work, Rewi’s Last Stand (1925/194) and gives a 1980s interpretation of the same.

This synopsis is drawn from Helen Martin and Sam Edward’s New Zealand Film 1912–1996, (1997, p.87):
New Zealand 1870. When troops sack his village, Māori militia scout Te Wheke deserts the British-led colonial army, has his face tattooed in full moko and vows revenge (utu). After beheading a fanatical minister he attacks a farm reading Macbeth while his men loot the house. When his wife is killed Williamson, the owner, vows revenge. Lieutenant Scott and army scout Wiremu plan to wage guerrilla warfare against Te Wheke, against the better judgement of the corrupt British colonel, Elliot. Scott falls for Kura, a young Māori woman spying for Te Wheke. In the ensuing stalking and shoot-outs Te Wheke and Williamson become increasingly fanatical. The showdown comes when, camped at a one-horse town, the army is attacked by Te Wheke’s followers using an ambushed supply wagon as a Trojan horse and creeping up on the soldiers disguised as bushes. Te Wheke murders Kura, blaming her for the army’s advance warning. He is caught, summarily sentenced to death by Scott. Scott and Kura’s Aunty Matu all offer to carry out the execution. Saying they are unfit because they all seek utu, Wiremu reveals that Te Wheke is his brother and carries out the execution himself, shooting Te Wheke in the head.

**Cast**

Te Wheke             Anzac Wallace
Williamson           Bruno Lawrence
Wiremu               Wi Kuki Kaa
Lieutenant Scott     Kelly Johnston
Colonel Elliot       Tim Elliot
Matu                 Merata Mita
Kura                 Tania Bristowe
Vicar                Martyn Sanderson
Belcher              John Bach
Emily                Ilona Rodgers
Henare               Faenza Reuben
Te Wheke’s people   Te Whetu Ote Rawhiti Māori Club
Church Crowd         People of Waipatu Marae
Villagers and Waiata mourners People of Te Haroto Marae
Militia              Hawkes Bay Black Power Club
Film case study 5 – Barry Barclay and Ngati (1987)

The film Ngati was made in 1987 by director, Barry Barclay (1944-2008) and produced by John O’Shea’s Pacific Films. Barry Barclay was the first Māori to direct a feature film in New Zealand and also credited as the first indigenous person to direct on indigenous subject matter (Tuckett 2008). Barclay had been instrumental in the landmark Tangata Whenua series (1974) and had worked in conjunction with John O’Shea and the historian, Michael King, in bringing the programmes to air. The Tangata Whenua series was the first examination of Māori culture, political and social issues on television and “for many New Zealanders it would be the first time Māori were seen on television in non-comedic roles, talking about themselves and their lives” (The Dominion Post 2008). Barclay’s work would include: The Town that Lost a Miracle (1972); Tangata Whenua (1974); Indira Gandhi (1975); Hunting Horns (1975); Autumn Fires (1975); Ashes (1975); Aku Mahi Whatu Māori (My Art of Māori Weaving) (1977); The Neglected Miracle (1985); Ngati (1987); Te Rua (1991); The Feathers of Peace (2000); and The Kaipara Affair (2003). On its opening night in 2002, Māori Television screened Ngati as a tribute to Barclay to highlight the director/writer’s contribution to Māori and filmmaking.

Barclay had made connections in the late 1960s with Māori protest groups such as Ngā Tamatao which became an awakening in terms of political activism (Murray 2007, p.89). The director viewed film as a place where the filmmaker’s vision was absolute and that “everything was in the service of film, and that the film (and its makers) served only truth” (Tuckett 2008). Barclay was described as a “lobbyist and a champion of have-nots” (The Dominion Post 2008) and his views containing a mix of: righteous anger and uncontradicted Marxism and spirituality” (Tuckett 2008). Similarly to Merata Mita, Barry Barclay sought to tell Māori stories from Māori points of views and to be understood as narratives in their own terms.

Ngati is based upon the childhood experiences of Barry Barclay and set in 1948 on the East Coast of New Zealand (Dennis and Bieringa 1996). To Barclay (quoted in Rongotai 1987, pp.2-4) producing Ngati was a political act which was evidenced in his comments about the film:

It’s about being Māori - and that is political [...] political in the way it was made, a serious attempt to have Māori attitudes control the film. Political in having as many Māori as possible on it or being trained on it. Political in physically distributing the
film or speaking about it and showing the film in our own way. Political in going in the face of a long tradition in the film industry here and abroad saying these simple things, without car chases or without a rape scene, actually have appeal, maybe it won’t work... I think a lot of the political struggle is to get through to pakehas and Pākehā institutions that this is the way we think, therefore change your manners. This is the Māori world, take it or leave it...

The screenplay of Ngati was written by Tama Te Kapua Poata, who was a member of Ngā Tamatoa and instrumental in the planning of the Land March in 1975. Poata was involved in Te Hokioi and the Māori Organisation on Human Rights (“MOOHR”) that would play crucial roles in the protest movements in the 1970s, 1980s and in particular, the Springbok Tour of 1981 (Poata-Smith 1996, pp.97-116; 2001; NZ on Screen No 2010). Poata would go onto found Te Hokioi Film and Publishing Company in 1978 in keeping with the newsletter of the 19th and 20th Century which he had resurrected. Tama Poata is often credited with coining the title of Halt all Racist Tours or “HART”. In 1978, Poata was described by Prime Minister, Rob Muldoon at a National Party Conference in Wellington, as the “country’s leading Māori communist” (NZ on Screen No 2010). Poata had, in fact, been expelled from the Communist Party in 1968 (Kitchen 2001). In 1981 Muldoon would accuse Poata of “treasonable activity” in relation to the Springbok Tour. Poata sued in the wake of such an accusation and the comments were withdrawn (Kitchen 2001).

Similarly to Mauri, there is a clear intersection between the arts and the political and social world. Eva Rickard, who was instrumental in the Raglan Golf course occupation and a key figure in the Māori protest movements, played the role of Kara in Mauri. Tama Poata would direct the documentary Nga Kara Me Nga Iwi (The Flags and the People) that focussed on Raglan’s past and present (NZ on Screen No 2010). Tama Poata’s involvement with Ngati gave the film an added dimension in that he was a significant figure in the broader Māori protest movements. Poata played a pivotal role in defending the 17 people who were arrested at Raglan for occupying Māori land. Poata would also initiate Claim Wai 262, which is based upon Māori intellectual property and still awaits a recommendation through the Waitangi Tribunal. Tama Te Kapua Poata died in 2005 and has been described as “one of our quiet revolutionaries who changed our world for the better, in so many different ways” (Turia 2005).
The term “ngāti” translates to the prefix of a tribal grouping, but it is important to note that the concept has deeper connotations in te reo Māori. In Gosden’s (1987) review of the film, the film is described as follows:

*Ngati is set in the tiny community of Kapua on the East Cape, in 1948. Change is in the air: truckies threaten to displace drovers and the old freezing works, the district’s main employer is clearly on the brink of closure. The town’s concern is equally focussed on Ropata, the twelve-year-old-son of Iwi and Hine whose illness neither Māori nor European medicine will cure. Meanwhile long-time Pākehā residents, the doctor, his wife and their daughter, the school teacher, are hosting Greg, the visiting son of a former town doctor who now lives in Australia. The film is framed by Greg’s arrival and departure. As he is guided through the district, so to some extent are we. Tama Poata’s screenplay provides a comprehensive portrait of a community and is especially rich in its myriad of the possible relationships between Māori ways and Pākehā. Both script and direction de-emphasise the personal or the melodramatic flavour of a vital sense of communal inter-connection. (In which regard it’s worth nothing that this first predominantly Māori feature contains better parts for women that any other man-made New Zealand film I can think of). Despite its apparently gentle surface, Ngati registers with considerable emotional depth. And as the first local film since Patu! to engage with contemporary political issues, it packs quite a wallop. Actors Wi Kuki Kaa and Connie Pewhairangi together find the conviction, the bite and the power to deliver the film’s eloquent manifesto for Māori self-determination*."

**Cast**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Character</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wi Kuki Kaa</td>
<td>Iwi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross Girven</td>
<td>Greg Shaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy McIntosh</td>
<td>Jenny Bennett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuta Ngarimu Tamati</td>
<td>Uncle Eri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngawai Harrison</td>
<td>Hine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oliver Jones</td>
<td>Ropata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnny Coleman</td>
<td>Drover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry Allen</td>
<td>Headmaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connie Pewhairangi</td>
<td>Sally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Relation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice Fraser</td>
<td>Sam Bennett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman Fletcher</td>
<td>Dr. Paul Bennett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Tibble</td>
<td>Tione</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erica Hovell, Priscilla Hovell</td>
<td>Tione’s Sisters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iranui Haig</td>
<td>Nanny Huia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiri McCorkindale</td>
<td>Sue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luckie Renata</td>
<td>Dike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paki Cherrington</td>
<td>Mac</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Film case study 6: Merata Mita and Mauri (1988)

*Mauri* was made in 1988 by the director Merata Mita (1942-2010) and produced by Awatea Productions. Merata Mita was the first woman to solely direct a feature film in New Zealand. Ramai Hayward had co-produced *To Love a Maori* (1972) with her husband, Rudall Hayward. O’Shea (1996, pp.18-19) credits both Hayward and Mita for the bicultural themes contained in their respective partners’ films, *To Love a Maori* (1972) and *Utu* (1983).


Mita used *Mauri* as a training ground giving many young Māori crew members the opportunity to participate in the production of film. *Mauri* would win a best prize at the Rimini Film Festival in Italy, but would garner some negative reviews in New Zealand. This is evidenced in the *Variety* (1989) review which called the film’s focus “confused”. Mita would respond by arguing that many Pākehā reviewers were “not qualified to assess it” and that she had consciously chosen a layered approach in the work as an acknowledgement of the oratory traditions of Māori. Mita (1998, pp.21-26) described this as the way in which “There are differences that Pākehā critics don’t even take into account when they’re analysing the film”.

As well as an extensive television, documentary and filmmaking career, Mita was a consultant on her partner, Geoff Murphy’s film, *Utu* (1983) and played the pivotal role of Matu. Most recently, Mita was a producer in Taika Waititi’s highly successful film *Boy* (2010). In the *Mana Wahine Māori* lecture series (2010), Mita would describe some of the tensions in bringing *Boy* (2010) to the screen. According to Mita (2010) there was opposition to depicting criminal activity and child neglect in the film from inside the Māori community. Mita viewed *Boy* (2010) as Taika “pushing boundaries of culture and modernity” and the director telling his “own truth”.

On 31 May 2010, Merata Mita died suddenly in Auckland, New Zealand. Mita’s last project was *Saving Grace* which was a documentary on child abuse that was intended to form part of Māori Television’s Tamariki Ora series (*New Zealand Herald* 2010). At the time of Mita’s death, the project was not completed. Māori Affairs Minister Pita Sharples (quoted in *New
Zealand Herald 2010) described Mita as a “renowned, actor, director and producer of films” and a person that had broken “nearly every barrier known to Māori women”. Prior to the deaths of Mita and Barry Barclay, the two directors and Tainui Stephens were instrumental in the creation of Te Paepae Ataata to encourage, support and foster Māori film and film makers (Akuhata-Brown 2010, p.5). Mita was passionate about the rights of Māori and indigenous peoples, workers and women. As a tribute to Mita, Ngā Aho Whakaari dedicated their July 2010 newsletter to her and the mana wahine of film, video and television.

Merata Mita made reference to embracing the Treaty as a way of becoming “one nation” and noted the importance of race-relations in films (Mita 1992). Mita’s work has been described as “fuelled by a steely determination in the fight against racism”, as well as a celebration of “Māori culture” (Dennis and Bieringa 1996). The director has been an ardent supporter of indigenising film and instrumental in bringing Māori faces to the screen. Mita sought to tell Māori stories and have the same understood in their own terms without conforming to the pressures of representation in Eurocentric terms, and commerce. As Mita (2010) stated, “the big bogey is how we will be judged by outsiders” and went onto identify structural constraints in production in that quite often “Indigenous movies don’t get distributed because they are not seen as commercially viable”. The importance of narrative and the layers of Māori storytelling made Mita highly critical of Niki Caro’s, adaptation of Whale Rider. In Mita’s view, the director [Caro] could “never understand that story”. Issues of the “control” of Māori stories and “who owned” the same were matters of central importance to Mita who saw her role as there to “facilitate the process” by which “people tell their stories”.

Merata Mita’s work has been, in her own words, a “quest for justice” and a “search for healing” (Mita 2010). Her work has played a crucial role in capturing pivotal moments in New Zealand’s history and raising awareness in some of the key issues in the broader protest movements in the 1970s and 1980s. In a career that exhibited, as Pita Sharples (New Zealand Herald 2010) noted, a “passion for causes – justice, race relations, Māori history and worker’s rights revealed in drama, documentary and biography”. Mauri is part of Merata Mita’s quest for Māori to be treated “fairly and equally” in terms of representation.

Merata Mita’s social justice and political activism is evident in all her works, but the two the most well-known are: Bastion Point: Day 507 (1980) and Patu! (1983). At the time, Mita was employed by the State owned television broadcaster, Television New Zealand and would lose her employment for sympathy toward Māori issues (Mita 1992). Mita’s experiences as a
social justice and political activist for Māori rights would see her come under intense scrutiny by the State. As Joanna Paul (quoted in New Zealand Herald 2010) notes of her first meeting with Mita: “She was working on her film about Takaparawha (Bastion Point) and trying to hide footage from the cop raids [on] her post-production suite all the time”.

Mita would experience a similar level of State scrutiny with her work Patu! which was her seminal work from the protestors’ perspective of the 1981 Springbok Tour. The documentary was made to provide a counter-balance to the “official” version of the Tour. Footage of Patu! had to be sent out of the country due to Police attempts to confiscate the material in order to use images to prosecute protestors. As noted, Mita’s activism came at a personal cost to herself and her whānau. The director bore a level of State interference for her work that no other film-maker in New Zealand has had to endure.

Similarly to Ngati (1987) there is a strong intersection in Mauri between the arts and the political, and social world. The lead character of Kara was played by the significant figure of Eva Rickard who had led the occupation and resistance at the Raglan Golf Course, which in turn had resulted in its return to Tainui. In 1978, Rickard had been arrested for a sit-in protest at Raglan Golf Course, which had been televised to a New Zealand audience courtesy of Barry Barclay and John O’Shea’s team at Pacific Films. Issues resulting from Bastion Point and the Raglan Golf Course would be instrumental in the decades that followed in changing land legislation for Māori. Rickard remained active in politics throughout the 1980s and until her death in 1997.

A significant example of Eva Rickard’s activism was her leading a 2,000 strong hikoi (march) to Waitangi in February 1984, whereby there was a demand for an end to Waitangi Day celebrations until all Treaty grievances had been settled (Walker 1990a). Of particular significance was that the 1984 hikoi brought together for the first time two important historical groups of Māori, namely the Kingitanga and Kotahitanga. In 1995, Rickard would be critical of Tainui’s settlement with the Crown and spoke out at various hui around the country about her concerns with the same. Arguably, Rickard’s involvement in Mauri can be seen as evidence of Mita’s activism as a filmmaker and drawing the link between examining race-relations in New Zealand from a Māori point of view. As Geraldene Peters (2007, p.112) notes: “a veteran Māori cultural leader and land rights activist, the mana accrued by Rickard as a social role model invests the character of Kara with an aura that
reaches beyond the life of the film to the record of her achievements within a “real historical world” …

The term “Mauri” translates to “life force”, but it is important to note that the concept has wider and deeper connotations in te reo Māori. The synopsis of the film (New Zealand film Commission 2010), Mauri is as follows:

MAURI – is the story of a man, Rewi, who reclaims his spirituality. Rewi is haunted by a past, which threatens to engulf his future. However, his relationships with two women set him on the road to redemption. The elder, Kara, he loves as earth mother and spiritual healer. The younger, Ramiri, is a beautiful headstrong woman with whom Rewi shares a volatile sexual attraction and deep painful love, which ends in deprivation and rejection.

The story is set among the colourful characters of a once thriving settlement, Te Mata, upon whom the encroachment by Europeans spells disaster. Now isolated by lack of numbers, time and distance, the remaining survivors form a tight-knit community, which outsiders find impenetrable. Rewi’s deceit forces him to become part of that community and his life in inextricably interwoven with those around him.

Kara, the elder and unacknowledged leader of Te Mata feels the unease in Rewi’s psyche and senses the emotional and spiritual damage he suffers. But like all spiritual healers, she wisely waits his time to unburden himself even though her time is running out.

Throughout all this a little girl, Awatea, watches and wonders. An old man, Hemi occasionally mediates and waits. Willie’s season comes and goes, while the two European men, Mr Semmens and his son Steve who marries Ramiri, hover at the parameters of insanity and sometime acceptance.

MAURI starts with birth, ends with death, and is about life.

CAST

Anzac Wallace, Eva Rickard, James Heyward, Susan D. Ramari Paul, Sonny Waru,
Rangimarie Delamere, Willie Raana, Geoff Murphy, Don Selwyn, Temuera Morrison.
Film case study 7: Lee Tamahori and Once Were Warriors (1994)

Alan Duff - Once Were Warriors (1990)

The film Once were warriors (1994) is based upon Alan Duff’s 1990 novel of the same name. The book was based upon Duff’s own childhood experience and set in the fictional city of “Two Lakes”, which was in actuality Rotorua (Beatson 1991, pp. 19-21; Cox 1993, pp. 19-21; Heim 1998; Kouka and McNaughton 1991, in T Sturm, p.385; MacDonald 1991, pp. 30-32; Taylor 1993, pp. 50-1; Thompson 1994, pp. 398-413). Duff was motivated to write Once were warriors as a response to what he considered the “weepy-weepy” stories of Māori, which was a feature of many works in the 1970s and 1980s (Knudsen 2004; MacDonald 1991, pp. 30-32). In particular, Duff sought to distance himself from the work of Witi Ihimaera, who is the author of Whale Rider, when stating typical modern-day Māori were not “… all like Witi Ihimaera’s [early] characters …” (MacDonald 1991, pp. 30-32). It is suggested that Duff’s motivation in writing Once were warriors (1990) as a response to works such as Whale Rider (1987), should not be underestimated.

Primarily, Duff was writing against particular views that were circulating in the social context of the 1980s through the Treaty settlement process and the establishment of the bicultural two world-view model. It is suggested that the novel is a criticism of both the “politically correct brigade”, which was primarily a sympathetic “Pākehā” audience and Māori cultural nationalist leaders (Harding 2005, p.1). This attitude is best summed up in the novel by a scene in which Beth relates directly to a “Pākehā audience” “But this toughness Pākehā audience of mine, it started to mean less and less as the world got older …” (Duff 1990, pp.47-48).

Duff’s presentation was a different view from inside the Māori population about what issues faced a subset of the group. Duff wrote that he “… knew the book would upset some of the politically correct brigade because they had different reasons for our high crime rate, and everything else” (quoted, in Hereniko 1994, pp. 328-344; Duff 1996, p.8). As Duff (quoted, in Hereniko 1994, pp. 328-344) states “having been there and done that myself, I knew they were just telling absolute lies or else they would be spouting theories that were completely irrelevant to the real situation”. What Duff’s novel presented was a grim account of a subset of Māori society, situated in the social realist genre, which ultimately held Māori accountable
for their contemporary situation. In this fashion, *Once were warriors* is best described as an internal debate, which was played out at the national level of New Zealand society.

Duff’s political views have been the subject of numerous accounts in the affirmative and negative. It is not the intention to engage with Duff’s political views, but to connect the work to its context. The novel was produced in a turbulent period of New Zealand history when the country was undergoing significant reforms both in terms of economics and race-relations. One critic observed that Duff had ignored the subject of Māori sovereignty, which was prominent in the year *Once were warriors* was published (Calder 1993, p.75). As Bruce Harding (2006, p.11) notes, *Once were warriors* was published in the sesquicentenary of the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi. Yet, while the novel does not focus on a direct examination of the Treaty of Waitangi, the work is framed by the Treaty settlement process and engaged in a critical dialogue about race-relations. In particular how Māori are situated inside that narrative. As argued, *Ngati* (1987) and *Mauri* (1988) can be viewed as responses to preceding cultural nationalist views of New Zealand society that sought to add a Māori perspective of New Zealand history, society and race-relations to the narrative. *Once were warriors*, however, is a response to the construction of a new national mythology based on biculturalism that returned to cultural nationalist views that, ultimately, blamed Māori for failing to adapt to the ‘modern’ world. In this fashion, the novel is a reactionary tale against biculturalism and Māori cultural nationalism.

Similarly to Keri Hulme, Duff was a relatively unknown author and his work became embroiled in cultural identity politics about whether his views or indeed, the author himself, were representative of Māori society. The poet, Apirana Taylor described Duff as having “no status”, and “simply a literary kupapa” (Taylor 1994). Others such as Danielle Brown (1995, p.75) have claimed that there has been “… an active politics of exclusion at work which serves not only to marginalise Duff, but to discredit him personally as well”. In the 1990s, however, Duff would experience both success and notoriety. The author had syndicated newspaper columns throughout the country, would be invited to guest lecture on his views, follow up his fictional works with a non-fictional book entitled *Māori: The crisis and the challenge* (1993) and win various awards, such as the Frank Sargeson Fellowship for writing in 1991. Duff would also win the 1997 Montana Book Award for fiction with the sequel to *Once were warriors*, *What Becomes of the Brokenhearted* (1996).
Both the novel and film of *Once were warriors* would have a major impact upon New Zealand society. The controversy was such that Lee Tamahori had reservations about directing the film. As discussed in the critical analysis, the film focuses upon different themes that omitted core elements of the novel in order to reflect some of the contemporary views circulating in New Zealand about what problems faced Māori society and how to overcome the same. For example, the subject of reconnecting Māori to their traditional roots is a theme evident in the film, but not in the novel. The Pākehā family, the Tramberts, who are used as a counterpoint to the Heke whānau are also excluded from the film. It is suggested, however, that the film ultimately reinforced already accepted and culturally romanticist explanations, rather than challenged them.

**Once were warriors: the film (1994)**

The film *Once were warriors* is an interesting exercise in how politics can influence the production of cinematic accounts. Emiel Martens (2007) provides an in-depth analysis of the film, *Once were warriors*, its adaptation, production and reception in New Zealand society. *Once were warriors* was the first feature film directed by Lee Tamahori who had a background in commercials and had been first assistant director on *Merry Christmas Mr Lawrence* (1983) and the Geoff Murphy directed films, *Utu* (1983) and *The Quiet Earth* (1985). Robin Scholes and Communicado Productions, Fine Line Features, New Zealand Film Commission and New Zealand on Air produced the film. Tamahori was somewhat reluctant to be involved in directing *Once were warriors* because of its controversial subject matter and the impact the same may have on the success of the film (Martens 2007, p.33).

While Martens’s work focuses on the reception of the film in the Māori community, from his own account, the potential for controversy due to its subject matter was shared across the ethnic divide. For example, the New Zealand Film Commission had doubts as to the suitability of the film’s content and feared the potential criticisms of involvement (Martens 2007, p.34). Indeed the Film Commission required the endorsement of people from inside Māoridom in order for the film to be made and upon release of the work a number of the bigger distributors turned the project down (Martens 2007, p.37). *Once were warriors*, however, would go onto critical acclaim both at home and abroad, and would become New Zealand’s highest earning film of all time. *Once were warriors* was New Zealand’s highest grossing film until *The World’s Fastest Indian* (2005). Martens (2007, p.98) argues however,
that if the box office take for *Once were warriors* was adjusted for inflation, *Once were warriors* would still hold the record. While the film and the novel are quite different, it is argued that the success of the filmic version of *Once were warriors* somewhat vindicated the director’s involvement.

Although Alan Duff was originally hired to adapt his novel into the script for the film, Tamahori and the Film Commission sought to minimise the controversy by replacing Duff with the playwright, Riwia Brown. Brown worked on Duff’s draft and changed the focus from ‘racial identity politics’ to a narrative that was constructed around the Heke Whānau, the destruction of a family due to alcohol and violence, the beauty of Māori culture and Beth’s personal journey (Martens 2007, p.33-35). In essence a film based on the issues of a Māori whānau’s struggles with domestic violence and alcoholism that reflected more contemporary bicultural or Māori cultural nationalist resolutions.

Symbolically, the fictional setting of “Two Lakes” (Rotorua) is changed in the film to South Auckland in order to ensure the marked distinction between rurally-based and urban-located Māori. Grace’s rapist in the film is exposed to Grace and the audience as the sinister friend of Jake’s, Uncle Bully. In the novel, Grace did not know who her rapist was and suspected her father. Jake’s suspected rape of Grace is the instigation for transitional change of Beth, the Heke Whānau and eventually, Jake who is thrown out of the house. The Tramberts, who are the middle class Pākehā family that creates a distinction between Māori/Pākehā, the Hekes and themselves, are also removed from the film. Furthermore, in the novel the character of Beth does not reconnect with her whānau and culture as she does in the cinematic account, but becomes a leader in her urban environment. What these changes suggest is that a number of critical themes were altered to reflect contemporary bicultural and Māori cultural nationalist views of Māori in New Zealand society, which are discussed in the body of the chapter on *Once were warriors*, and construct the notion of cultural distance where Pākehā are notably absent as meaningful characters in the film. Moreover, as has been well argued, the film gives little historical or social explanations as to why the Heke Whānau are in the situation they find themselves in (Pihama 1996, pp. 191-194). This ambiguity leaves the audience to determine from their own ideological standpoints what factors have contributed to the Heke’s misfortunes. The resolution of the film is clear, however, in that culture is a cure for the social ills of the Māori population, a view that was advanced within the bicultural two world-view model and Māori cultural nationalism.
Synopsis: Once Were Warriors

In a violent relationship, it takes a mother’s strength to save herself and her children from the man she loved. Once were warriors is a violent love story set against a contemporary urban backdrop. Eighteen years after Jake and Beth Heke married in the first flush of teenage love, it’s easy to see why Beth found him irresistible. Jake is a muscular handsome man who exudes an explosive sexual energy. Even now, five kids later, he can still arouse Beth with one look. But Jake now spends most of his time at the pub proving his manhood with his fists. And if Beth answers back, she’s likely to get the same treatment. But Beth’s a survivor. It will take more than a few knocks to conquer her spirit and besides, she’s still deeply in love with Jake. At home, Beth struggles to keep the family together but the violence is taking its toll. One son has joined a gang, the next has been taken into welfare. Still untouched is Grace, the beautiful teenage daughter, a gifted writer and thinker who embodies Beth’s own hope for a better future. Tragically, Grace’s special gifts set her apart from her tough urban surroundings and make her the most vulnerable member of her family. She’s destined to be cut down before she’s had a chance to mature. While the loss of Grace is the worst tragedy Beth can imagine, it is also the very thing which turns her own life around for the better. Forced to make a choice – her man or her family – Beth finds the strength to seek a new alternative.

Cast

Beth          Rena Owen
Jake          Temuera Morrison
Grace         Mamaengaroa Kerr-Bell
Nig            Julian (Sonny) Arahanga
Boogie        Taungaroa Emile
Polly          Rachael Morris
Huata         Joseph Kairua
Bully         Cliff Curtis
Toot          Shannon Williams
Dooley        Pete Smith
Film case study 8: Niki Caro and Whale Rider (2002)

Witi Ihimaera: The Whale Rider (1987)
The film Whale Rider (2002) is based upon Witi Ihimaera’s 1987 novel of the same name. Ihimaera is one of New Zealand’s celebrated Māori authors and his first works began to appear in the 1970s (Prentice 2003, p.88). As legend has it, Ihimaera was inspired to write after reading Bill Pearson’s essay, ‘The Māori in Literature’, in which Pearson declared there were still no Māori novelists or playwrights.245 Ihimaera’s early works were published in The Listener, Te Ao Hou and Landfall and were written in a way that has been described as “nostalgic” (Williams n.d). It has been noted that much of Ihimaera’s early works were designed not to make the “Pākehā audience” feel uncomfortable (Heim 1998; Knudsen 2004). Ihimaera is, however, a good example of how the politics of different social contexts can influence the narrative styles of writers. Ihimaera has rewritten his earlier works, such as Pounamu, Pounamu, Whānau and Tangi because, in his words, when he wrote them he was a “colonised person” (in Watkin 2004, pp.19-21). There is in Ihimaera’s statement a reference to a different social context, one which has been influenced by post-colonial, bicultural and Māori cultural identity politics. In contemporary times, Witi Ihimaera is described as “… one of the fulcrums of the Māori cultural renaissance movements of the early 1970s” (Watkin 2004, pp.19-21).

Whereas Duff has been described as an “outsider” in terms of the New Zealand literary scene (Harding 2005), Ihimaera has been very much a fixture of the establishment. It is important to note, however, that Ihimaera has been the subject of some criticism for his views on women. For example, Atareta Poananga and Ngahuia Te Awekotuku criticised Ihimaera’s novel The Matriarch (1986) for utilising anthropological stereotypes of women (Heim 1998).

While Once were warriors depicted the grim social realities of urbanised Māori, Whale Rider offers the counter-view. The tensions between the competing views of Duff and Ihimaera about Māori society should not be underestimated. Alan Duff was motivated to write novels in opposition to Ihimaera’s early works and Ihimaera wrote the foreword to Anaru Vercoe’s text Educating Jake (1998), which was a polemic written against Duff’s work and syndicated columns. There is a synchronicity between the two authors, the two novles and the two filmic versions in their contradictory and competing views about Māori society and culture. Although these two works can be viewed in opposition to one another, both examine similar
concerns such as the subject of “culture” and the future direction of the Māori population within the auspices of the bicultural, two world-view model.


*Whale Rider* was directed by Niki Caro and produced by South Pacific Pictures Limited in 2002. The film has been a critical and financial success, winning the 2002 Toronto International Film Festival People’s Choice Award, 2003 Sundance Film Festival World Cinema Audience Award, 2003 Rotterdam Film Festival Audience Award, 2003 San Francisco Film Festival Best Narrative Feature, 2003 Seattle International Film Festival Best Film and Best Director, 2003 Maui International Film Festival Award, and the 2003 Lake Placid Film Festival Audience Award. The lead actress, Keisha Castle-Hughes was nominated for an academy award in 2004. *Whale Rider* has also been described as the “first fruit of the Film Production Fund” set up by the [New Zealand] Government (NZ Herald 2002).

At the time of release, considerable attention was paid to Caro’s ethnicity, as a Pākehā, in relation to her right to direct and produce a Māori oriented film. Caro followed cultural protocol in securing the permission of Ngāti Konohi to produce *Whale Rider*, employing a cultural advisor from the iwi and appointing Witi Ihimarea as associate producer. Bruce Babington (2007, p.228) describes Caro’s involvement in *Whale Rider* as the “bridge” that crosses the “ethnic-cultural divide”. Merata Mita was highly critical of Caro’s involvement declaring “The director could never understand that [Whale Rider] story”. In a similar vein, Barry Barclay (Murray 2007, pp.88-89) wrote an open letter to John Barnett, the head of South Pacific Pictures, criticising Barnett’s comments that stressed *Whale Rider* had “managed to express a cultural fidelity to the narrative [as well as telling an] … international story”. Barclay (cited in Murray, 2007, pp.88-89) wrote:

> [D]on’t badger us that this is the glorious path which we must all go along, head to tail; don’t put us down when we raise our concerns about how non-Indigenous artists handle this type of material; and don’t go hyper-promoting, in any triumphalist way, “universal story, to the detriment of genuine Indigenous efforts. Above all don’t tell us that we, as Māori, must like this film. It is every People’s right to make their
minds up on that, particularly when it is their own world being shown up there on screen.\textsuperscript{248}

As discussed in the body of the chapter, there is an emphasis placed on gender in \textit{Whale Rider} that served to avoid the criticism arising from ethno-cultural politics (or the credibility of a non-Māori to direct a Māori oriented film) (Matthews 25 January 2003; Mitchell 6 June 2002; Mottesheard 2003; Wiles 2007). It is not the intention of this work to engage in the suitability or lack thereof in Niki Caro directing \textit{Whale Rider}. Rather it is to indicate the politics involved in bringing the work to the screen.

Similarly to \textit{Once were warriors} (1994) there are marked differences between the text and film. For example the name of the central character in the novel, Kahu, is changed to Paikea in order to draw the strong association with the protagonist and authenticity through the ancient tribal traditions of Ngāti Porou. Kahu’s father, Porourangi, does not marry a Māori woman from the South Island in the film, but instead is engaged to a German woman, Anna. This engagement between Porourangi and Anna brings in another international dimension to the film which was not in the novel.

\textbf{Synopsis}

\textit{In a small New Zealand coastal village, Māori claim descent from Paikea, the Whale Rider. In every generation a male heir has succeeded to the chiefly title. When twins are born and the boy twin dies, Koro, the chief is unable to accept his grand-daughter Pai as a future leader. Koro is convinced that the tribe’s misfortunes began at Pai’s birth and calls for his people to bring their sons to him, sure a new leader will be revealed. Pai loves Koro more than anyone in the world, but she must fight him and a thousand years of tradition to fulfil their destiny. When whales become stranded on the beach, Koro is sure this signals an apocalyptic end to his tribe. Until one person prepares to make the ultimate sacrifice to save the people: The Whale Rider. A contemporary story of love, rejection and triumph as a young girl fights to fulfil her destiny, WHALE RIDER is directed by Niki Caro who adapted it for screen from the novel by award winning New Zealand writer Witi Ihimaera”.

WHALE RIDER has achieved recognition and acclaim around the world winning many awards including – 2002 Toronto International Film Festival People’s Choice Award, 2003 Sundance Film Festival World Cinema Audience Award, 2003
Rotterdam Film Festival Audience Award, 2003 San Francisco Film Festival Best Narrative Feature, 2003 Seattle International Film Festival Best Film and Best director, 2003 Maui International Film Festival Audience Award, 2003 Lake Placid Film Festival Audience Award.

Cast

Paikea Keisha Castle-Hughes
Koro Rawiri Patene
Nanny Flowers Vicky Haughton
Porourangi Cliff Curtis
Uncle Rawiri Grant Roa
Hemi Mana Taumaunu
Shilo Rachel House
Willie Taungaroa Emile
Dog Tammy Davis
Maka Mabel Wharekawa-Burt
Miro Rawinia Clarke
Miss Parata Tahei Simpson
Hemi's Dad Roimata Taimana
Rehua Elizabth Skeen
Jake Tyrone White
Ropata Taupua Whakataka-Brightwell
Wiremu Tenia McClutchie-Mita
Bubba Peter Patuwai
Parekura Rutene Spooner
Maui Riccardo Davis
Henare Apiata Whangaparita-Apanui
Obstetrician John Sumner
Young Rawiri Sam Woods
Ace Pura Tangira
Anne Jane O'Kane
Baby Paikea Aumuri Parata-Haua
Appendix 1 – Terms and definitions

Outlined in this appendix are the meanings of the terms and definitions used, and applied in this thesis. Contained within this appendix are some of the foundational ideas in the literature that are drawn upon and provide the frame of reference for both the writer and reader. The reason why these foundational ideas are placed in this appendix is that there are large volumes of work devoted to these concepts within and between academic disciplines. To analyse the strengths, limitations and differences between disciplines in the body of this thesis would have placed restrictions on the central arguments of the work itself. Set out below in alphabetical order are the key concepts, terms and definitions.

A1.1 Archetypes, prototypes, stereotypes and encoded characters

Paul Darke (1999) describes the differences between a stereotype, archetype, type, proto-type and sub-type, or even a myth as dependent upon the perspective of the writer or academic discipline that he (or she) is representing. Darke’s comments allude to the subjective nature of the use of archetypes, prototypes, stereotypes et al in works when analysing the same for meaning. For ease of reference the terms used in this thesis are “encoded characters” or “transitional figures” which are protagonists, antagonists and secondary players in the films. A number of characterisations are instantly recognisable to the audience such as heroes and villains, love interests, antagonists and protagonists. As the plot unfolds, it can be seen that actors begin to symbolise particular ideas about social forces or issues in the context from which the works are produced (Partridge and Hughes 1998, p.16). Some examples of these encoded characters are: Tom Sullivan's family in Broken Barrier (1952) that disapprove of Rawi because she is Māori, Fancy-pants in To Love a Maori (1972) who is explicitly racist and Colonel Elliot in Utu (1983) who represents the “old colonial world” of Great Britain.

Encoded characters are employed (and sometimes deployed) in films as representative of social forces that invite the audience to participate in either identifying or condemning points of view in the works. These figures often articulate or act out the director’s point-of-view, where the audience either sympathises or rejects, the positions conveyed. In relation to Māori, encoded characters often draw upon well-established images, figures, tropes and genres to direct the audience in how to interpret the plot or subplots of the narrative. Some of the enduring images of Māori are: the warrior, the noble savage, the urban degenerate, women as victims, objects of desire, sacrifice and conflicted inter-racial relationships. Primarily these images form part of a central conflict and/or encounter narrative within the
nationalised race-relations framework, where issues about race-relations are played out at the inter-personal level between two or more characters. What are examined in each chapter are these two conjunctive factors in order to analyse race-relations, the meta-narrative contained therein and the directive codes imparted to intended audiences. These two factors are: location or the rural-urban divide, and gender or the concepts of contested masculinities and inter-ethnic love affairs.

**A1.2 Directive codes and the point of view**

As discussed, codes, conventions, genres, tropes, characterisations, plot and setting are embedded in works for the audience to determine “meaning” or make sense of events unfolding on screen. This is often termed “the point of view” of the director, whereby the director makes certain choices on how to convey “meaning” to the intended audience. The point of view is the result of a choice among alternatives that Patridge and Hughes (1998, p.16) argue is “… determined by the society (and its values) who produces the image”. In the New Zealand context, until *Utu* in 1983 directors were quite explicit in advancing overt directive codes to the audience throughout the work on how race-relations and events should be interpreted.

In Rudall Hayward’s films *Rewi’s Last Stand* (1925/1940) and *To Love a Maori* (1972), and John O’Shea’s *Broken Barrier* (1952) for example, the race-relations theme is made explicit from the promotional material of the film, to the events unfolding on screen. Film has provided a social commentary function and been active in the construction of a populist, unitary national identity, centring on race-relations. The function that film has served is to attempt to direct and constrain, if not quite contain, disputes in society regarding race-relations.

**A1.3 Gender**

The concept of gender is also used to explore relationships between Māori and Pākehā in the films. In this context, the subject of “gender” is examined through the idea of “contested masculinities” or the inter-ethnic relationships between Māori and Pākehā characters. It is important to note that “gender” in this thesis is acknowledged as a socially constructed concept (see Fausto-Sterling 1985; James and Saville-Smith 1989; Gilbert and Taylor 1991; Connell 1987; Weiten 1998). In this thesis, the term “gender” refers to the way in which the relationships between Māori men and Pākehā men (“contested masculinities”) and inter-
ethnic love affairs are utilised as representative of wider issues. The term “contested masculinities” is closely associated with the work of RW Connell and in particular Connell’s (1987) social theory of gender relations. Connell challenged the notion of a “hegemonic masculinity” by examining the social constructions of masculinity and the layers of structural power in gender relations in how men were (and are) framed. Connell (2005, p.xii) has advocated for a diverse approach to the subject of masculinity (or masculinities). In terms of this thesis, Connell (2005, p.xvii) has identified the use of ethnic (or inter-ethnic) masculine conflict as a problematic area in the social constructions of masculinity. As a result the author has adopted the phrase “contested masculinities” to examine how the conflict between male characters are used as representatives of social forces as an appeal to the audience to make sense of events unfolding in the works.

Further analysis of the notion of “contested masculinities” between Māori and Pākehā protagonists in the films has drawn upon the work of Brendon Hokowhitu who has produced some seminal work in the area of the construction of Māori masculinity (Hokowhitu 2003, pp. 179-201; 2008, pp.115-141) which examine the way in which Maori masculinity is represented. The notion of “contested masculinities” in this thesis is used to examine how Māori and Pākehā male protagonists stand in as representatives of social forces regarding the nationalised race-relations narrative through competition for, primarily, women and resources. These inter-ethnic conflict relationships are part of the director’s point-of-views when conveying meaning to the audience in how to enact harmonious race-relations or provide explanations as to why the two “races” apart.

These relationships have been utilised as a core part of the settlement narrative, where men contest over women and land. Inter-ethnic conflict and conversely, friendship has been a central plot device in the eight works. In this fashion, inter-ethnic love affairs, inter-ethnic masculine conflict and friendships at the interpersonal level between characters have been used as an allegory to explore the national dilemma of race-relations. Wider social concerns are conducted at the interpersonal level, where the tensions in relationships are used to both examine and promulgate particular ideas about race-relations. It is suggested that the interactions around “gender” signpost particular ideological and social conventions in the contextual environment when works were produced.

In addition, there is a strong intersection between issues of race/ethnicity, class and gender where often the social status of the characters is often tied to these analytical concepts. For
example, Pākehā characters who are involved with Māori characters are perceived by society as marrying “beneath” them or bringing, as Rawi in *Broken Barrier* (1952) articulates “…bad blood into the family”. Historically, the notion of “marrying up” or “marrying down” has been conflated with race/ethnicity and class. While it was somewhat acceptable for Pākehā men to marry Māori women, albeit with a reduction in social status, the same did not apply in reverse. Pākehā women who married Māori men were made invisible in the historical record. As Trevor Bentley (2007, p.14) notes “White women were charged with maintaining the prestige of their race. Those who crossed cultures were consequently viewed as a threat to that prestige and omitted from histories…”.

There are, however, historical accounts of Pākehā women marrying Māori men (see Porter and MacDonald 1996), but these relationships were not depicted on screen until 1972. The relationship between Tama and Penny in *To Love a Maori* (1972) directly references this ‘social taboo’ and crosses both race/ethnicity and class lines. Due to the intersection between race/ethnicity, class and gender there are, at times, a general confusion in the directive codes in the works where films such as *Broken Barrier* (1952) which examines racism in New Zealand society in fact, provides a strong class critique. Therefore, it is important to factor into analyses the way in which each of the key concepts are utilised in the works, and how often there is an intersection between the same when advancing notions of equality.

**A1.3.1 Inter-ethnic love affairs, inter-ethnic masculine conflict (contested masculinities) and friendships**

The majority of the films examined in this work use inter-ethnic love affairs to examine race-relations in the construction of the nation. What is examined is how the issues of race-relations and national identity are often conducted at the inter-personal level between individuals that actually echo wider concerns. For example, a number of the films use inter-ethnic love affairs between Pākehā men and Māori women, or the contestation between Pākehā and Māori men as a plot device to present particular issues to the audience. Martin Blythe (1994, p.34) has identified the trend of relationships between Māori and Pākehā as always ending “unhappily”. As Blythe indicates these unhappy affairs are largely the depiction of historical romances, which are allegorical and work out the national dilemma of how “Māori and Pākehā can be brought together” (1994, p.34).

There are also strong directive codes in the works where women who make the “wrong” choices (Ariana, Tina and Kura) are sacrificed. Māori women are depicted in conflicted ways
in which they are love interests, desired sex objects, femme fatales, victims and sacrifices. The strong directive codes toward Māori women are to ensure the characters make the correct decisions or suffer the consequences. In this way Māori women offer the promise of peaceful integration through inter-marriage and as catalysts for change (Grace in Once were warriors).

**A.1.3.2 Enlightened exceptionalism**

While a number of inter-ethnic relationships have ended in tragedy (Ariana and Bob in Rewi’s Last Stand, 1940; Kura and Lieutenant Scott in Utu, 1983), not all have done so. For example, Rawi and Tom in Broken Barrier (1952), Penny and Tama in To Love a Maori (1972), and Ramai and Steve in Mauri (1988) have successful relationships where they end seemingly happy. It can be seen that in each relationship there are trials and tribulations about social concerns, where the inter-ethnic love affairs are utilised to explore the “national dilemma”. There is a common theme, however, with characters that cross the race/ethnicity and class divide which centres upon the notion of “exceptionalism”.

Drawing upon the work of Tim Wise (2009, p.9), “enlightened exceptionalism” is the notion that allows for and even celebrates the achievements of individuals because they are “…generally seen as different from a less appealing even pathological black or brown rule”. The characters in film may ‘transcend’ these ‘rules’, but exceptionalism’ relies “principally on characterological judgements about persons of colour” (Wise, 2009, p.105). In essence, characters are depicted as transcending the socially constructed stereotypes circulating in society about certain groups of people. Moreover, enlightened exceptionalism provides the rationale as to why characters are involved in inter-ethnic love affairs with people of colour.

**A1.3.3 Māori male as warrior, noble savage and antagonist**

Argubably, the most recognisable stereotype of Māori masculinity is the warrior. This stereotype has been played out in various forms, from the Māori male as noble savage, aggressor, combatant in the nation’s building, competitor for female attentions to the rebellious outlaw. Māori have been framed as red savages (aggressive), grey savages (dying), brown and green savages (environmentally friendly and harmonious), and the quintessential noble savage (see Belich 1996; 2000; Bell 1991). Invariably, the image of the Māori male has characterised not only the representation of Māori men in the cinematic record, but also Māori society.
The image of Māori man as “warrior” has long historical roots in both the visual form and literary traditions. This warrior image of Māori men was developed in the European literature before the formation of New Zealand in the 18th Century (Thompson 1997, pp. 109-19). From Abel Tasman in 1642, who lost four men at Taitapu when trying to land, Captain Cook, who described Māori as the most “warlike race on earth”, Marion du Fresne, Dumont d’Urville and Charles Darwin, Māori men have been constructed in the accounts as the epitome of the “savage warrior”. These first-hand accounts of visitors developed what Christina Thompson describes as a ‘European fascination with what one might call the ordinary violence of Māori life’ (Thompson 1997, pp. 109-19). The sensationalised accounts in Europe of the “Māori warrior” and “Māori society”, framed Māori before European settlement had taken place. Primarily, this mythology of violence has been shaped around a figure of the warrior type and remains one of the central mythologies in relation to Māori society today (Thompson 1997, pp. 109-19).

In terms of nation building New Zealand’s national image of itself has been formed in the various acts of masculine conflict in the encounters of Māori and Pākehā (Belich 1996; Belich 2000; Cowan 1983, Reprint of edition first published 1922-23 edn; King 2004; Phillips 1996; Sinclair 1987a). What were once termed “the Māori wars” and are now known as “the New Zealand wars” or “land wars” has featured largely in the building exercise of establishing settlement on the landscape. While some directors, such as Rudall Hayward were subject to criticism for the use of the noble savage, as in Rewi’s Last Stand (1940), the image of a Māori warrior is incorporated on the symbol of New Zealand identity, the passport. Māori warrior- hood also, forms a central part of the country’s international profile through “the” haka, Ka Mate, Ka Mate. Ka Mate Ka Mate has become an iconic symbol of New Zealand identity, but as only men perform this particular haka, it is an icon of respective masculinities in the national framework.

It is suggested that if directors have perpetuated the noble savage through the cinematic form, then it is an image which has been embraced at the highest level of New Zealand society and is still in use today. The Māori male as warrior or noble savage has been crucial to the construction of national mythologies about settlement, progression and civilisation. Pat Moloney (2001, pp.153-176) describes this aspect as a mixture of “savagery” and “civilisation”, whereby in the process of British settlement Victorians reinforced their own superiority, and identity over conquered peoples.
A1.4 Genres and tropes

Film genres are various forms of identifiable types, categories, classifications or groups of films that are recurring and have similar, familiar or instantly recognizable patterns, syntax, filmic techniques or conventions. These can include one or more of the following: settings (and props), content and subject matter, themes, mood, period, plot, central narrative events, motifs, styles, structures, situations, recurring icons and stock characters (or characterizations) (see Partridge and Hughes 1998; Turner 1996). Many films can fit into several film genres such as action-drama, action-comedy, historical-romance, romance-comedy, drama-romance. The importance of “genre”, however, is its structure and function for the audience. The audience can recognise how the plot, events and outcomes may proceed in the works.

The term “trope” is defined as a figurative expression where a familiar and often repeated symbol, meme, theme, motif, style and character are tied to a particular medium, such as film or narrative (Abrams 2005, pp.101, 127, 142, 173). Tropes are also tied to genres in that they can be read as meta-narratives in an overall plot. Further, tropes can also be used as plot devices and events in narratives, which follow a formulaic theme. For example, the “frontier” trope of the settlement of New Zealand where “civilisation” is brought to the country can be seen in earlier works such as Rewi’s Last Stand (1925/40) and Broken Barrier (1952) but the same is inverted in Utu (1983).

A1.4.1 Frontier trope

The American Frontier genre is associated with Frederick Turner’s thesis on the “significance of the frontier in American history (Turner 1947). In 1893, Turner argued that the frontier gave the notion of unlimited free land and a sense of unlimited opportunities. The Frontier was about expansion and control of a recalcitrant land and people by white settlers to America. Within this sense of unlimited opportunities, there was also the sense of freedom with the lack of social and political institutions, as well as law and order. In relation to the American Frontier film genre, Thomas Schatz (1981, p.695) argues that there is a “field of reference” in the guise of a familiar social community, which takes place in a “cultural milieu where inherent thematic conflicts are animated, intensified, and resolved by familiar characters and pattern of action”.

A1.5 High Culture and Low Culture: Māoriland period and Victorian morality

In Rewi’s Last Stand (1925) there is some discussion on the attitudes toward the quality of works produced in the Māoriland era. New Zealand’s Māoriland era, crosses the Victorian period and it is argued that the tensions associated with the artistic endeavours of Māoriland can be found in the competing views of what is described as “high culture” and “low culture”. In the Victorian era there were strong attitudes toward issues of morality, class, culture and gender, but there were also strong humanitarian movements for social justice. As commentators have noted, the Victorian period is one full of contradictions, regarding the strident moral codes of behaviour, at a time when issues of prostitution, child labour and poverty were prevalent (Gardiner 2002; Himmelfarb 1995; 1996; Wilson 2002; Taylor and Wolff 2004). Primarily, these tensions would focus on the debates between “low culture” and “high culture”. Low culture in this instance refers to the works of popular culture associated with the masses, which has been a term applied to the artistic endeavours of the Māoriland period. Traditionally, high culture refers to the milieu of the arts and sciences fostered under the European Renaissance. Essentially, the terms low culture and high culture are underpinned with the notion of class (Bordieu 1984).

A1.6 Postcolonial studies

The field of postcolonial studies emerged from a critical literary tradition (Fleras and Spoonley 1999, p.93), but it is not solely a literary term and can be referenced to the historical era where countries, such as New Zealand, were no longer deemed a colony of Europe (see Aschcroft, Griffiths, and Tiffin 1989; Walder 1998). Arguably, the three most well known contributors to the field of postcolonial studies are Edward Said, Gayatri Spivak and Homi Bhabha (see Bhabha 1994; Said 1978; 1993; Spivak 1990). Postcolonialism is also often theorized as the “condition” directly following colonialism when the European powers have formally retreated from countries, which had once been held as former colonies by Europe. One of the core interests in the field of postcolonial studies is the culture of the colonised and how people, such as Māori, were disempowered through ideology, discourse and/or language because of the colonial project. The colonial project refers to the process by which European powers reached a position of economic, military, political and cultural domination in the world over other peoples (Stam and Spence 2004, p.878).
Postcolonialism has also been described as “… a kind of knowledge-inducing, but changing historicist paradigm” (Walder 1998, p.xi) which reframes former colonies, such as New Zealand, into a model that utilises the binary demarcation of the colonised and the coloniser. Since the 1980s, New Zealand has constructed itself in terms of postcolonial propositions where the impact of the colonial project through the act of colonisation has informed Māori-Pākehā interactions. Within this framework, Māori and Pākehā are constructed in a binary category, where Māori are depicted as “colonised” and Pākehā as “coloniser”.

One of the aims of postcolonial studies is to examine the ways in which peoples from colonised countries attempt to articulate, celebrate and reclaim cultural identities in the aftermath of the colonial project. In this fashion, postcolonialism was conceived as a form of social and political activism in resistance to the complex set of power relations, which were a legacy of European colonialism (Young 1990). Primarily, the field was posited as an emancipatory project, which was designed to examine the impact of the colonial project upon groups which had effectively been marginalised through the impact of colonisation (Aldred and Ryle 1999, p.70). Postcolonial studies was conceived as a way in which to liberate peoples that had formerly been subjugated by the dominant colonial powers. Colonialism and racism have been identified as structural dominations whereby the “Other” has been used as an object to construct, and affirm colonial superiority. Dismantling or overturning the colonial project which is also termed “decolonisation”, became a primary aim through which to effect freedom for formerly conquered peoples or at least to “resist” the remnants of colonialism.

A1.6.1 The marginalised collective subject and identity politics

The term “marginalised collective subject” refers to Michel Foucault’s notion of peoples and groups, including people of colour, gay and homosexual peoples, residents of the colonial and postcolonial worlds who have been excluded from the mainstream of society (Agger 2002, p.167). In Jacques Derrida and Foucault’s view, it was the marginalised collective subject, people who had suffered oppression due to difference, that offered the key to human emancipation. Through this act of ‘exclusion’ from the mainstream of society lay the key to unlocking systems of power (Foucault 1980). Commensurate with this view, the ‘marginalised collective subject’ was constructed in terms of an “other”.

The term ‘identity politics’ has at its central focus groups which have historically suffered particular oppression because of their identities and, as such, may in turn require a specific
form of emancipation. Groups such as women, peoples of colour, indigenous peoples and non-heterosexual orientation are encompassed within the identity politics framework. Commensurate with this view members of the ‘oppressed groups’ utilise their identity to form the basis of political activism in which they unite to challenge the power structures in the wider mainstream of society. The field has become a dominant field of study in the humanities and social sciences as an avenue to causal explanations for the oppression of minority groups from the wider mainstream of society (Marie and Haig 2006, pp. 17-21).

**A1.7 Race, Ethnicity and Culture**

**A1.7.1 The Idea of race**

There is a large body of literature regarding the impact of the “idea of race” on the perceived differences of groups of people and how, historically, racialised categories were utilised to exclude peoples on the grounds of biological determinism (Hannaford 1996). “Race has been widely debunked as a robust category for analysis in the humanities and sciences, centring on the problems associated with differentiating human beings into discrete biological entities (see Banton 1977; 1983; 1994, pp. 1-18; 1998; Barkan, E 1992; Barzun 1937; Cornell, and Hartmann 1998; Guillaumin 1972; Hannaford 1996; Miles 1989; 1993; Morning 2008, S106-S137; Peterson 1995). In this fashion, human beings were ranked according to superiority or inferiority on the belief that the distinctive biological features of individuals or groups of people denoted a particular “race”. As many academics have noted, the rationale for excluding human beings on the grounds of “race” were primarily ideological and used for social, political and economic purposes, rather than being grounded in scientific fact.

It is widely agreed that “race” is not a robust analytical category to describe the differences that exist between people. In fact, it is argued that the idea of “races” is flawed and that there are minimal biological differences between human beings. Given the considerable volume of material debunking the idea of race, it is not the intention of this writer to cover well analysed terrain (see Banton 1977; 1983; 1994, pp. 1-18; 1998; Barkan, E 1992; Barzun 1937; Cornell, and Hartmann 1998; Guillaumin 1972; Hannaford 1996; Miles 1989; 1993; Morning 2008, S106-S137; Peterson 1995). It is suggested that while the rigid biological distinctions between peoples may have proved erroneous, there are still notions of “differences”, and analyses centre on how such distinctions are made. In contemporary times, these notions of “difference” centre upon the conceptual categories of “ethnicity” and “culture”. In the New
Zealand context, discussions are couched within explanations of “cultural differences” or “cultural misunderstandings” between the two largest populations. The fundamental distinctions between group membership of Māori and non-Māori, however, are based upon ethnicity.

The theoretical overlap between “race” and ethnicity is widely acknowledged within academic circles, but the acknowledgement often serves as a dismissal of any further investigation of the idea (see Banton 1998; Cornell and Hartmann 1998; Eller, and Coughlan 1993, pp.199-201; Eriksen 1993; Miles 1993; Mintz 1992, pp.245-256). Thomas Eriksen (1993) highlights the inter-connection between societies such as New Zealand where the idea of races were important, and he advocates that the category of “race” should be studied as part of the local discourses surrounding any alternative to “race”, such as ethnicity and/or culture. What this means is while there has been a shift in terminology from using the term “race” to describe distinctions between groups, it maybe only a superficial difference from the idea of “race”. As Marie, Forsyth and Miles (2004, p.227) note:

*Although the shift from race to ethnicity may be interpreted as a progression away from the notion of objectively descended “races” to subjectively defined ethnic identity (Kertzer and Areal 2002), “descent” and “ancestry” remain decisive criteria in determining who is Māori, and who is not.*

This statement by Marie, Forsyth and Miles (2004) has particular significance for the examination of the cultural authenticity and cultural degeneracy dichotomy. As argued, when analysts advance notions based upon cultural authenticity and cultural degeneracy, coupled with ideas of ethnicity and culture in rigid fashions, there is a deterministic quality that invokes the spectre of race.

**A1.7.2 Ethnicity**

Since the 1960s, ethnicity has become the central focus of theoretical analysis in which to situate the study of group structural organisation and interaction. The term “ethnicity” first appeared in the Oxford English Dictionary in 1972, but its first usage has been attributed to the American sociologist, David Reisman (1953). The word “ethnic” is somewhat older and derives from the Greek *ethnos*, which in turn stemmed from the word *ethnikos* meaning, heathen or pagan (Eriksen 1993, p.4). As has been noted by academics, “ethnicity” has strong
connotations with “minority issues” and people of colour (Tonkin, McDonald and Chapman, 1989, p.17).

Ethnicity has been defined as “the condition belonging to a particular ethnic group” (Glazer, and Moynihan 1975, p.1). It is important to note however, that there are considerable differences in how “ethnicity” is conceptualised in the social sciences. For example, there are two fundamental approaches that are used to analyse ethnic groups, which can be described as “ascriptive” (or primordialist) and the “situational” (subjectivist and instrumentalist). The ascriptive approach advances that members of an ethnic group are bound together by their common descent (Kuper 1999). Thus, kinship ties through blood instil immutable and emotional attachments and allegiances, which transcend circumstances (Geertz 1963; Shils 1982, pp.93-109; Van den Berghe 1987).

Conversely the situational approach argues that giving primacy to primordial attachments is problematic. Frederick Barth (1969, p.11) argues against identifying ethnic groups with cultural units and contends that such descriptions of ethnic groups “… allow us to assume that boundary maintenance is unproblematic and follows from the isolation which itemised characteristics imply: racial difference, cultural difference, social separation and language barriers, spontaneous and organised enmity”. In Barth’s view, an ethnic group is primarily concerned by social organisation and as such, must be defined from within by the group members themselves.

The study of ethnic relations and how groups differ from each other culturally or physically has informed much of the literature in understanding how divergent collectivities are perceived (see Banton 1977; 1983; 1994, pp. 1-18; 1998; Eriksen 1993; Hannaford 1996; Roosens 1989). Part of the fascination with ethnic group interaction is its revitalisation at a time when it was widely perceived that group boundaries would disappear with the constant encounters between different groups of people. It was assumed that ethnic groups would gradually disappear as organisational forms and be replaced by a more homogeneous universal ordering principle (Roosens 1989). This universal principle of humanity underpinned modernity, but its intellectual successor (postmodernism) has advanced a more fragmented form of analysis.

Banton (1989) advances one clear distinction between the two analytical concepts of race and ethnicity. In Banton’s view “race” refers to the categorisation of people by others, while ethnicity is focussed upon in-group identification. Thus, ethnicity is concerned with the
identification of “us”, while “race” is more oriented toward the categorisation of “them”. In the New Zealand context, it is not just a matter of the identification of “us” or “them” because who are “us” and “them” is often prescribed by people outside the group. For example ethnic membership is defined by the State “… relating to any segment of the population within New Zealand society sharing fundamental cultural values, customs, beliefs, languages, traditions and characteristics that are different from those of the larger society” (Statistics New Zealand 2001).

In relation to the Māori “ethnic” category there has been a focus on a shared history, language, culture, symbols, motifs, art and also resistance in the literature. Paul Meredith (1998, p.8) states that the construction of Māori subjectivity within the discourse of ethnicity is:

… in a continual process of self-definition, always configuring itself about the group’s practices with regard to internal composition and allocation of resources, as well as in terms of their external relations with other groups and authorities. Ethnicity then is concerned with those processes of self-definition and self-identification which give the group its cultural distinctiveness.

The Māori population has, however, been subject to wider influences in the construction of identity than a “continual process of self-definition”. Importantly, subscription to the Māori category has been legislated through the 19th, 20th and 21st centuries. Further, the concerns of the Māori population have been framed to reflect dominant views, occurring in different social contexts. The argument made here is that latterly the concerns of the Māori population have been shaped by “biculturalism”.250

A1.7.3 Culture

The term culture has been invariably described as patterns of human activity and includes particular modes of behaviour, systems of beliefs, language, religion, rituals and art-forms (see Benedict 1934; Boggs, Brumann, Herzfeld, Hirsch, Reyna, Sewell and Sokefeld 2004, pp.187-209; Geertz 1975; Nugent and Shore 1997; Kuper 1999; Elliot 2002) Culture has also been linked to civilisation and imperialism, especially the prevailing view that majority groups held superior social systems and values to peoples categorised as “other”. There is no general consensus in the literature as to “what” culture actually is and the subject is highly
contested. It is agreed that culture is socially constructed and people make, shape and invent the same. Furthermore it is people that give “culture” meaning.

Culture has also been described as a “whole way of life” and contradictorily, a “whole way of struggle” (Thompson 1966; Webster 1998). Groups such as Māori, who have ethno-cultural difference from the wider mainstream of New Zealand society can be presented in a conflicted fashion as having a “whole way of life”, regarding culture and also, as a “whole way of struggle”. Steven Webster (1998, p.25) has argued that these divergent views of “culture” are conjoined regarding the Māori population:

Let us try to conceptualise ‘contemporary Māori society’. In barest terms, it is about 15 per cent of the national population, about 30 per cent of its youth, and lives primarily in the urban centres. Beyond this, the situation appears paradoxical.

Contemporary Māori society has undergone a cultural florescence since the depression years of the 1920-30s and especially in the last twenty years, now called the Māori Renaissance. On the other hand, Māori remain about three times more likely than Pākehā (“whites”) to live in poverty, to be unemployed, to be unhealthy, to be poorly educated, to be without satisfactory housing, and to be in gaol – and some of these indices have actually worsened during the Renaissance … Thus Māori cultural life and social reality appear to diverge as though independent of one another.

What Webster’s comments allude to is a particular view of Māori culture, which is at odds with the actual social living conditions of the Māori population. This view of culture as a “whole way of life” has been advanced in the aftermath of the protest movements in the 1970s and 1980s, and as a core part of the reconciliation process in settling historic Treaty of Waitangi claims. It is important to note, that advancing Māori culture as a “whole way of life” has, in fact, obscured the other side of the Māori population in a “whole way of struggle”. As will be discussed in Film case studies 7 and 8, these two competing views of culture often become mutually reinforcing.

The Māori population provides a salient example of the intersection of ethnicity and culture. As Bartholomew Dean and Jerome M Levi (2003, pp.4-5) note ethnic relations have been vital in determining and maintaining indigenous identity “a group’s ethnic identity consists of its subjective, symbolic or emblematic use of any aspect of a culture”. While aspects of culture can be utilised to advance and mobilise peoples for particular causes, there is a danger in reducing people’s culture, and identity to the symbolic or emblematic. It is suggested that
cultural symbols and emblems, especially coupled with a subjective frame of reference can, in fact, be misinterpreted as endorsing or supporting particular positions. For example, in the films, most “encounters” occur between people from different ethnic, cultural and social backgrounds, where different rules of engagement can often cause conflict between the characters. There is the field of “cross-cultural” communication, where it is acknowledged that there are different rule-based systems of understanding between groups of people. In essence, different groups of people can interpret the same “object” from another point of view and have highly contested conclusions.

As discussed throughout this work, when the boundaries between culture, ethnicity and race become blurred, there is the tendency to confuse or correlate one of these concepts with another. Ethnicity and culture are, however, fluid concepts. Application in a rigid fashion, such as the demarcation between groups based upon ethnicity and culture, should be undertaken with care, lest “ethnicity” and “culture” be utilised as euphemisms of “race” which has largely been debunked as a rigorous analytical category.

**Conclusion**

The meanings of the terms, definitions and key concepts that are used and applied in this work have been referenced in this appendix. It is envisaged that these foundational ideas will be used as a frame of reference when the terms are used in the body of this thesis. As discussed, there is a large body of literature devoted to these concepts which are highly contested and differ within, and between disciplines. The aim of this appendix is to clarify for the reader how the writer envisages these terms and some of the central arguments in the literature regarding the same.
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2 Please see filmic case studies.
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8 With regard to the race-relations narrative, these transitions are crucial and examples include, but are not limited to, the soldiers realisation of Māori nobility in Rewi’s Last Stand (1940), Tom’s awakening to racism in New Zealand society in Broken Barrier (1952) through his relationship with Rawi and Jonny’s sacrifice, Mr and Mrs Davis overcoming racism through love and the birth of their mixed heritage grandchild (To Love a Maori, 1972), Wiremu’s apportioning of blame to the main characters involvement in hostilities and conflicts (Utu, 1983), Greg Shaw embracing his Māori heritage when he learns his mother was Māori and that Kapua is his turangawaewae (Ngati, 1987), Steve Semmens marrying Ramari in the face of family opposition and familiarising himself with Māori tikanga and te reo (Mauri, 1988), Rewi/Paki realising he is answerable to both Māori and Pākehā law/lore (Mauri, 1988), Beth Heke and the children leaving Jake in the aftermath of Grace’s rape and suicide (Once were warriors, 1994) and Koro’s dawning realisation that Paikea is the prophesied leader (Whale Rider, 2002).

9 Please see Chapter Two, Theory and methodology.
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20 This factor has been advanced as a form of “progress” in terms of race-relations and based upon wider political issues that identification to an ethnic group on the category of “race” alone was, in itself, racist.
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Please see Chapters Five and Six, *The advent of biculturalism* and *The two world-view model* respectively.

Please see Chapter Eight, *Broken Barrier* (1952).

Please see Section 3.2, The Māori ethnic group.

Please see Merata Mita’s biography on her experiences with filming *Patu!* in particular the attention she received from agents of the State in their attempts to confiscate material to stop the documentary from being released. In Māori Television’s *Kete Aronui* programme with Merata Mita in focus (2009), Mita articulated the personal cost to herself and her whānau when bringing *Patu!* to the screen. The pressures and personal toll had been so great, that Mita queried whether the project was worth it. Mita had, however, come to realise the value of the work due to its reception, acclaim and meaning to audiences.

Please see Chapter 13 *Once were warriors* and Film case study 7.

A critical analysis of films will be undertaken in separate chapters.

Please see Section 3.2, The Māori Ethnic Group, Chapter Three, *Key Thematics*.

The theoretical propositions of biculturalism will be investigated in Chapter Five, *The two world-view model* in order to link contemporary understandings of Māori subjectivity and race-relations to the framework.

Please see Chapter Ten, *Utu*.

Please see Chapter Seven, *To Love a Māori*.

Please see Chapters 11 and 12, *Ngati* (1987) and *Mauri* (1988) respectively. This notion of power-sharing or the promise of partnership and the control of Māori affairs is a key thematic where the redefining of the Māori-Pākehā relationship was still in negotiation.

Please see Chapter Six *The two world-view model* and in particular, John Rangihau’S diagram of Māoritanga in binary opposition to Pākehātanga.


Please see Chapter Six, *Māori cultural nationalism, the Māori renaissance and Māori women*.


The strongest clause regarding the Treaty of Waitangi is in Section 9 of the State Owned Enterprises Act 1986, which states: “Nothing in this Act shall permit the Crown to act in a manner that is inconsistent with the provisions of the Treaty of Waitangi”. The strength of the verb has not been repeated in any following legislation regarding the Treaty of Waitangi.

The author subscribes to the view that tino rangatiratanga means full chieftainship and sovereignty rests with chiefs, but it is important to note that the term tino rangatiratanga has, as Poata-Smith (2005, p.214) notes “… meant quite different things to different people” and the “… slogan as it evolved over the last two decades has become the catalyst for both a move to the left and a sharp move to the right”.

Please see Chapter Four, *The advent of biculturalism*.

Please see Section A1.6, Race, ethnicity and culture, Appendix 1, *Terms and Definitions*.

Please see Section 7.5, Race-relations in *Rewi’s Last Stand* – cultural nationalism-settler nationalism, Chapter Seven, *Rewi’s Last Stand*.

Please see Chapters Nine and Ten, *To Love a Māori* and *Utu*.

Please see John Rangihau’s Māoritanga and Pākehātanga diagram in Section 5.3 Race-Relations and The two world-view model, Chapter Five, *The two world-view model*.

Please see Chapters Five and Six, *The advent of biculturalism* and *The two world-view model*.

Please see Section A1.7 Race, ethnicity and culture, Appendix 1, *Terms and definitions*, Chapters Five and Six, *The advent of biculturalism* and *The two world-view model* respectively.
Please see Appendix 2, *Bicultural references*.

Please see Chapter Six, *Māori cultural nationalism, the Māori renaissance and Māori women*.

Please see Chapter Nine, *To Love a Māori*.

See Appendix 2, *Bicultural references*.


Duff described people who held these views as “limp wrists” and “wankers”.

See Appendix 2, *Bicultural references*.

Please see John Rangihau’s Māoritanga and Pākehātanga diagram in Section 5.3 Race-Relations and The two world-view model, Chapter Five, *The two world-view model*.

Please see Appendix 2, *Bicultural references*.

Please see Chapter Six, *Māori cultural nationalism, the Māori renaissance and Māori Women*.
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Please see A1.6, Race, ethnicity and culture, Appendix 1, *Terms and Definitions*.
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Please see Chapters Nine and Ten, *To Love a Māori* and *Utu*.

Please see Appendix 4, *Mana wahine references*.

Please see Appendix 2, *Bicultural references*.

Please see Appendix 4, *Mana wahine references*.

In July 1993, Mira Szasy and others lodged Claim WAI 381 with the Waitangi Tribunal. The claim sought to address the failure of the Crown to acknowledge the Rangatira status of Māori women when fulfilling its obligations in accordance with the Treaty of Waitangi. According to Johnston (2005, p. 22) as at 2005 the Claim was yet to be heard. As at 2010, the claim has still not been heard.

Refers to the Josie Bullock case when she challenged the Department of Corrections about gender roles and Māori culture. Please see *New Zealand Herald* 18 January 2006, ‘Corrections Changes Māori Policy after Bullock Case’; 24 December 2008, ‘MP Upset at being asked to sit behind men’.

Please see Appendix 4, *Mana wahine references*

Wairupe is the tipuna of the author.

Please see Section A1.3.2 Māori male as warrior, noble savage and antagonist, Appendix 1, *Terms and Definitions*

Please see Appendix 4, *Mana wahine references*.

The author has had experience with non-Māori women who believed that women were forbidden to speak on the marae at all. While this was somewhat a minority view, the clarification of marae protocol and also the variance of tikanga regarding women’s speaking rights needs further circulation in New Zealand society.

Please see Section 14.1 Social context, Chapter 14, *Whale Rider*.

Please see Section 6.6. Māori women, Chapter Six, *Māori cultural nationalism, the Māori renaissance and Māori women*.
The author received this invitation to: Wahine Tu: Weekend Wananga for women to speak on the marae, 3-5 September 2010, Te Ore Ore marae, Masterton, A stand for women to speak on the Marae has grown wings and is about to soar. After appropriate consultation, Te Ore Ore Marae (Ngāti Kahungunu me Rangitane ki Wairarapa) in Masterton will hold a 3 day wananga (3rd-5th Sept) where supportive male and female elders will train our local women in the art of whaikorero resulting in a great celebration powhiri on the Sunday in which at least one of our wahine toa will stand to speak on the paepae, with her people's backing, creating a progressive new way forward for our people, strengthening the mana of our Marae, Hapu, Iwi, enhancing our capacity to manaaki manuhiri, bringing back the powerful perspective of the divine feminine to the fore, freeing women to step fully into their light as leaders, not just on our Marae but in all areas of society. Huge ups to all the brave souls who are helping to champion this timely cause.

Please see Section 4.5, Māori in the 1990s, Chapter Four, The advent of biculturalism.

Ms Donna Awatere-Huata joined the right wing ACT NZ parliament before the general election in 1996. She became a list MP and remained in parliament until 2004 when she was expelled and subsequently convicted of fraud.

Please see Film case study 1: Rudall Hayward and Rewi’s Last Stand (1925/1940) and in particular, Hayward’s comments in relation to remaking the 1940 version on the grounds of historical accuracy and criticisms the director had faced about ‘authenticity’ when making The Te Kooti Trail (1927).

Please see section on Rewi’s Last Stand (1940).

This scene would be reworked and referenced in Utu (1983) when Kura first encounters Lt. Scott and Henare, by jumping off a waterfall to escape them. Kura, however, proves to be more adept in bush-craft than Takiri or Lt Scott and Henare.

In the 1940 film, Bob and Ariana are lovers, which adds a different set of dynamics into the work. Please see section on Gender for an analysis of Bob and Ariana’s relationship as an allegory for race-relations.

Please see Appendix 3, Māoriland.

Please see Appendix 3, Māoriland. Cowan, J 1910b, Official record of the New Zealand International Exhibition of Arts and Industries held at Christchurch, 1906-7: a descriptive and historical account, Government Printer, Wellington. In 1906, the Government organized Christchurch International Exhibition, which notably reconstructed a Māori pa on a 2 acre site, with 2 meeting houses, palisades, carvings, pataka, 20 dwellings, plus performances of haka and poi by Māori.

Please see Film case study 1, Rewi’s Last Stand.

The term “Māori Malady” indicates the racialising of the Smallpox epidemic in New Zealand. While the disease had a significant effect on the Māori population, it was introduced from overseas.

See Chapters One and Three, Introduction and Theory and methodology respectively. In particular Section 3.4, Meta-narrative – cultural authenticity and cultural degeneracy, Chapter Three, Theory and methodology.

In 27 October 1994 (the 159th anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence in 1835), Mike Smith attacked One Tree Hill with a chainsaw in protest to the monument that encompassed Featherstone’s comments that commemorated the notion of “smoothing the pillow” for Māori, as a “dying race”. Mike Smith’s protest was also to draw attention to the protest movement of Māori seeking redress for claims as a result of breaches to the Treaty of Waitangi.

The Māori land farming schemes would be highlighted in John O’Shea’s Broken Barrier (1952) to draw attention to the contribution of Māori to the nation.

Princess Te Puea Herangi was voted number 55 out of 100 in a poll of New Zealand’s top history makers. Te Puea was ranked 45 places above Rudall Hayward, who was placed at number 90.

Please see Chapters Nine and Ten, To Love a Māori and Utu respectively.
Hill gives an account of the complex set of interactions, engagements, manoeuvrings and motivations of Ngata and his contemporaries between Māori institutions and the Crown.

In 1983, in a different social context, the “Vicar” of Utu (1983) would replay this role and be portrayed as the antithesis of the Reverend Morgan. What are portrayed in Rewi’s Last Stand, however, are the Victorian values associated with the clergy and the role the Church played in that society. In Utu (1983), the Vicar is a heuristic for hypocrisy, at a time when the Church was under scrutiny in New Zealand for its involvement in matters of State. Please see Chapter Ten, Utu.

Ahumai Te Paerata survived the siege at Orakau Pa, but was wounded in four places. She died at Mokai near Taupo in 1908 (Cowan, J 1983 p.403).

The notion of the “hearth and home” was a Victorian value and as indicated by the above comment, it was synonymous with both gender, and civilisation.

This theme is revisited in the film Once were warriors (1994) between the characters of Beth and Jake.
In 2010, both the South African and New Zealand Rugby Unions apologised to Māori for excluding indigenous players from the All Blacks touring teams.

In 1959 Dr Harry Bennett was refused service in an Auckland Bar because he was Māori. Please see Belich (2000, p.190).

Noel Hilliard was a major novelist in the 1960s, now fallen somewhat into neglect. Primarily, Hilliard was active in left-wing politics and wrote in the social-realist genre. Hilliard’s work is still in publication and has been translated into a number of languages, including Russian.


Please see Chapter Seven, Rewi's Last Stand.

For an analysis on the Māori protest movements, please see Poata-Smith (1996; 2001).

Please see, Porter and MacDonald (1996, pp.252-336). In particular, Elizabeth Ann Wharepapa (married to a Māori man), Hirini Taiwhanga and Leopold Puhipi (married to European women) had inter-ethnic marriages in the 19th Century.

Please see Section A1.3, Gender, Appendix 1, Terms and definitions for Trevor Bentley’s comments in relation to how inter-ethnic love affairs between Māori men and Pākehā women were perceived.

Please see Chapter Nine, To Love a Maori.

Ibid.

See Chapters Eight and Nine, Broken Barrier and To Love a Maori respectively.

Please see Chapter Nine, To Love a Māori.

As outlined in To Love a Maori (1972), in 2010 the South African and New Zealand Rugby Unions have formally apologised for the exclusion of Māori in the All Blacks touring team. The South African Rugby Union’s apology preceded the New Zealand Rugby Union’s formal apology to Māori. Significantly, 2010 is the centenary year of Māori rugby.

Please see Chapters Eight and Nine, Broken Barrier and To Love a Māori respectively.

Please note that this section draws on the seminal work of Evan Poata-Smith’s (1996; 2001) analysis in relation to the history and tensions within the broader political protest movements of the 1981 Springbok Tour.

Please see Chapters 11 and 13, Ngati and Mauri respectively.

The Raglan Golf Course dispute centred on Māori land that had been confiscated by the State from Tainui for defensive purposes in World War II. At the end of the war, the land was returned and instead was set aside by the local council to be turned into a golf course at Raglan. The leader of the Raglan Golf Course dispute was Eva Rickard, who would be an influential activist in the Māori protest movement and also star in the 1988 film Ngati. Rickard had been arrested in 1978 for a sit-in protest, which had been filmed by John O’Shea’s Pacific Films Unit and televised to a national audience.

Please see Chapters Five, Six, 11 and 12, The advent of biculturalism, The Two world-view, Ngati and Mauri respectively.

Please see Film case study 1, Rewi’s Last Stand.

Emphasis is placed on the word Satan because the Vicar shouts the word at his congregation.

There is more than a passing resemblance to the killing of the Reverend Carl Volkner by the Pai Mairire (Hau Hau movement) at Opotiki in 1865 in the beheading of the “Vicar”. On 1 March 1865, Volkner was captured by
the Hau Hau, accused of spying and passing information to the Crown. Volkner was sentenced to death in a makeshift military court and executed on 2 March. A chief, Mokomoko from Te Whakatohea in the Eastern Bay of Plenty was captured and charged with Volkner’s death. Although Mokomoko denied responsibility in the murder, he was sentenced to death and hanged in 1866. In 1981, Te Whakatohea sought a pardon from the Government for Mokomoko and in 1988, the iwi were allowed to exhume his remains from Mt Eden Gaol. In 1992, the Government pardoned Mokomoko posthumously for the murder of the Reverend Volkner.

Please see Chapters Seven, Eight and Nine, Rewi’s Last Stand, Broken Barrier and To Love a Māori respectively.

In Babington (2007, pp.159-160), the author draws reference to James Cowan’s 1934, The Adventures of Kimble Bent and ‘A Bush Court Martial’, Tales of the Māori Bush, A.H. & A.W. Reed, Wellington. In Cowan’s account the murderer Wi Heretangi is captured and subject to a ‘log court-martial’ in a similar fashion to how Te Whēke is tried in Utu. This referencing in Utu shows the attention to detail by Murphy and his crew to New Zealand history, and literature, when bringing the work to the screen.

There are further references in this scene to the historical murder of Volkner and execution of Mokomoko. Both Te Whēke and Mokomoko were tried in makeshift military courts and executed. Upon sentence of death, Mokomoko stated: “Tangohia mai te taura i taku kaki kia waiata au i taku waiata” (Take the rope from my throat that I may sing my song). In the observance of cultural protocols in the execution of Te Whēke, the condemned man sings his final waiata before his death. What the performance of a waiata reinforces is that both Mokomoko and Te Whēke die in Māori cultural terms, rather than be executed by the Crown.

Moloney (2001, p.159) notes that “facial tattooing” was considered to be a “savage” practice by those intent on ranking different groups of people on the scale of civilisation. When visiting New Zealand in 1835, Charles Darwin compared Māori unfavourably to Tahitians due to the practice of Ta Moko. Darwin (quoted, in Moloney, p.159) stated “one glance at their respective expressions, brings conviction to mind, that one is a savage, the other a civilised man”.

There is a similarity between the character of Kura and the historical figure of Lucy Takiora. Lucy Takiora was a guide, interpreter, scout, spy, mistress and mediator in the New Zealand wars of the 1860s throughout which Takiora had shifting alliances between Māori and Pākehā. Takiora is credited with causing the last known fatalities in Titokowaru’s war by providing information about Titokowaru to the Crown. As a result, Takiora was labeled a traitor by Taranaki and due to her status as a “mistress” she was also shunned by European society. Takiora’s mother, Kotiro, was a former slave who was taken by Nga Puhi in a raid. Kotiro had a mission education and married the Pākehā shopkeeper, Alexander Grey. Kotiro is the woman that likened Hone Heke to a pig’s head which resulted in Heke and his followers being labeled traitors. As a result, Takiora was labeled a traitor as well.

There is a similarity between the character of Kura and the historical figure of Lucy Takiora. Lucy Takiora was a guide, interpreter, scout, spy, mistress and mediator in the New Zealand wars of the 1860s throughout which Takiora had shifting alliances between Māori and Pākehā. Takiora is credited with causing the last known fatalities in Titokowaru’s war by providing information about Titokowaru to the Crown. As a result, Takiora was labeled a traitor by Taranaki and due to her status as a “mistress” she was also shunned by European society. Takiora’s mother, Kotiro, was a former slave who was taken by Nga Puhi in a raid. Kotiro had a mission education and married the Pākehā shopkeeper, Alexander Grey. Kotiro is the woman that likened Hone Heke to a pig’s head which resulted in Heke and his tāua ransacking Kotiro’s family store. Please see Belich (1988; 1993); Cowan, (1983, Reprint of edition first published 1922-23 edn) and Wilson (1985).

Please see Chapters Four and Five, The advent of biculturalism and The two world-view model respectively. In particular Chapter Five, Section 5.2 Issues of race/ethnicity and class in the Treaty of Waitangi settlement process where Mason Durie makes explicit that biculturalism was implemented into State policy in its developmental stage.

Please see Film case study 5, Ngati for Barclay’s views on making the film and its political dimensions and implications.

Broken Barrier was made in 1952, whereas Ngati is set in 1948.

Please see Chapters Nine and Ten, To Love a Maori and Utu for further analysis of the role the State played in the protest movements and the 1981 Springbok Tour.

Please see Sections 5.2, Issues of race/ethnicity/class in Treaty settlement process and Section 5.5, Cultural clashes and cultural differences, Chapter Five, The two world-view model.

Please see Section 5.5, Cultural clashes and cultural differences, Chapter Five, The two world-view model.
Wi Kuki Kaa played the role of Wiremu in *Utu*, making the ultimate personal sacrifice when he agrees to execute his brother, Te Wheke, to restore the balance and ensure peace.

Merata Mita had planned for some time to bring an adaptation of *Cousins* to the screen, a dream which upon her death, remained unrealised. Please see (New Zealand Film & TV 2010, ‘Leading Film Maker Merata Mita has passed away’. Retrieved 23 August 2010, from http://newzealandfilmtv.co.nz/2010/06/leading-film-maker-merata-mita-has-passed-away/.

Please see Film case study 6, *Mauri* for full synopsis of the film and cast details.

Please see Chapters Four, Five, Six, Ten and 11, *The advent of biculturalism, The two world-view model, Māori cultural nationalism, the Māori renaissance and Māori women*, and Ngati respectively for an analysis of the social contexts that informed *Mauri*. Please also see the Film case study 6, *Mauri* for the pivotal role Merata Mita’s works played in capturing moments from that historical time period. In particular, *Bastion Point: Day 507 and Patu!* that presented the Springbok Tour from the protestors’ perspectives.

At the 2010, 'Mana Wahine Māori Lecture Series, Aotahi: School of Māori and Indigenous Studies, University of Canterbury', Christchurch, 23 April 2010. Retrieved 15 May 2010, from http://www.maori.canterbury.ac.nz/soundbites/mita.wma, a question was put from the floor regarding a “new taniwha rising” with reference to Rogernomics. The director gave her assent that she was, indeed, unaware of what the future held in relation to the economic changes after *Mauri*. The inference drawn from the questions to and responses by Mita was that “what the future held” referred to the reforms of biculturalism and Rogernomics, and the impacts on Māori and New Zealand society. While this will be discussed in more depth in the critical analysis, Mita made distinctions between “collaborators” who sided with non-Māori interests over Māori concerns (in direct reference to Niki Caro and *Whale Rider*) and “corporates” (Māori who worked for powerful institutions).

Please see Chapters Five and Six, *The two world-view model and Māori cultural nationalism, the Māori renaissance and Māori women* respectively.

The term “cultural safety” refers to the work of Ramsden, I (1988-1990), *Kawa whakaruruhau: Cultural safety in nursing education in Aotearoa/the Hui Waimanawa, Otautahi, 1988, Hui Piri ki Ngā Tangaroa, Manawatu, 1989, Hui Raranga Patai, Te Whanganui a Tara, 1990*, prepared by the Education Officer, Māori Health and Nursing', ed. Ministry of Education. IM Ramsden, Wellington. In the 1990s there were considerable debates on the issue of cultural safety with regard to nursing practices with Māori patients. Cultural safety was an extension of the idea of “cultural sensitivity” toward Māori which had arisen through the critical dialogue of cultural understandings (or potential misunderstandings) within the bicultural framework. Cultural safety advanced a policy in nursing practice of understanding the effect of colonial structures on Māori patients and provided an alternative model framed around notions of tino rangatiratanga. Trainee nurses, nurses, medical staff and teaching staff were required to evaluate their own cultural values, biases and attitudes in relation to Māori, and to critically examine their roles in the colonial structures in postcolonial New Zealand. Cultural safety was to become part of the national curricula of nursing and was to be a core requirement of registration for nurses. This policy was met with considerable opposition and reached its climax when a Christchurch Polytechnic trainee nurse, Anna Penn, went to the media with her grievances. Please see Fleras and Spoonley (1999, pp.99-106) for a more in depth analysis of the cultural safety policy and the opposition to its implementation.

In 1979 Dun Mihaka challenged the long-standing court rulings that only allowed the use of English in the New Zealand Court system. Mihaka asserted his right to speak Māori in the Courts in what became known as the “Te Reo Māori case”. Mihaka won his case in the Court of Appeal and it was this legal ruling that sparked the 1986 Waitangi Tribunal Ruling on te reo Māori. Please see Mihaka (1984) and Claim Wai 11, Te Reo Māori.

Please see Chapter Three, *Key thematics* and Film case study 6, *Mauri* for Merata Mita’s experiences when filming *Patu!*

Please see Film case study 7, *Once were warriors*. In particular the criticisms aimed at the film for ignoring the historical, political and social context of the urbanisation of Māori.
In Mauri, Māori film director and broadcaster, Don Selwyn, portrays the older Police Officer. Selwyn would direct the first Māori language feature film with the Merchant of Venice (2002) and also played a crucial role in bringing the adaptation of Alan Duff’s Once were warriors (1994) to the screen.

Please see Chapters Five and Six, The advent of biculturalism and The Two-world view respectively.

Please see Chapters Six and Ten, Māori cultural nationalism, the Māori renaissance and Māori women, and Utu respectively.

Please see Chapter Six, Māori cultural nationalism, the Māori renaissance and Māori women.

There is reference in the notion of the Māori child as full inheritor of the new nation in a scene in a film called The Land of Fury (also known as The Seekers) (1954). The plot revolves around the adulterous affair between Moana, the wife of Chief Tepe and settler-adventurer, Jack Hawkins. The affair leads to a number of ramifications where Hawkins and his settler wife, Marion Southey are killed in a conflict. They leave a newborn child in the arms of Chief Tepe or literally, “holding the baby”. What this scene suggested is that the future of New Zealand rests with the settlers and their children as eventual, true inheritors of the land.

Please see Film case study 6, Mauri.

Please see Film case study 7, Once were warriors.

Please see Chapters Four, Five and Six, The advent of biculturalism, The two-world view model, Māori cultural nationalist, the Māori renaissance and Māori women respectively.

Please see Film case studies 7 and 8, Once were warriors and Whale Rider regarding questions on the legitimacy of both Duff and Caro to present Māori-oriented works.

Please see Section 4.5, Māori in the 1990s, Chapter Four, The advent of biculturalism.

Ibid.

Please see Section 5.3, Race relations and the two world-view model, Chapter Five, The two world-view model.

Please see Section 5.3, Race relations and the two world-view model and and 5.5, Cultural clashes and cultural differences, Chapter Five, The two world-view model.

Please see and 5.5, Cultural clashes and cultural differences, Chapter Five, The two world-view model.

Please see Sections 6.1, 6.4 and 6.5, Māori cultural nationalism, Notions of authenticity and an unacknowledged index of exemplar and Te Ao Māori – traditional Māori as authentic, Chapter Six, Māori cultural nationalism, the Māori renaissance and Māori women.

Please see Sections 6.1, Māori cultural nationalism which sets out the tenets of Māori cultural nationalism in Chapter Six, Māori cultural nationalism, the Māori renaissance and Māori women.

The theme of the cultural alienation of Māori through the impact of colonisation was evident across all State Sector domains such as health, education and justice.

This notion of destiny being within the Māori group’s “grasp” is also identified as a key thematic in Whale Rider (2002). Please see Hokowhitu (2008, p.59).

It is important to note that Kai Tahu have a different creation tradition to the standard accounts taught in New Zealand schools. In Kai Tahu’s traditions, Papatūānuku had a previous husband, Tangaroa, who returned to find her married to Ranginui. A conflict ensued where Ranginui was injured and fell upon Papatūānuku, and could not remove himself. Due to the suffering of their children because of the forced conjoining, the parents asked their children to separate them.

In the scene where Bully is liaising with women in the public bar, Jake states “if I wanted to drink with women I’d drink in the bloody lounge bar alright?”.

“Whakapohane” would be the title of Te Ringa Mangu (Dun) Mihaka’s 1990 work. Famously, Mihaka had practised whakapohane in 1983 on Prince Charles and Princess Diana, the Prince and Princess of Wales when they visited New Zealand. In 1986, Mihaka was arrested and charged with dangerous driving, due to driving a van with the image of whakapohane on it, in the vicinity of the royal motorcade carrying Queen Elizabeth II.

In Mauri, Māori film director and broadcaster, Don Selwyn, portrays the older Police Officer. Selwyn would direct the first Māori language feature film with the Merchant of Venice (2002) and also played a crucial role in bringing the adaptation of Alan Duff’s Once were warriors (1994) to the screen.

Please see Chapters Five and Six, The advent of biculturalism and The Two-world view respectively.

Please see Chapters Six and Ten, Māori cultural nationalism, the Māori renaissance and Māori women, and Utu respectively.

Please see Chapter Six, Māori cultural nationalism, the Māori renaissance and Māori women.

There is reference in the notion of the Māori child as full inheritor of the new nation in a scene in a film called The Land of Fury (also known as The Seekers) (1954). The plot revolves around the adulterous affair between Moana, the wife of Chief Tepe and settler-adventurer, Jack Hawkins. The affair leads to a number of ramifications where Hawkins and his settler wife, Marion Southey are killed in a conflict. They leave a newborn child in the arms of Chief Tepe or literally, “holding the baby”. What this scene suggested is that the future of New Zealand rests with the settlers and their children as eventual, true inheritors of the land.

Please see Film case study 6, Mauri.

Please see Film case study 7, Once were warriors.

Please see Chapters Four, Five and Six, The advent of biculturalism, The two-world view model, Māori cultural nationalist, the Māori renaissance and Māori women respectively.

Please see Film case studies 7 and 8, Once were warriors and Whale Rider regarding questions on the legitimacy of both Duff and Caro to present Māori-oriented works.

Please see Section 4.5, Māori in the 1990s, Chapter Four, The advent of biculturalism.

Ibid.

Please see Section 5.3, Race relations and the two world-view model, Chapter Five, The two world-view model.

Please see Section 5.3, Race relations and the two world-view model and and 5.5, Cultural clashes and cultural differences, Chapter Five, The two world-view model.

Please see and 5.5, Cultural clashes and cultural differences, Chapter Five, The two world-view model.

Please see Sections 6.1, 6.4 and 6.5, Māori cultural nationalism, Notions of authenticity and an unacknowledged index of exemplar and Te Ao Māori – traditional Māori as authentic, Chapter Six, Māori cultural nationalism, the Māori renaissance and Māori women.

Please see Sections 6.1, Māori cultural nationalism which sets out the tenets of Māori cultural nationalism in Chapter Six, Māori cultural nationalism, the Māori renaissance and Māori women.

The theme of the cultural alienation of Māori through the impact of colonisation was evident across all State Sector domains such as health, education and justice.

This notion of destiny being within the Māori group’s “grasp” is also identified as a key thematic in Whale Rider (2002). Please see Hokowhitu (2008, p.59).

It is important to note that Kai Tahu have a different creation tradition to the standard accounts taught in New Zealand schools. In Kai Tahu’s traditions, Papatūānuku had a previous husband, Tangaroa, who returned to find her married to Ranginui. A conflict ensued where Ranginui was injured and fell upon Papatūānuku, and could not remove himself. Due to the suffering of their children because of the forced conjoining, the parents asked their children to separate them.

In the scene where Bully is liaising with women in the public bar, Jake states “if I wanted to drink with women I’d drink in the bloody lounge bar alright?”.
It is important to note that in the novel Grace’s rapist was unknown and Grace suspected Jake was the rapist. In the novel she hangs herself not at her own home, but symbolically at the home of her wealthier Pākehā neighbours.

It is acknowledged that Nig’s facial tattoo may best be described as “kirituhi” rather than Tā Moko. Tā Moko is usually associated with the whakapapa of an individual, their connection to āwhānau, hapu, iwi, cultural and spiritual beliefs. Kirituhi is more Māori inspired art or design. The use of the term Tā Moko in relation to Nig’s facial tattoo is due, in part, to its popular use in New Zealand society for Māori facial tattooing. Please see Simmons (1997).

In essence this is correct, but Beth comes from the ariki and/or rangatira lines of descent. While it is never explicitly stated how close Beth is to the chiefly lines of descent, one can infer by her “puhi” status that she was high ranking in her whakapapa.

Please see Chapters Four, Five and Six, *The advent of biculturalism, The two-world view model, Māori cultural nationalist, the Māori renaissance and Māori women* respectively.

Ibid.

Please see Film case study 8.

Please see Appendix 4, *Mana wahine references.*


Titewhai Harawira is a veteran activist and protestor. As at 2010, her son Hone Harawira is currently the Member of Parliament for Te Tai Tokerau and in the Māori Party.

Please see Section 6.5, Gender, Chapter Six *Māori cultural nationalism, The two world-view model and Māori women.*

Please see Film case study 8, *Whale Rider.*

Please see Chapter 15, *Conclusion.*

It is important to note, however, that Anna is not “Pākehā” as the term “Pākehā” is used to explicitly identify New Zealanders of European descent.

The waka utilised in *Whale Rider* is a waka taua, which in traditional times, was a war canoe. The vessels are no longer used for warfare and are largely ceremonial. Waka taua are powered by people paddling through the water. This is to demonstrate the strength and mana of the group.

Tipuna is an ancestral name, which will have particular significance to a āwhānau, hapu and iwi.

Please see Chapter Six *Māori cultural nationalism, the Māori renaissance and Māori women.*

Homi Bhabha’s concept of hybridity or “third space” refers to the notion of “in-betweenness” or the straddling of two cultures and/or the ability to negotiate differences between the same. Hybridity is where, produced under specific conditions of colonialism, the governing authority undertakes to translate the identity of the colonised and produces something similar, but new. (Please see, Bhabha 1994a; 1994b; Meredith, 1998). The reason why the author advocates a different position in this analysis is that Māori via the directive codes in the film are being urged to maintain culture, heritage and a secure Māori cultural identity to negotiate internal and external threats. In terms of the main subject area of the film, namely gender, the director is advocating a similar position to Irwin (1992), Johnston (2005), Johnston & Pihama (1995), Pihama (2001), Mahurika (1992), Matahaere-Atariki (1991), McIntosh (2001), Mikaere (1994; 1995), Pere (1988), Ralston (1993), Sykes (1994) Te Awekotuku (1991), Whiu (1994; 1999b) for the acknowledgement of the role of women and leadership in Māori society. While the impact of the colonial process is deferred in *Whale Rider*, mana wahine contributors are asking for the restoration of the role of women based upon ancient tradition that has been distorted as a result of colonisation. Both positions, however, grant salience to resolution within a cultural context.

Jonny, *Broken Barrier*, Wiremu (at the conclusion of *Utu*), Tama and Riki (*To Love a Maori*), Iwi and Greg Shaw (*Ngati*), Older Police Officer and Willie Rapania (*Mauri*), Dooley (*Once were warriors*) and Rawiri (*Whale Rider*)
Tama Te Heu Heu (Rewi’s Last Stand 1940), Te Wheke (Utu)

Greg Shaw (Ngati), Rewi/Paki (Mauri), Tama (To Love a Māori), Jake (Once were warriors)

Tama Te Heu Heu (Rewi’s Last Stand, 1940), Rewi Maniapoto (To Love a Māori, 1925), urban Māori criminal (To Love a Māori) Te Wheke (Utu), Herb (Mauri), Jake (Once were warriors) and Bully (Once were warriors)

Tama Te Heu Heu (Rewi’s Last Stand, 1940), Rewi Maniapoto (To Love a Māori, 1925 and 1940), Te Wheke (Utu), Herb (Mauri), Jake (Once were warriors), Tama (To Love a Māori), Herb (Mauri), Jake (Once were warriors) and Koro (Whale Rider)

Tama and Riki (To Love a Māori), Rewi/Paki (Mauri), Iwi (Ngati), Dooley, Boogie, Nig and Toots (Once were warriors), Porourangi and Rawiri (Whale Rider).

Jonny (Broken Barrier), Te Wheke and Wiremu (Utu), Iwi (Ngati), Willie and Rewi Rapana (Mauri), Jake (Once were warriors) and Koro (Whale Rider)

Tama Te Heu Heu and Rewi Maniapoto (Rewi’s Last Stand), Te Wheke (Utu), Young Police Officer, (Mauri), Jake (Once were warriors) and Koro (Whale Rider)

Tama Te Heu Heu and Rewi Maniapoto (Rewi’s Last Stand 1940), Jonny (Broken Barrier), Tama (To Love a Māori), Wiremu (Utu), Iwi (Ngati), Willie Rapana (Mauri), Boogie (Once were warriors) and Rawiri (Whale Rider).

Please see Section 6.6, The place of Māori women in Māori cultural nationalism and biculturalism, Chapter Six, Māori cultural nationalism, the Māori renaissance and Māori women.

219 The author would like to acknowledge the work of Sacha McMeeking who guest lectured on this subject in the Mana Wahine Māori Guest Lecture Series, Aotahi: School of Māori and Indigenous Studies, University of Canterbury, 22 May 2007.

220 New Zealand’s Top 100 History Makers, Prime TV/Visionary TV/Olonne Productions, New Zealand, 2005.

221 The Birth of New Zealand (1922) was directed by Harrington Reynolds and produced by Tiki Films.

222 The melodramatic trope is a dramatic form, which is characterised by excessive sentiment, together with exaggerated, sensational and thrilling action. Please see Abrams (2005).

223 It is important to note that Ramai Te Miha, who would become Rudall Hayward’s second wife, was given “top billing” as an actress in the 1940 version, above the other lead actors. This indicates that Rewi’s Last Stand was a star vehicle for Ramai Te Miha in the 1930s and 1940s which in terms of “race”, and gender was unprecedented. Usually, “coloured” actors of this period, played one-dimensional minor roles in films.
Please see Chapter Seven, *Rewi’s Last Stand*.

Some commentators credit *The Land of Fury*, (also known as “The Seekers”) (1954) as the first New Zealand feature film to be made in colour.

Hayward remade *Rewi’s Last Stand* (1940) to provide a historically accurate account of the Battle of Orakau Pa, framed by James Cowan’s version of the New Zealand wars. Similarly, John O’Shea’s *Broken Barrier* (1952) seeks to present a “true” story of the Māori which is articulated by the main character of Tom Sullivan (the journalist and writer of fanciful tales from the South Pacific).

Please see Film case study 6 *Mauri*, for more information about Merata Mita’s career.

*Patu!* which focused on the 1981 Springbok Tour from the protestors’ point of view, won awards at the Amiens Festival of Films against racism in 1983.

Please see Chapter 14, *Whale Rider* for further analysis of Mita’s comments in relation to the film.

Please see Section 10.7, The Springbok Tour, Chapter Ten, *Utu*.

Please see Section 3.5, The State and the Arts, Chapter Three, *Key theomatics*.

In 1996 Eva Rickard spoke at a student hui for Te Wiki o Te Reo Māori (Māori Language Week) at the University of Canterbury where she was highly critical of the settlement between Tainui and the Crown.


Don Selwyn, who played the older Police Officer in *Mauri*, was instrumental in bringing the adaptation to screen including securing Māori actors to play parts in the work.

Riwia Brown makes a small cameo appearance in the film.

Riwia Brown’s first draft was rejected by the New Zealand Film Commission and it would take negotiations, and endorsement from Māori leaders for the funders to give the project their approval.


Please see Pearson (1968, p.87). In the encyclopedia of New Zealand it was stated that “… there was once a distinctive Māori architecture and art”, the author asserts that “… their meaning and purpose is of the past and they linger on in practice only as traditional crafts. Their motifs have been used effectively in decorative schemes but their original purpose and significance have vanished and, with them, the creative impulse. No Māori artist of stature has yet arrived. The process of integration has isolated the Māori of today from the living meaning of the arts of his forefathers, and his culture must, from now on, be one with that of his European neighbours”.


The stress on “like” is Barclay’s own.


Please see Chapters Four, Five and Six, *The advent of biculturalism, The two-world view model and Māori cultural nationalism, the Māori renaissance and Māori women* respectively.