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Abstract

As a public medium and a vehicle of "culture", which frames and comprehends social priorities, relations and identities, news has received scant anthropological attention (Spitulnik 1993).

Whanganui Iwi’s occupation of Moutoa Gardens in 1995 was made available to a public as "news". My project reveals a range of exclusions around these mediations, which conjure wider issues regarding the production of representations within (post)colonial contexts. As a contribution to anthropology, my ethnography responds to the limitations of traditional ethnographic praxis, providing a productive response to criticisms of the discipline and revealing the public value of ethnographic sensibilities.

Whanganui Iwi believed the Gardens to be the historical site of Pakaitore pa. The area was reclaimed as a marae, shelters were built, the perimeter fenced, and Iwi lived on site for 80 days. The initiative constituted an expression of Iwi’s experiences of exteriority within Wanganui and their frustration with the delay of the Crown’s response to their claims alleging breaches of Treaty of Waitangi. Iwi temporarily inverted their relationship to the Pākehā community by establishing a literal boundary to the marae, which rendered those who were not supportive of Iwi aspirations "outsiders". While access to the marae was controlled, and restrictions were placed on news workers, the only group banned from the marae were the employees of the city’s newspaper, the Wanganui Chronicle.

My project details the production of news about Pakaitore, and the attempts of Iwi to control their representation; specifying the role of "location" (both spatial and ideological) in the production of written and photographic accounts (Haraway 1991). I examine how the structures of news production are deployed and contested by news workers, and the manner in which news texts may or may not be "inhabited" by their subjects and publics.
I compare the journalistic practices of Chronicle workers, prior to and following their ban, with those of out of town newsworkers from press and television. The mechanisms, codes, and values of what makes "good" news structure particular locations for news workers, and this largely precluded conveying the intention and experience of nga Iwi at Pakaitore. This extended to the reports gathered by the reporter for TVNZ (the state owned broadcaster), who, as Iwi whānau, was allowed unfettered access to the marae.

Being "the news" interfered with agendas inside the marae. From this location, Pakaitore was about building relationships between hapu and strengthening a sense of community. Hui addressed the status of Iwi within Wanganui, and rangatahi and visitors were educated in tribal history and tikanga. These priorities contest the "outside" perspective that Pakaitore was simply an attempt to antagonise Pākehā authorities.

Throughout the course of my fieldwork visual aspects of media representations of Pakaitore were cited by a range of my informants as conveying particular authority. In some contexts this was by way of revealing the "truth" about the threat of protest to social cohesion, while in others it provided evidence for the media's inability to represent the initiative in a manner that was sympathetic to, or representative of, Iwi whānau. I argue that the privileging of the disembodied visual reproduces myths of "otherness", covering over experiences of embodied "difference" and the history which renders activism intelligible.

My project reveals that in Aotearoa/New Zealand, those contesting the Pākehā imaginary of a "post-racist" culture are cast as producing racial disharmony.
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I am at a Wellington restaurant with a friend I am staying with on this research trip. I do not know anyone else at the table; half a dozen men wearing ties make the conversation. They are talking about their work and the ways new right politics favour their interests and I am quiet. I don't know how to talk about these things in the way they do. These are not the kinds of conversations I am used to, and I wonder what would happen to this evening, somebody's birthday, if I inserted my politics into the conversation. I won't do that to my friend. I feel uncomfortable but I smile back at the man looking at me. It is interesting what I can hear when I am quiet. I am outside this conversation not only because what I want to say inhibits my participation, but also because of the intimacy between these friends, their shared meanings, jokes I don't get.

"I wish Ken was here" says a man. The others laugh again. Different people have said this several times already, everyone understands that it means something and that it is a good joke. I imagine an absent friend who knows how to have a good time like these lads. And so I ask.

"Who's Ken?"

"Ken Mair". More laughter. I know these people don't know the topic of my research or that I have recently interviewed Mair, a Māori activist, and I am intrigued. 

"Why do you wish he was here?" I ask

"So I could take him outside and beat the shit out of him".

I have made assumptions about the man sitting next to me. He wears a t-shirt, he is Fijian, he does not work with a computer shifting money around. On this basis I am puzzled by his participation (does he imagine he is not somehow constituted by the racism that circulates in and underpins this conversation?). So it is him that I ask what this talk of Ken is about. They hate him, someone should shut him up.

My cue.
Why don't you question the story the news has told you? But I don't really want to get into this here. I know how I am being read. I am pleased that the man across the table won't look at me any more.
introduction

making the news at Pakaitore: a multi-sighted ethnography

The production of "Ken Mair" is one of several themes central to my project of examining the politics through which certain meanings become authorised in specific contexts. I interrogate the production of knowledge, both within media and the academy, and the ways in which this is variously deployed and contested within wider communities. My ethnographic focus is the community of interest which formed around the occupation of Moutoa Gardens, a park in central Wanganui which was reclaimed as Pakaitore marae by local Iwi. On February 28, 1995, members of Iwi whānau and their supporters moved onto the site and lived there for 80 days. My agenda is to investigate the ways in which this initiative carried different meanings for a range of participants, and to reveal the mechanisms through which the translation of these events into "news" constrained their meaning in a manner which favoured local Council and Crown interests.

This work emerges from the frustration I experienced at the lack of sense I was able to make of these events as I followed television and press coverage of the occupation. At the time I was in living in Dunedin (I have family in Wanganui) and the occupation frequently featured on the evening news and in the local paper. As I elaborate in the following chapters, Whanganui Iwi were characterised by this coverage as doggedly adhering to an illegitimate position which threatened social stability.

While I had a desire to know what was "really happening" in Wanganui my particular interest was in the way these events were produced as news stories; initially this was the material that

---

1The term "occupation" can connote a range of meanings: the two which may be inferred by the press's use of the term are "taking or holding possession esp. of country or district by military force" or "tenure" which is distinct from ownership. An "occupier" is defined as a person in "temporary or subordinate possession" (O.E.D.). While this latter meaning does not reflect the desire of Iwi it reflects the power of the Crown to constitute their status as subordinate. When I use the term I imply the Crown's positioning of Iwi in relation to the land, and the caveat that ownership of the site (and much of Wanganui) remains contested.
constituted my experience of these events\(^2\). Such an analysis cannot be confined to the interrogation of media texts. Textual analysis has a range of limitations: it is indicative rather than illustrative of the specific practices news making consists of and the ways texts are read by their consumers. Further, it can tell us little about the experience of being the subject, or producer of, the news. My intention is to ventilate critique fashioned through theory by employing a fine grained analysis of the contestability of meaning. I use ethnographic methods to evaluate and critique the destabilising of meaning central to recent strategies of textual criticism, by mapping the cultural contexts in which texts are produced and disputed by actors embedded within broader discursive and political frameworks. In this respect my agenda corresponds with the socio-semiotics articulated by Gottdiener (1995), according to whom, signs must be considered in relation to their social context and as constituted by historically contingent articulations of power\(^3\).

The events at Pakaitore/Moutoa Gardens were unaccessible to me, not only in the practical sense that I had work commitments that required me to live elsewhere, but also in the sense that as manuhiri my place was not at the marae. The agenda of those at the marae was specific to Iwi of the region, and the occupation was publicly criticised by the chairman of my Iwi (Ngāi Tahu). My distance in this respect seems somewhat at odds with a traditional ethnographic agenda, for as Geertz (1988) suggests:

> The ability of anthropologists to get us to take what they say seriously has less to do with either a factual look or an air of conceptual elegance than it has with their capacity to convince us that what they say is a result of having actually penetrated

\(^2\)As Hartley details, the process of making news requires a translation of events into stories which accord with the values of news organisations and the expectations of the majority audience (Hartley, 1982: 8-11). Using semiotic methods Hartley illustrates the specifics of the ideological bias of discourse composition in the making of news.

\(^3\)Gottdiener’s formulation of socio-semiotics is motivated by a critique of the idealism of deconstruction. Postmodern criticism of representation and the renderings of knowledge derived from the theory of Baudrillard, Derrida and Lyotard rely, along with these authors, on a critique of Saussure’s model of the sign. Gottdiener contends that by following alternate models of semiosis; those articulated by Pierce, Barthes (in Mythologies and The Fashion System), and Bakhtin, in conjunction with Foucault’s specifications regarding the operations of power, an analytic framework which enables attention to ”the articulation between sign systems and exosemiotic processes of politics and economics while recognising the power-knowledge articulation” may be crafted (Gottdiener 1995: 25). Thus the agenda of the researcher is to interrogate the cultural context beyond the text; and ”to engage in critical discourse regarding the articulation between media, or mass cultural forms, power, and material culture”(ibid: 31).
(or, if you prefer, been penetrated by) another form of life, of having, one way or another, truly "been there". And that, persuading us that this off stage miracle has occurred, is where writing comes in (Geertz, 1988: 4-5).

I contend that under some circumstances "being there" can in fact be at odds with one's agenda. While travelling to Wanganui to observe news media may have been a plausible alternative to being at the marae, particularly as media were my intended focus, I was concerned that the politics of this association may impede my access to Iwi. For the project I had in mind it was crucial for me to "play all sides" of these events in order to interrogate a multiplicity of meanings and experiences. "Being there" would have produced a substantively different project: I was aware that the local paper had been banned from the marae, there was tension between police and occupiers, and the local council was preoccupied with defending their legal ownership of the site. Under these circumstances my presence at any of these locations could never constitute an unobtrusive access to the complexities of events, in as much as I would never be an "objective" witness to them (that is, without political, ethical and scholarly investment).

So it was after the occupation had ended that I went to Wanganui, and later Wellington and Auckland, to trade on the reflective moment rather than attempt to witness these events first hand. I anticipated that this would be more conducive to a "playing of all sides". In tracking the meanings produced around Pakaitore, my course of research engages with the multiple sites where news is sourced and selected by newsworkers, and engaged with by readers and viewers in their processes of meaning-making. An ethnographer of the contemporary mediated environment cannot be bound to a single location; thus I offer an example of a multi sited ethnography as described by Marcus4. In this sense my "field" became the living

---

4Marcus (1995) documents the increasing tendency within anthropology towards "multi sited ethnography", a mode which "moves out from the single sites and local situations of conventional ethnographic research designs to examine the circulation of cultural meanings, objects and identities in diffuse time - space. This mode defines for itself an object of study that cannot be accounted for ethnographically by remaining focused on a single site of intensive investigation. It develops instead a strategy or design of research that acknowledges macrotheoretical concepts and narratives of the world system but does not rely on them for the conceptual architecture framing a set of subjects. This mobile ethnography takes unexpected trajectories in tracing a cultural formation across and within multiple sites of activity that destabilise the distinction, for example, between lifeworld and system, by which much ethnography has been conceived. Just as this mode investigates and ethnographically constructs the lifeworlds of variously situated subjects, it also ethnographically constructs
rooms, news rooms and offices of my informants, the cafes of Wellington, Wanganui and Auckland, and of course in front of my television and daily paper in Dunedin.

Some of my respondents were amenable to reflecting over these events. My requests for interviews with workers at the Wanganui Chronicle were readily granted; there was an apparent desire to talk through their frustration with their ban from Pakaitore as part of an attempt to understand it. A reporter who covered the occupation for the Chronicle told me:

I still haven't figured out what the hell went on [and] I just can't be bothered with all this Māori shit any more. I've made no headway, I've put a lot of emotion and time into it as well as shutting out my home life for three months because of the occupation. I was working long hours, the same subject day in, day out and I was always unpopular. We were getting it from the other side too: "how dare you cover them, it's because you're giving them publicity that they're there". I hoped it would all go away and I'd get over it. I'm not over it yet, its still there.

To me these comments voice the difficulties of trying to produce cross cultural representations and, in the process, position oneself as impartial. In his attempt to render both sides of the dispute the reporter was read as politically positioned by both supporters and critics of the occupation.

This reporter allowed me to follow him on his rounds so that I could observe and discuss with him the process of making news stories. I also interviewed the editor of the paper and spent many hours with the secretary who helped me access and collate press clippings. I later interviewed her about her experiences in the news room and wider community over the time of the occupation. I also interviewed journalists from TVNZ, a sub editor from The Dominion in Wellington, the reporter who covered the occupation for The Evening Standard in Palmerston North and a feature writer from Metro who has written on Māori radicalism. This work with news producers gave me access to the language, practices and protocols of the
different aspects of the system itself through the associations and connections it suggests among sites" (Marcus, 1995: 96).
business and enabled me to interrogate the codes through which news is made. All but two of these respondents were Pākehā. The way I characterised my research to these respondents was simply that I was researching the relationship between protesters and media at the Gardens. My own opinion or agenda was never solicited. I believe that at times my fair skin was read as sympathetic to some newworkers' perceptions of unjust treatment by Iwi.

It is necessary, then, to address the character of my complicity with Iwi and the manner in which I differentially positioned myself (and was differentially positioned) in various interview contexts. When interviewing Pākehā news workers and police I allowed their assumptions about me to frame our discussions. I did not explain that I was wary of the claims newsmakers make to impartiality and objectivity; that I am compelled by Haraway's agenda whereby she states "I am arguing for politics and epistemologies of location, positioning, and situating, where partiality and not universality is the condition of being heard to make rational knowledge claims" (Haraway 1991: 195). There was a very different character to the relationships I formed with my informants from Pakaitore, where my fair complexion signified differently. Mindful of the politics of knowledge production in this country, I was reluctant to explain I was an anthropologist.5

As I made initial contact with some of the spokespeople from Pakaitore I made it clear that my agenda was to investigate the specific processes and dynamics which led to the censuring of local and national media by Iwi whānau. Rather than interrogate the legitimacy of their actions, or search for the "authentic" activist behind the media image, I wanted to discuss Iwi's experience of news media. My request for interviews and the nature of my research were discussed at hui and consent was granted. In the course of my research the privilege and responsibility this access represented was made explicit by one of my respondents, who, after a long day of talking told me:

---

5 In this particular anthropological moment, who gets to "tell" about indigenous peoples in (post)colonial societies is a political issue. The manner in which anthropology represents and forms relationships with its subjects has generated debate and (in some contexts) a reflexivity about the ethnographic project has emerged (see for example Ruby 1982; Clifford and Marcus 1986; Fox 1991; James, Hockley and Dawson 1997).
We want to be clear about people. We want to be clear about you too, Sue. So in a sense I'll give you the benefit of the doubt - my hope is that you will use whatever it is we do here for our benefit, and that's why we talk ... Judith Binney came down, Niko might have hinted there was a possibility of a book. Judith Binney! No way were we going to have her write our story. All the information was on my computer. Fortunately we had bought our computer home, its a powerful machine that machine. There was no way we were going to tell her things unless she was there all the time. You have a different perspective so its not quite the same, but I'm happy to talk to you, you tell our part of the story in a different context.

Previous lack of control over both academic and media representation of nga Iwi allowed me a particular type of access, based on the assumption that I would do things "differently". Yet, while I do not assume to speak for Iwi whānau I remain uncomfortably aware that the silencing of particular types of voice of nga Iwi by the media enables my ethnographic voice, in effect compounding the silence of my respondents. In other words, the possibility of my voice is premised on the exclusion of Iwi's narratives from media, while the context in which I write cannot disrupt this aspect of media practice. To allow the assumption that benefits may accrue to Iwi whānau through my work in an academic context is analogous with the "anthropological irony" noted by Geertz, whereby the colonial context which frames the ethnographic encounter is fictitiously rendered by both parties as able to be affected through the anthropologist's role. This consists of pressure to regard "these goals as near when they are in fact far, assured when they are merely wished for, and achieved when they are at best approximated. This pressure springs from the inherent moral asymmetry of the fieldwork situation" (Geertz, 1968: cited in Marcus, 1997: 90).

The character of the relationship between ethnographer and informants under what Marcus terms "the changing mis-en-scene" of fieldwork is contentious, and the ethnographer is not merely the producer of "innocent" knowledge but rather is politically constituted: "the

---

6 I will of course make this work available to my respondents and have asked if I can speak about my work at hui.
anthropologist, by virtue of these changing circumstances of research, is always on the verge of activism, of negotiating some kind of involvement beyond the distanced role of ethnographer, according to personal commitments that may or may not predate the project" (Marcus, 1997: 100). Under these conditions the anthropologist and informant share an affinity which arises from their mutual curiosity and anxiety about their relationship to a "third" - not so much the abstract contextualising world system but the specific sites elsewhere that affect their interactions and make them complicit (in relation to the influence of that "third") in creating the bond that makes the fieldwork relationship effective ... complicity here rests in the acknowledged fascination between anthropologist and informant regarding the outside "world" that the anthropologist is specifically materialising through the travels and trajectory of her multi sited agenda (ibid).

If I allow that the occupation produced two sides to the dispute, (I am hesitant to reduce the multiple perspectives and agendas of my informants in this way, however this was how events were at times rendered by news media and my informants) then my relationships were triangulated in this manner with respondents from news media in our mutual fascination about the occupation. A common interest in the initiative, and the media's representation of police involvement, facilitated my rapport with police. I shared with Iwi an interest in news media and the way in which the occupation was rendered as "news". It is in my engagement with the latter that I am personally committed in a manner which renders my role commensurate with Rosaldo's (1993) description of the ethically invested anthropologist:

The social analyst's multiple identities at once underscore the potential for uniting an analytical with an ethical project and render obsolete the view of the utterly detached observer who looks down from on high. In this respect, my argument parallels Walzer's discussion of social critic who is connected to a community, not isolated and detached. Rather than work downward from abstract principles,
social critics work outward from in-depth knowledge of a specific form of life. Informed by such conceptions as social justice, human dignity, and equality, they use their moral imagination to move from the world as it actually is to a locally persuasive vision of how it ought to be. Because different communities differ in their problems and possibilities, such visions must be more local than universal (Rosaldo, 1993:194).

This is not a simple position to occupy\(^7\), and I wish to avoid a simplistic rendering of heroes and villains. Indeed, my focus is not on the character of individuals, be they newsmakers or the subjects of news stories, but on the broader discursive formations they conjure. My informants represented a range of political positions and agendas, from the explicitly racist to what might be considered an extreme position on indigenous rights. For example, one of my respondents from the marae rendered the "One Law" group which staged counter protests as the local "upholders of the Ku Klux Klan". This statement at once positions those who contest an indigenous rights perspective as dangerously racist, and on another level intimates a correlation between Iwi whānau and the explicitly violent persecution of Blacks in the U.S. South. While I certainly take the experience of racism seriously, and later in this chapter identify similarities in media depictions of Blacks vis-a-vis Māori, this particular rendering fails to attend to the local specificity of racisms. For me, naming particular practices, discourses, desires as "racist" can only mark an analytic beginning. As a strategy to dismiss what we fear, the labelling of "racists" may conceal, rather than reveal, the mechanisms through which privilege is reproduced.

\(^7\)As Haraway explains: "there is a premium on establishing the capacity to see from the peripheries and the depths. But here lies a serious danger of romanticising and/or appropriating the vision of the less powerful while claiming to see from their positions. To see from below is neither easily learned nor unproblematic, even if 'we' 'naturally' inhabit the great underground terrain of subjugated knowledges. The positionings of the subjugated are not exempt from critical re-examination, decoding, deconstruction, and interpretation; that is, from both semiological and hermeneutic modes of critical inquiry. The standpoints of the subjugated are not 'innocent' positions. On the contrary, they are preferred because in principle they are least likely to allow denial of the critical and interpretative core of all knowledge. They are savvy to modes of denial through repression, forgetting, and disappearing acts - ways of being nowhere while claiming to see comprehensively. The subjugated have a decent chance to be on to the god-trick and all its dazzling - and therefore blinding - illuminations. 'Subjugated' standpoints are preferred because they seem to promise more adequate, sustained, objective, transforming accounts of the world. But how to see from below is a problem requiring at least as much skill with bodies and language, with the mediations of vision, as the 'highest' techno-scientific visualisations" (Haraway 1991: 191).
At the other extreme, a respondent who worked within a news organisation explicitly characterised Māori as "other" to the community and a threat to its stability:

I don't know why they call us racist, we have a Māori page every Monday, especially for their topics, like we have a farming page or a church page. Maybe its because they have such dissension within their own ranks ... instead of being ruled by white people and the Queen they want a Māori king or queen to be appointed and therefore they would change all the laws into their own favour. And the way they are thinking they could dispossess us all of our land. If they were to claim all the land that we have settled in the last 150 years, where would the white people go? The mind boggles.

While these comments are produced through a dearth of understanding of issues pertaining to and voiced by Iwi Māori, that these perspectives were not disrupted by my informant's extensive engagement with media coverage over the course of the occupation is somewhat disquieting.

For the most part, the discourse of my informants was not this objectionable. Indeed, I have selected these comments from broader discussions in much the same way as news workers select a comment or sound bite to furnish the "hard angle". Comments such as these extended from profound investments in the status of Iwi Māori, and within this project I offer a context which unsettles the authority of these caricatured positions as "news". I argue that those rendered "extreme" deflect attention from the more pedestrian racism which is sanctioned by "mainstream" cultural positions. "Extremes" function within my site of inquiry to allow the "centre": the ostensibly impartial press, law, and government agencies, to reproduce their appearance of objectivity. Specifically, the way the occupation was produced as news stories, through both words and images, reveals the partiality of this "centre".

Because nga Iwi at Pakaitore had been rendered "extreme" by media, and their tactics condemned by mainstream politicians and conservative Māori, I entered my relationships
with them ambivalently. My concerns regarding how I would be viewed by Iwi were in part formed by portrayals of them as insular and dogmatic in news reports. This was tempered by my assumption this proclivity of newsmakers effaced the complexity of the agendas of Iwi whānau and the history which produced their initiative as reasonable. I surmised that many news providers, particularly those outside of large metropolitan areas, had not engaged with processes of self reflexivity, which within anthropology have disrupted the traditional production of "others".

Within the contests over meaning that constituted events at Pakaitore the assessment of the legitimacy of the position of Whanganui Iwi in relation to the state entailed moral claims from both sides. State and public outrage assumed the occupiers were morally wrong in their action because they were acting outside of Pākehā law. For Iwi the law was failing to address the Crown's obligations under the Treaty of Waitangi which had produced contemporary socio-economic inequities. The sustained presence of clergy at the marae relied on the moral authority of the gospel to suggest what the response of council should be. Within these debates the validity of Māori claims of "oppression" were assessed. I am explicitly committed to indigenous rights\(^8\), and this directly implies my arbitration of these debates around meaning and ethics. In his discussion of the reasons for the occupation Moon dismisses the socio-economic disadvantage of Māori as a contributing factor in such a way that distances those at the marae from broader manifestations of inequity. He casts the dispute as specifically focused on land ownership, overlooking what these resources would enable for Iwi:

Some in the media also tried to draw a link between the occupation of the Moutoa Gardens and the low socio-economic status of Māori, pointing out that Māori, while being just 17 percent of population of Wanganui, made up 40 percent of

---

\(^8\)The colonial encounter between Māori and Pākehā has been characterised by the continuing struggle for Māori to assert their rights under the Treaty of Waitangi; to protect cultural practices in the face of state policies of acculturation. According to Walker "The Māori stoutly resisted colonial despoliation -- by defending their land against invasion, by guerrilla warfare, by petitions to the British Sovereign, and by political means such as the formation of Māori parliaments. But these efforts are not part of the collective memory of the Pākehā New Zealander. Attempts at accommodation with the colonising power by educated Māori leaders were interpreted by the Pākehā as signalling Māori acceptance of their subordinate place in society" (Walker 1990: 39).
Wanganui's unemployed and over half the apprehended criminal offenders. However, such views failed to take into account the momentum of Māori activism that had been gathering speed over many months, and the shift in emphasis among a growing number of Māori in the resolution of Treaty grievances - from a stance of compromise to one of asserting independence. The link between a low socio-economic status and subsequent protest also implied that the occupation of the Moutoa Gardens was not really about ownership or sovereignty at all, but instead, was a veiled reaction to low employment and income levels, low health and education standards and so on. To make such an assertion not only devalues the real purpose of the occupation, which was continually and unambiguously articulated by the protest leaders, but is also condescending in its attitude towards all Māori. Besides, rather than being dominated by young radicals, heated by resentment and bent on revolution, the Moutoa Gardens protesters were drawn from all sectors of the Māori community, some of whom had previously invested several years in trying (unsuccessfully to that point) to regain Māori control of the Wanganui River through existing legal channels. They were certainly not part of some lost drifting unemployed criminal class (Moon, 1996: 30-31).

This analysis fails to make the imperative connection between the alienation of resources and the contemporary socio-economic status of Māori. According to one of my informants, a spokesperson for the occupation, the occupation was "to tell the Crown that they can't continue to do this to us. We can't continue to watch our kids go down the damn gurgler". In these words an explicit correlation is drawn between the relationship of Crown to Iwi and the difficulties facing Māori youth. Moon's account also misrepresents the role of the leadership of the protest, which was not simply to promote select interests, but rather to represent the interests of Iwi as a whole, including whānau who may be characterised as a "drifting unemployed criminal class". Implicit within Moon's account is the presumption of

9 According to a 1993 report, Māori comprise 13 percent of New Zealand's population and are "this country's poorest, unhealthiest, worst housed, least educated group ... Almost a quarter of the Māori work force is on the dole. Almost half all prisoners in jail are Māori. Forty-four percent of Māori families are headed by a sole parent. The only welfare benefit not paid to Māori out of all proportion to their numbers is the pension, because hardly any of them live long enough to collect it" (McLoughlin 1993: 61).
individualist rather than community directed imperatives. His account relies on the assumption that as an impartial outsider he can identify the "real" meaning of the occupation, and this perspective relies not only on his distance, but on a caricatured understanding of what constitutes a "radical".

Over the days I spent with Sister Makareta Tawaroa, who ran the press tent at the marae established at Pakaitore, I was given access to a range of materials including press releases prepared at the press tent and video tapes of several marches and demonstrations which were filmed by a TVNZ cameraman who gave footage to Iwi. Over a series of interviews Sister detailed protocols at Pakaitore marae, (particularly those established to deal with the influx of news crews), activities that took place during their stay, and the ways in which these were affected by or necessarily unavailable to media workers.

My role in collating the variety of materials and stories provided by my respondents is not to offer a definitive version of these events. My range of informants: police, journalists and other news workers, Iwi and their supporters, were convinced of the propriety of their own position and actions. According to reporters their stories were pursued and reported in a professional and impartial fashion in accordance with the particular codes of news practice. Iwi had a range of general and specific criticisms of the misrepresentations produced by news media and the invasiveness of media presence, accompanied by a conviction of the validity of their own position. The police Superintendent in charge of operations at the Gardens lauded the efforts of his team and claimed media coverage was at times irresponsible and misrepresentative. Accordingly, a feature of my analysis is to reveal the disparate terms through which various parties evaluated their participation, rendering the "truth" of events problematic and consensus or resolution an impossibility.

While news stories formed a dominant narrative of these events (particularly in a sense that this was the one accessible to those who were not there) the alternative ways of telling by my informants problematise these meanings and illustrate how these events happened differently for participants with different stakes in them. This is particularly illuminating in relation to
my Iwi informants who drew on knowledges resistant to the logic of the (post)colonial state. On one level this illustrates the obvious and widely researched claim that the ways events and people are re-presented, as "news" is a process of authoring through which some meanings are privileged over others. On further levels, examining the experience of "being the news" mitigates the theoretical authority of semiotic and discursive analysis in general. In my particular case this authenticates my theoretical voice.

**Pakaitore/Moutoa Gardens as Contested Terrain**

The different meanings attached to Pakaitore/Moutoa Gardens indicated that there were fundamentally disparate protocols and agendas for the uses of this space. For Nga Iwi of Wanganui the reclamation of the site was a way of expressing grievances over the acquisition of Māori land and the consequences of colonisation for Māori. One of my respondents told me:

> It was a time of reaffirmation for us, of connecting back to the land, and also for affirming what tino rangatiratanga really meant for us as a people ... Pakaitore was about justice, it wasn't about Māori - Pākehā relations. We weren't only talking about Pakaitore, we were talking about the whole of Wanganui ... we specifically chose that piece of land to highlight the issues because that's where the sale of Wanganui took place.

As this comment suggests, while one agenda at Pakaitore was to publicise grievances in relation to alleged breaches of the Treaty of Waitangi, this was not the only motivation behind the occupation. For those at the marae it was also an opportunity to educate the young in local tikanga and address historical rivalries between hapū. One of my informants told me:

> I didn't want to follow [the media coverage] because in a way it wasn't our greatest concern. Our greatest concern was trying to build unity, and I think that was one of the most wonderful things that happened. There was a measure of understanding that I hadn't seen, I don't think anyone had seen this century. Just
being together. The lower river (Tupoho) and upper river had fought at Moutoa, and that's always been on our minds. Where in the history of humankind would you have whites killing whites for blacks? Well [the battle at Moutoa] was blacks killing blacks for whites.

The staking of a claim to this territory by Nga Iwi of Wanganui was rendered by news media (in line with the position of local council) as an unlawful occupation of the two acres of land. Coverage from the Wanganui Chronicle documented the illegality of building structures and living on the site, and the process through which the Council went to the High Court to prove their ownership rights. The dissonance of the Chronicle's stance with the position of those at the marae is made explicit by the editor's comments:

If they hadn't talked about sovereignty they could have had their marae - let's face it isn't the most popular park in town. But then the sovereignty issue surfaced - they kept changing the rules and that really pissed people off ... nobody knew what they wanted, this is not disputed land. In all the years I've lived here I've never heard of Pakaitore. There had never been any claim on it, it had nothing to do with the Treaty of Waitangi.

The history of Whanganui Iwi's claims under the Treaty is explained by Brown:

The dispute over rights to the Whanganui, the country's longest continuously navigable river, began 108 years ago with a petition complaining at a loss of traditional fishing rights. It is the longest running legal case in the our history and has been through almost every forum for which it is eligible. Even when it has fallen out of public view, the river grievance has been alive and kicking in the oral history of local Māori. Over the past decade, preparations of claims for the river and the Waimarino Block (currently a national park) has focused tribal identity (Brown, 1995: 20).
The alienation of Iwi land and resources through Pākehā settlement was fraught with misunderstanding. A research paper commissioned by the Waitangi Tribunal on land purchases in the district details that a court of inquiry into land transactions prior to 1840, conducted by William Spain, found there was little consensus among chiefs regarding the sale of land, much ambiguity around the particular areas involved and inadequate payment received for it (indeed the chiefs who sold the land lacked the authority to do so). Governor Hobson instructed that all transactions prior to the signing of the Treaty were invalid, unless the Government approved the title, but nevertheless Spain decided that a "partial sale" had taken place. The New Zealand company was awarded 40 000 acres of land and Māori given 1000 pounds to complete the transaction. Māori retained control of all pa and land under cultivation under the agreement, however no mention was made of the river. When, in May 1848 the sale was finalised at Pakaitore 86 000 acres were specified in the deed of sale, although Spain's award was only for 40 000. No further payment was made for this extra land (Cross, 1995: 17-39):

Spain concluded that the Māori's understanding of the transaction was limited, the payment had been improperly distributed, and only limited Government consent had been gained for the sale. "Given these admitted shortcomings in the conduct of the purchase, it is doubtful whether the Crown should have accepted the Whanganui deed as a valid conveyance (The Evening Post, April 3, 1995: 2).

Pakaitore Marae was the site through which broader Iwi frustrations of the dubious legality of transactions and the alienation of control of the River were articulated. Historically Pakaitore Pa has been a significant site for local Iwi. It was a major fishing settlement and later an important trading place. Māori occupation of the site ended when it became a parade ground for the 57th regiment; from 1847 to 1868 Wanganui was a garrison town in order to defend settlers from local Iwi (Moon, 1996: 8). During this period John Ballance was editor of the local paper and participated in attacks on local Iwi:
There were two other cavalry patrols during December [1868]. The first was a “looting expedition” mounted by Finnimore’s Wanganui Cavalry Volunteers, probably including Trooper John Ballance. Finnimore rode out on 13 December, moving by night to keep his presence secret from the Māori. Finnimore intended to give them a dose of their own medicine by ravaging the unoccupied and undefended villages in their rear... They reached Manutahi at 4am, found it empty, burned it, and proceeded to a nearby small hamlet where an old Pakakohe couple were keeping the home fires burning for their people. According to Livingston, a reliable source “they murdered two old Māoris, a man and a woman, burnt their bodies and did other atrocities, which if done by the Māoris on us would create a great sensation”. The “atrocities” included some form of sexual mutilation - the grim likelihood is that the man’s genitals were severed and placed in his mouth (Belich, 1989: 209-10).

Pakaitore is also the site where the "sale of Whanganui" to the New Zealand Company was signed, and it is where a monument was erected by Pākehā to thank lower river Iwi for defending settlers against the upper river Iwi in 1864, who, under the auspices of the Hauhau movement wished to expel the settlers (Brown, 1995: 22). The monument is dedicated to the "friendly Māori" who defended "law and order against fanaticism and barbarism". Later in the century Pakaitore was "a site of a refuge for Māoris [sic] who had transgressed against law and order. If they could reach their sanctuary before being apprehended they were safe for the time being and they knew that" (Warburton, 1906: 75-6, cited in Moon, 1996).

However the historical record regarding the geographical site of Pakaitore Marae is disputed and contradictory. While there is no doubt that what is now Moutoa Gardens is of significance in terms of the monuments erected, the High Court disputes that Moutoa Gardens is the historical site of Pakaitore pa. According to Moon:

On the balance of evidence submitted, [to the High Court] it is beyond dispute that the council owned the Moutoa Gardens at the beginning of 1995. It is also
clear that from 1839 onwards, Pakaitore Marae was never on the Moutoa Gardens site, and if it had been previously, there is no evidence, either written, archaeological or otherwise to confirm this. In addition some evidence seems to suggest that the Pakaitore Marae, during the earliest stages of European settlement in Wanganui, was on land that had been washed away by the Wanganui River by the end of the nineteenth century (Moon, 1996: 18).

This version of history and geography is not accepted by Iwi whānau. The written and photographic history of the region provides contradictory evidence. As Moon (1996) notes, despite his testimony above, varied accounts "revolve around the extent to which the area was utilised by Māori, and there is clearly a great deal of variation of views on this (Moon, 1996: 13). In light of the New Zealand Company's securing of over twice the land they had paid for, coupled with the lack of specification made about the river, the focus on determining whether Moutoa Gardens is the historical site of Pakaitore seems somewhat pedantic.

Theorising news (in) culture

The academic provocations for this project emerge from several literatures which bear on my ethnographic context. I offer a contribution to the nascent study of media within anthropology, and supplement scholarship within Aotearoa/New Zealand on the constraints which operate to deny Māori self representation, drawing attention to the colonial amnesia which underpins mainstream renderings of Iwi aspirations. Further, my anthropological agenda suggests some limitations of the scholarship on news conducted within media and communication studies. Within the following account I deal with each of these relevant literatures, elaborating my engagements throughout the project.

anthropology and media

Spitulnik wrote in 1993 "there is as yet no "anthropology of mass media" (Spitulnik, 1993: 293). She proposes that there are "numerous angles for approaching mass media anthropologically: as institutions, as workplaces, as communicative practices, as cultural
products, as social activities, as aesthetic forms and as historical developments”, however, she suggests:

the greater challenge lies in integrating the study of mass media into our analyses of the “total social fact” of modern life. How, for example, do mass media represent and shape cultural values within a given society? What is their place in the formation of social relations and social identities? How might they structure people’s senses of space and time? What are their roles in the construction of communities ranging from subcultures to nation states, and in global processes of socioeconomic and cultural change? (ibid: 293).

I engage with some of these concerns through my analysis of news production within Wanganui, citing the role of news media within the formations of community around the occupation. My attention to the cultural roles of news and the localised contests around them also conforms to the nature of anthropological inquiry into media as described by Ginsburg (1994a):

I would argue (as do others) that our work is marked by the centrality of people and their social relations - as opposed to media texts or technology - to the empirical and theoretical questions being posed in the media as a social form, whether we focus on its production, modes of representation, or reception .... if there is some original contribution to be made by an ethnographic approach, it is to break up the “massness” of the media, and to intervene in its supposed reality effect by recognising the complex ways in which people are engaged in processes of making and interpreting media works in relation to their cultural, social and historical circumstances [my italics] (Ginsburg, 1994a: 13).

While anthropological attention to news has been limited, engagements with other forms of media reveals the utility of anthropological tools for comprehending the roles of media within cultures. Dickey (1997) suggests that
Anthropologists, as it turns out, are entering media studies at a time when the field has posed the kinds of questions that our methods and theoretical approaches are especially well equipped to answer. In particular, we can and should ask how different people create and use different media, and how those media are embedded in social, political, and economic systems. Using the standard ethnographic techniques of participant observation and qualitative research methods, anthropologists have begun to examine the ways that viewers, readers and listeners respond to media - how they interpret the 'messages' they 'receive'; how they use representations to comply with and contest the ideologies embedded in texts, and to create identities and imagine other realities; and how they organise social, cultural and political activities around the media (Dickey 1997: 415).

Critiquing the scholarship on mass media conducted within traditional sites of inquiry, Abu Lughod observes

Many of the studies of popular culture, and especially television, that I have come across are disappointing. They do not seem to be trying to offer profound insights into the human condition, or even into the social, cultural, and political dynamics of particular communities - goals anthropology has always, perhaps with hubris, set for itself (1997: 110).

Abu Lughod (1993) advises a "thickness" of description, which brings together the analysis of production, reception and media texts. Within her field site the deployment of such an agenda reveals a differentiated audience of the renderings of national culture screened in popular television serials.

Barry Dornfeld's (1998) ethnography of the production of public service television responds to his perception of a lack in attention to this site of inquiry:
The profitable reorientation towards the study of audiences has left in its wake a shallow pool of research on production processes, and a limiting theorisation of producers as conduits of corporate ideologies. We need to rethink producers as particular types of agents, producing media texts within contexts constrained by both culture, ideology and economy, but operating within particular social locations and frameworks, not floating above society, as many approaches to the study of media forms seem to imply. This kind of reorientation would allow us to discuss with greater specificity and clarity the relationship between media forms and practices and the larger public spheres they produce and are situated within (Dornfeld 1998: 13).

Dornfeld's work on the Childhood television documentary series uses methods of participant observation to detail the production of the series and the manner in which it framed cross cultural child rearing practices. Painter (1994) also combines methods of textual analysis and fieldwork in television production in his study of the depiction of youth in Japanese media.

Anthropological attention to mass media has contested and accounted for articulations of "others" in mainstream representations (Hamilton 1990; Russel 1991; Ginsburg 1993; O'Barr 1994; Feldman 1994; Conklin 1997), and in a related and often overlapping site of inquiry attended to indigenous self representation through media technologies and its cultural specificities and complexities\(^{10}\) (Burnett 1990; Ginsburg 1991, 1994b, 1995; Langton 1994; Sullivan 1993; Conklin 1997; Dávila 1998). Hamilton (1993) maps the displacement of

---

\(^{10}\)Ginsburg's work on media production by Australian Aborigines, for example, explores the role of indigenous production within a (post)colonial context enshrined in paradox, where the local deployment of media technologies takes place within national and global contexts: "The complex mediascape of Aboriginal media, for example, must account for a range of circumstances, beginning with the perspectives of Aboriginal producers, for whom new media forms are seen as a powerful means of (collective) self expression that can have a culturally revitalising effect. Their vision coexists uneasily, however, with the fact that their work is also a product of relations of governing bodies that are responsible for the dire political circumstances that often motivated the Aboriginal mastery of new communication forms as a means of cultural intervention" (Ginsburg 1994b: 366); "I want to emphasise that the social relations built out of indigenous media practices are helping to develop support and sensibilities for indigenous actions for self determination. Self representation in media is seen as a crucial part of this process. Indigenous media productions and the activities around them are rendering visible indigenous cultural and historical realities to themselves and the broader societies that have stereotyped or denied them. The transnational social relations built out of these media practices are creating new arenas of cooperation, locally, nationally and internationally. Like the indigenous producers themselves, I suggest a model that stresses not only the text but also the activities and social organisation of media work as arenas of cultural production. Only by understanding indigenous media work as part of a broader mediascape of social relations can we appreciate them fully as complex cultural objects" (ibid: 378).
locally produced media and the ascendancy of transnational product emerging from state censorship in Thailand; Spitulnik's (1997) analysis of the circulation of media discourse within Zambia charts the mediation of communities and the milieu through which linguistic innovation is facilitated; and Conklin (1997) investigates the deployment of traditional dress by Amazonian activists as theatre to engage the sympathies of transnational ecology movements.

Within this body of work a number of strands instruct my project. My attention to the role of media within a local community, and the broader discursive frameworks interpolated within it, necessitates engagement with the cultures of news production (as recommended by Ginsburg 1994a; Spitulnik 1993; Abu Lughod 1993, 1997; Dickey 1997 and Dornfeld 1998). Within this context I register the public value of anthropological sensibilities, and note moments where the practices of newsmakers may be rendered "ethnographic"11. In my qualitative analysis of news texts I draw theoretical provocations from those who are represented by them. This aspect of my project is informed by an anthropological tradition of ethically and politically fraught efforts to represent subaltern perspectives; I at once critique media representation as largely failing in anthropological terms, but as I have indicated, cannot escape certain problematics of re-presenting "others" within my own project.

extra-disciplinary mediations

Within media, communication and cultural studies, despite calls for multiperspectival approaches to media (Hall 1980; Kellner 1995; Deacon et al 1999), the tendency is for attention to be limited to a particular site of either the political economy or production of media, the analysis of the linguistic, semiotic or discursive features of texts, or the reception of media by audiences.

11Here I refer to a contemporary attention to positionings; this is contrary to Lett's contention that "for the journalist, being objective means being fair to everyone involved; for the anthropologist, being objective means being fair to the truth" (Lett 1987:258), in the dual sense that news values often result in the privileging of institutionalised authority, and the vaunting of scientific objectivity in relation to anthropological endeavours has received much criticism. See also Ruby's (1982) discussion of the "ethnographic-ness" of new journalism.
In their propaganda model of the political economy of news media Herman and Chomsky (1988) argue that, as businesses, news organisations adhere to the specific logic of profit accumulation. Media organisations are responsive to their most powerful markets and news is "filtered" to accord with the interests of advertisers, government and owners of news organisations. While this approach in its entirety does not map with my interests, there are elements which I find instructive: their attention to the profit imperative of news, the preference within news organisations for official or state sources, and the disciplinary function of "flak" from owners and the public. However, I would be reluctant to imply an explicit intention to favour dominant interests within the production of news (as "propaganda"). Rather, the relevant frame for my study is the codes, practices, conventions and traditions defining what is considered "newsworthy", the broader cultural frameworks they invoke, and the way in which these codes are deployed or contested by newsworkers and those they represent.

A fundamental distinction made by newsworkers is between "hard" and "soft" news. The best news is "hard": it is dramatic, of widespread or immediate concern, or involves violence or conflict. "Human interest" or feature stories are "soft news". News must fit within the time frames determined by broadcast or print deadlines and time slots or copy space. The complexity of issues must be minimised and a perspective given which accords with the assumption of a majority audience. Within this milieu there are constraints on providing

---

12While the reduction of Chomsky's approach to "conspiracy theory" is misrepresentative of the comprehensive empirical evidence he provides for his propaganda model, his focus on political economy enables the telling of a particular story which effaces the presence of people, as both employees and audiences.

13Bell's discussion of news values adapts the widely cited work of Galtung and Ruge (1973) (Bell 1991: 156-60). The values he lists determining the newsworthiness of events and actors are: negativity (including accidents, disasters, conflict, deviance); recency; proximity (news value is enhanced when an event is local); consonance (when the expected occurs; when people behave according to cultural or sub cultural tropes); or conversely, unexpectedness; unambiguity (clear facts, sound sources); superlativeness (the most sensational or dramatic of a type of event); relevance (to the intended audience /'ordinary viewer'); personalisation; eliteness (of people / nations); attribution (sources are affiliated to elite institutions); facticity (numbers, names, places etc, are favoured over concepts or processes). The values Bell lists which determine newsworthiness as it relates to the news gathering process are: continuity (once something has become news it tends to remain so); competition (between news organisations for the hard stories); co-option (a high profile, continuing story will incorporate marginally related events) composition (balance of local, national and international stories); predictability (stories are sought at places where news is likely to happen, such as courts, parliament, etc) prefabrication (ready made text from another source). For other studies of new values and practices see Gans 1979; Hartley 1982, 1992a&b; Ericson, Baranek and Chan 1987; Mancini 1988; Zelizer 1990; Clayman 1990; Byerly and Warren 1996; Roth 1998; Deacon et al 1999.
sympathetic coverage of raced "others". This reflects broader cultural marginalisations. In accounting for poor news coverage of raced minorities scholars have cited the conventions of news practice which operate within raced contexts (whereby journalists represent status quo expectations) and which manifest in textual features such as stereotyped, reductive, or sensational reportage. This is maintained through the under recruitment of minority news workers.

Walker (1990) outlines, with recourse to the linguistic selection and sourcing of news stories, the manner in which Pākehā media sensationalise and misrepresent Māori in stories such as those pertaining to gangs, protests at Waitangi, and Tribunal claims, concluding that:

"In any contest between Māori and Pākehā over land, resources or cultural space, media coverage functions, unwittingly or otherwise, to maintain Pākehā dominance. The Fourth Estate is controlled by Pākehā. It selects events it deems newsworthy, which usually centre on violence, conflict and competition. When"

14 Aotearoa/New Zealand, the period following World War Two was marked by the rapid urbanisation of Māori to meet the demand for labour created by industrialisation. The State and industry actively recruited Māori labour and by 1976, 76.2 percent of Māori lived in urban areas (in 1936 the figure was 10 percent) (Spoonley, 1990a:14). The experience of racism and monocultural institutions among urban born Māori was articulated through activism from the late 1960s. During the 1970s activist initiatives included protests staged by Nga Tamatoa, a group largely associated with the University of Auckland, which included protests on Waitangi Day. The Māori Land March of 1975 and occupation of Bastion Point in 1977 also aimed to raise public awareness of racism and breaches of the Treaty. Walker (1990) contends that "the rising tide of Māori activism was identified through the news media with a few disaffected young radicals disturbing social harmony and dividing the races. On the issue of race relations, the Fourth Estate represented establishment thinking and functioned to maintain the status quo -- that is, Māori subordination" (Walker, 1990: 39).

15 Campbell (1995) analyses press and television news coverage of the Martin Luther King, Jr. Holiday in the U.S. January 18 1993. He concludes that "the ultimate message of nearly all the coverage of the King holiday viewed for this study was that American racism was a thing of the past. The occasional contradiction of that notion was overshadowed by the dominant theme of story telling and imagery that testified to America as a melting pot ... Considering the more typical coverage of people of colour on local television news - coverage that tends to marginalise and stereotype members of ethnic minorities - the existence of this other world becomes more profound. If our society is the just and fair one that was portrayed on King Day, the constant barrage of menacing images of minorities that more commonly appear in local TV news will undoubtedly fuel racist attitudes" (Campbell 1995: 57). For other studies of racialised news coverage and organisational practice see Hartman and Husband 1973; Entman 1992, 1994; Van Dijk 1988,a,b;& Hartley 1992a; Hartley and McKee 1996; Walker 1990; Spoonley 1990 a&b; Jakubowicz 1994; Rodriguez 1996; McQuail 1992; Cottle 1998; McGregor and Te Awa 1996; Abel 1997; Parisi 1998.

16 Similarly, Spoonley (1990b) argues that: "The shorthand style of the media's reporting is a fundamental problem. It starts with the one-word definitions used by the media to categorise people. A label such as activist/radical protestor/demonstrator automatically invokes a negative perception. Those such as Atarata Poananga or Titewhai Harawira, who are labelled in this way become folk devils to the extent that they are used to illustrate the 'excesses' of Māori activism. Their comments and activities become a caricature, and even in reports where the labels are not used, the convention is sufficiently well established for the reader, viewer or listener to supply the appropriate label for themselves" (Spoonley 1990b: 33).
these events involve Māori and Pākehā it consistently represents the Pākehā status quo, helping them to maintain their power (1990: 45-6).

McGregor and Te Awa (1996) contend that Māori are under represented by New Zealand news media, both in terms of reportage and the sourcing of stories, and in terms of employment within news industries. With reference to broadcast news, McGregor and Te Awa argue that stories pertaining to Māori may rely on sensationalism and fail to provide a context for events. Sources for news, they argue, are "overwhelmingly white male and institutional" (McGregor and Te Awa, 1996: 238). They argue that "what is largely unexamined in New Zealand scholarship is how the news media cover Māori news and why the coverage is so poor" [my italics](ibid: 239).

Abel's (1997) study of television news coverage of Waitangi Day protests concludes that the influence of Māori in the journalistic process, along with wider social changes in regard to the status of the Treaty of Waitangi have led to some self reflexivity in the making of news. However, the nature of the news making process means that news remains shaped by a Pākehā world view. She contends that:

News workers set out to do their job as well as they can given the constraints and conventions within which they work. But these constraints are enormously demanding, particularly the constraints of time and of maintaining a mass audience, and mean that stories are simplified and dramatised, historical background and complexity are minimised, and the range of possible views is generally limited to two clearly defined and opposing positions (Abel, 1997:185).

Augmenting this scholarship on news in concurrence with contemporary anthropological preoccupations, my project attends to the multiple sites within which news circulates, constitutes and is engaged with by a community. I detail the practices of newsworkers within different organisations; registering that news codes are neither uniformly deployed or uncontested; thus rendering visible the way significance is differentially assigned as a product
of organisational and political location. I move beyond an analysis of stereotypes, providing a "socio-semiotic" analysis of news texts, which elucidates the broader discursive formations enlisted by the producers and readers of news.

An important caveat to studies of the political economy, production and discursive features of news is that the cultural life of media subsequent to its circulation in printed or visual form is customarily neglected or assumed. Responses to problematic conceptions of media audiences have been revised through inquiry into the nature of textual reception, often through the use of "ethnographic" methods (Morley 1980; de Certeau 1984; Radway 1984; Ang 1985; Morley and Silverstone 1990; Moores 1990; Fiske 1987 & 1989; Wark 1993). A tendency within these projects has been the equation of "creative" decodings with power. My opening anecdote to this project describes a creative use of "Ken Mair" in a collusion between men across differences of class and ethnicity in a fantasy of violence towards a specific (mythic) black body, but it is, of course, racist. Bordo (1995) likewise responds to Fiske's (1987) position that "consumption" is in fact another site of production where "there is power in asserting one's own subcultural values against the dominant ones":

Note in Fiske's insistent, repetitive invocation of the category of power, a characteristically postmodern flattening of the terrain of power relations, a lack of differentiation between, for example, the power involved in creative reading in the isolation of one's own home and the power held by those who control the material production of television shows, or the power involved in public protest and action against the conditions of that production and the power of dominant meanings -- for instance racist and sexist images and messages -- therein produced (Bordo, 1995: 261).

In an earlier ethnography of consumption (Tait, 1993) I illustrated that multiple and creative meanings are made from media texts, but that resistance in the moment of reception does not

---

17 Swingewood (1977) provides an overview of the rendering of ignorant "mass" audiences in the work of scholars such as de Toqueville, Eliot, and Nietzsche. Contemporary theorists similarly constitute media viewers and readers as a "mass" in tutelage to the culture industries; see for example Adorno and Horkheimer 1977; Habermas 1989; Jameson 1984; and Kellner's edited collection on Baudrillard (1991).
easily unsettle the ways we experience ourselves in the variety of locations we inhabit in the material world. Similarly, Jensen (1990) argues that:

oppositional decodings are not in themselves a manifestation of political power in any specific or relevant sense. The wider ramifications of opposition at the textual level depend on the social and political uses to which the opposition may be put in contexts beyond the relative privacy of media reception18 (Jensen, 1990: 58).

Within this project I remain suspicious of theory which assumes rather than reveals the processes of consumption, yet my agenda is not to celebrate the creativity of consumers; rather I acknowledge the complicity of some consumers with the raced contexts underpinning news production. My primary concern is to identify and elaborate meanings made by my respondents who were represented within news stories, or who work within news industries. While this 'authenticates' my theoretical voice, it also grounds my analysis in the specific struggles over meaning my respondents are engaged in.

In chapter one I examine the production of "Ken Mair" through the Chronicle's account of the beheading of the statue of John Ballance in Moutoa Gardens several months before the site was reclaimed. I locate this act within the wider context of political iconoclasm. Through analysing and comparing the written and photographic text of the paper's account of this event I address the production of affect and the power and contestability of the visual. Through analysis of the news text, response to this coverage by members of the public, and by assessing the intentions of the editor, I engage with Barthes' theorising of the production and reading of myth, arguing that Mair was mythologised as the presence of racial tension in Wanganui. This chapter introduces my analysis of the "culture of news" and the roles of news within cultures which I elaborate throughout the chapters which follow.

18 For further re-evaluations of audience research see Kellner 1995; Ang 1996; and Deacon et al 1999.
In chapters two, three and four I detail the processes through which the Chronicle made the occupation into news. This coverage is problematised by comparing the Chronicle's reports and selection of photographs with coverage from other media and the views of Iwi. By playing a range of ways of telling about Pakaitore together I reveal the legitimisation claims on which various perspectives were premised. I consider that the legitimacy of discourses was arbitrated through recourse to a range of knowledges (for example, the law, journalistic codes of practice, the gospel, the Māori vis-a-vis the English version of the Treaty). I address the manner in which particular discourses are authorised in specific contexts. Each chapter addresses a theme which attends to the locations from which knowledge is produced. In chapters two and three I examine the Chronicle’s positioning prior and subsequent to their ban from Pakaitore. In chapter four I focus on the role of media in legitimising state authorities and the sites from which these are contested.

In chapter five I elaborate on the nature of journalistic processes and the ways in which these were experienced by Nga Iwi at the marae. I compare the medium of the press with television news. Some of the news workers I interviewed who worked within these media claimed that the requirement of concision prohibited the production of representative news coverage. With this in mind I compare a thirteen minute current affairs story, "Pa or Park", with news reports. I extend my analysis of news imagery beyond the press photograph, and assess the role of the visual within televised reportage. I conclude with the assertion that news workers who produced exceptional coverage (in that it rendered the protester’s position sympathetically) may be characterised as employing an "ethnographic" process and sensibility.

In chapter six I draw together the considerations I have raised regarding the role of images in the meanings produced about Pakaitore. By examining the "culture" of photography: the practices of taking photographs; the selection of particular photographs for publication, and the way specific images are rendered significant by viewers, I demonstrate the specific ways in which we see culturally rather than "naturally". Framed by Haraway’s (1991:188) insistence on the "embodied nature of all vision", I critique the visualising practices of press
photographers. I extend this critique to encompass the way press and documentary photography are publicly understood, and assess the terms for comprehending photographs offered through literatures in visual culture. My discussion draws on Barthes' (1972) theorising of the "poses" of white consciousness. I argue that the images of Pakaitore which were circulated by news media reproduced wider cultural tropes which produce "others" as objects of a naturalised "white" (and gendered) gaze. I illustrate this argument with the testimony of my respondents, some of whom were compelled by these images; and others who could not inhabit the gaze they represent.

I conclude the chapter with an analysis of the "raw" footage from which the news clip I analysed in chapter five was edited. I do not use this material to prove what "really happened"; nor do I offer an interpretation of the events which are filmed. Rather, my reading of this footage illuminates the presence of a camera which is not naturalised. The camera (and the man who operates it) is responded to by the participants in, and the spectators of, a march of Iwi and supporters. These responses constitute acts of locating a process of representation.

In my concluding chapter I summarise relevant developments in Wanganui which post date the events I have focused on. I consider the functions of news as a "public" medium and contend that an anthropological approach to the role of media within cultures (with the breadth and complexity this implies) proves instructive for other disciplinary areas which take the media as their object of analysis. News does not simply operate to inform the public. As my project details, within Wanganui the news media proscribed relationships within the community, and represented the perspective of a specific set of interests.

Reflexive representational practices demand the visibility of the locations from which texts are produced. Exploring the contestability of meaning is not an exercise in fashionable theory. Rather, such projects are premised on the exclusions "othered" sensibilities to the spaces where representations are made.
Decapitation triggers racial tension fears

Wanganui Mayor Chris Peryer has called for calm in the wake of what he described as a "wanton vandalism" of the John Ballance statue at Maunganui Gardens.

"It is a matter deserving of severe comment,\" the mayor said in a statement yesterday.\"The headless statue was cut off. Red paint was sprayed on the back and around the neck."

"I think it is an appalling and disgraceful display and the council will consider the matter as a matter of as much as possible," Mr Peryer said.

Mr Peryer said there were vandalisms and doings nothing for the cause relating in Wanganui.\n
Mr Peryer said his phone had not stopped ringing with angry comment as the day progressed.

"It got a long way ahead of me and I was told that all this morning, \"Mr Peryer said.

"Two bus were held up at Maunganui Gardens the first time this November and the second one Sunday on the Government's driveway," Mr Peryer said.

Mentions was made at both boil about the statue.\n
"Te Ahi-Kaa spokesman Ken Mair said at the time that John Ballance was a outstanding person who had given up his life for Maoris and that the statue was a portrait of a person who were seen a statue.\n
At this week's last meeting Mr Richard suggested passing the statue brown, giving him a red paint and putting a huge faner in his hair.\n
Patrick Mair\n
"Mr Mair said yesterday Te-Ahi-Kaa fully supports the actions of the man who attacked the statue. He described them as "Patrick Mair".\n
"History has shown that John Ballance was a person who was closely responsible for the flourishing of Maori at Maori land and that he observed the conditions of Maori land," he said.

"I don't think it would add any depth, it may inflame it," he said.

"It is0 we always been on about that.\"What we always been on about it is that the community network that is kept up the community network," Mr Waugh said.

"Mr Waugh said it would be the people in the middle who would settle the issue.}\n
Mr Waugh said the government had not made much money which would require a legal opinion and personally did not think it was an issue.\n
"I don't think it would add any depth, it may inflame it," he said.

"What we always been on about it is that the community network that is kept up the community network.\"Figure 1
chapter one

creating tensions

We ran a photo which got me an official censure from my employers ... Our switchboard was jammed with calls from enraged readers: "how dare you run a photo of that arrogant black bastard". To me it was just a good news shot. Days later we were still getting calls and cancellations of subscriptions ...don't let anyone tell you that this is a racially harmonious little country because it ain't. Just scratch the surface a little - we were absolutely blown away by the reaction to that photo (Editor of the Wanganui Chronicle).

I began this project by recounting an episode at a dinner which illustrates one of the "uses" made of "Ken Mair", or more precisely, the uses of the way Ken Mair is imagined by news media. It is my contention that this tells us more about the media's production of Māori activism, native masculinity and "hard news" than it does the man it represents. Indeed, I shall argue that press and television coverage of the occupation of Moutoa Gardens / Pakaitore functioned to reproduce the colonial imaginary of native masculinity as a menace, evading analysis of the structural conditions of (post)coloniality which produce responses such as Māori activism. Rather than representing any legitimate foundation to Iwi grievances, the press, in pursuit of the "hard angle", focused on "unruly" young men in order to tell a particular story of a threat to the state and its structures. Accordingly, the positions taken by local Council, the police and counter protesters became the authorised discourses through which to represent the occupation.

Playing off Barthes' theorising of the production of myth, this chapter examines the mythologising of Ken Mair as "news". In Mythologies Barthes sought to demonstrate the ideological function of linguistic and visual signs: what passes as "natural" is in fact a product
of historical and political circumstance and this is confounded through signification in order to serve the interests of the bourgeoisie. This is what Barthes calls the production of myth. By rendering visible these naturalised assumptions, or connotations passing as denotation, the mythologist reveals their service to particular social interests (Barthes 1972: 11).

While textual analysis can theorise the political locations from which certain meanings become privileged it cannot demonstrate the specifics of either the production of news by its authors or its use by its consumers. Barthes imagines a deliberate manufacture of myth on the part of its producers, and his attention to the potential of texts to signify a range of meanings is confined to the ability of the consumer to either decode or be duped by myth. The ways Mair is read and used by consumers cannot simply be explained as the result of media manipulation, but neither is he capable of endless signifying potential, as the deconstructionist critique of semiotics might imagine.

The signifying potential of texts is constrained by processes and factors external to, yet reproduced through the text. One factor which reins in signification is the reader’s experience of the text in relation to their experience of the world and position within it. Another is the linguistic and visual devices employed by the author to contain the play of signification, the intention of the author to, for example, subscribe to the codes of news. Rather than rendering the production of myth by news makers as a deliberate deception, it is more productive to interrogate the codes through which it is imagined news is produced, according to the editor of the Wanganui Chronicle, "objectively, impartially and fairly". The press photograph of Mair and the article which frames it are capable of sustaining a range of meanings, and as I unpack these I am not seeking its "true" meaning, but rather I want to establish the impossibility of a consensus in meaning. These tensions in meaning are located within a social context which, as Foucault (1979; 1988; 1995) suggests, is structured by articulations of knowledge and power. The meanings ascribed to Ken Mair must be understood as embedded within a cultural context in which his producers and consumers have a variety of stakes: profits, security, identity, community, privilege; in other words, ways of making sense which would be disrupted if Mair was to mean differently.
My semiotic analysis of the mythologising of Mair is anchored, through ethnographic methods, in the uses of this image by news producers and consumers. The event this chapter addresses occurred in December 1994, prefacing the occupation of the Gardens. My analysis of this event establishes my agenda in analysing the subsequent occupation by outlining the way news functions culturally and the manner in which Mair, a spokesperson for the occupation, had already been "produced".

The Press Photograph: A semiotic analysis

As the quote which opens this chapter illustrates, it was this photograph of Mair, rather than the accompanying news story, that members of the public reacted to vitriolically. The image and text work in concert: the photograph visualises the story which accompanies it, and the meaning of the photograph is anchored by the story. But the photograph tells its story in an imperative fashion; its meaning is displayed, its constituent signs read all at once. A written account unfolds for the reader over time, the words are symbols which the imagination must translate into mental images. The photograph does the work of visualising for the reader, exacting a moment of "real life". As Chow contends, "visual images, because they do not have the possibilities of interiorisation and abstraction that are typical of the written word, operate differently as a mode of signification" (Chow, 1995: 7).

Photographs are compelling because they seem to denote an event. The form on the page professes, according to Barthes, "a mechanical analogue of reality" (Barthes 1977: 18). By this he means that common sense tells us we are witness to the "authentic" event, rather than its coding through the style of the medium. Painting or drawing, for example, stylise that which is represented, whereas the photograph claims an objective and direct correspondence with its subject (ibid: 17). Barthes argues that this is where the mythical potential of the press photograph lies; it deploys connotation from this lack of coding. I would elaborate that it is its coding as a "press photograph" that generates the authority of this representation, offering a status as "truth".
Thus Mair's image is read by those who responded to the paper as providing unmediated access to the truth of the event. However, it is connotation, or the ideology Mair embodies that elicits this response. As Barthes argues, the photographic text is "authored" like any other:

on the one hand, the press photograph is an object that has been worked on, chosen, composed, constructed, treated according to professional, aesthetic or ideological norms which are so many factors of connotation; while on the other, this same photograph is not only perceived, received and read, connected more or less consciously by the public that consumes it to a traditional stock of signs (Barthes, 1977: 19).

Just as the "authentic" event itself is not available to those who are not present, nor is the process through which the event is rendered into image. The photograph is produced by the photographer who does not simply convey reality, but rather selects a moment of "reality" for capture, removing it from its temporal and spatial context. As Clarke writes: "[o]ne never 'takes' a photograph in any passive sense. To 'take' is active. The photographer imposes, steals, re-creates the scene/seen according to a cultural discourse" (1997: 29). Thus the essentially random moment is rendered as intentioned and both the sequence and context of events are reduced to a single frame; dislocating it and pinning it down as "representative".

While Mair does not dispute that this image was "a fair indication of what [he] was thinking at the time", he pointed out to me that it was not posed. "At that time there was quite a bit of media around ... I was talking to some of our colleagues who were there when it was taken". The photographer may have taken many shots at this scene, perhaps including the people Mair is speaking with, perhaps simply of the statue. The editor selected the one above for its value as a "news shot" and the particular story it tells.

The point of rendering this image problematic is not to argue that it is a "misrepresentation", but rather that it is produced and consumed according to codes and expectations which will
always position Mair "outside". Thus when Mair told me "I know that picture got up the noses of a lot of people in the community but I hold fast to the fact that those types of actions bought out some very valuable understandings of where we were coming from"; there is a paradox. To "understand" Mair's position implies an access to the same meanings as Mair employs to read what his stance means for him. However, it is not possible for Mair's image to tell a story that reflects a legitimacy to his position because the coverage by the paper provides limited access to the rationale behind it. Indeed, the members of the public who responded to the paper have been told that their (colonial) history and privilege is subject to violence from this man.

The "traditional stock of signs" which the public relied upon to read Mair as an "arrogant black bastard" is the social knowledge which identifies him as a Māori activist and interprets the "thumbs up" as a gesture of support or victory, referencing the headless statue of a local "founding father". Perhaps the fact that the scene appears posed contributes to the perception of Mair's "arrogance" by Chronicle callers. The pale stone statue serves as an apotheosis of Pākehā settlement, and the reference to Mair as "black" specifies that race underpins the statue's desecration. That Mair is read as "black" in this context also reveals the way his skin is differentially framed according to the multiple ways in which his critics attempt to undermine him. "Black" in this case specifies him as a "racial" threat, while as I elaborate later in this chapter he was also rendered as "inauthentic" because he is relatively light complexioned and has Pākehā tūpuna in his whakapapa.

It is on the level of connotation which Mair is read. His meaning is already culturally and ideologically coded as "activist" and as (hard) "news". Mair had already made front page news in Wanganui through the Chronicle's coverage of a hui at Moutoa Gardens headlined "River Māori to reoccupy land, city hui told". Mair was pictured beneath the headline and the report recounts Mair's assertion that the Gardens would be occupied by local Iwi. Mair is quoted "The township of Wanganui was settled by dubious means, including the 1848 transaction, and I think the Iwi should sit with the Council as equal partners and work out a process of handing over the power base to the Iwi. We should be the ones who decide the
future for Wanganui, not some organisation that recently arrived" (Wanganui Chronicle, 24 November 1994:1).

While the photograph above could potentially signify that the headless statue *is a good thing*, (Mair's position), it is clearly read as a *bad thing and so is the man that supports it*. Mair's image already signifies an unwarranted threat to Pākehā privilege. This signification is precisely what makes it a "good news shot" for the editor. The incredulity he claims at the response to the photograph belies his intention to produce "hard news", which prescribes that the best news is controversial, dramatic, often involving conflict or violence. It is not Mair who beheaded the statue; the accompanying article explains two other men had been arrested. Nevertheless Mair's presence performs a newsworthy function by personifying the issue and providing a focus for public anger.

Galtung and Ruge (1973) argue that personification is favoured in news production because it privileges individual action over systemic or structural causes. This is easier to represent: people can be photographed, act within the time frames which structure news production, and are more accessible objects of negative or positive identification. Rendering individuals as culpable or admirable rather than addressing the complexities of social context corresponds with prevailing individualist ideology (Galtung and Ruge, 1973: 66-7).

Hall (1973) argues that personification "is the isolation of the person from his relevant social and institutional context, or the constitution of a personal subject as exclusively the motor force of history" (Hall, 1973: 183). In my example of the use of Mair, the use of personification reduces Mair to a caricature which effaces the complexities of his politics and the history which produces his position.

Mair is aware of the implications of the way he is represented and read. He told me:

Any time there is a particular issue that goes against the normal make up of the community, which in our case is most issues, the *Chronicle* don't tend to give our
side of the story very well, if at all. For example, with the beheading of the Ballance monument they were particularly aggressive towards us.

Mair's construction as a public and political figure is also gendered; there is a "masculinity" to his tenacious action in public spaces and the "dangerous" politics he delivers. Mair commented to me: "I am the care giver in our family, we've got five sons, but journalists play up the aggressive, macho angle". Mair recognises that this construction of him as problematic and compromises the safety of his family, but at the same time he is unwilling to counter this image and play into news media's desire to personify issues he is involved in:

I walk around Wanganui, and the looks and abuse I get, they get these ideas from the media - whereas if they asked to talk about it they might find a different character and a different story. I have to be more conscious in regard to my own safety and security, I have to be aware of the ramifications for my kids and partner, some of the abuse they might get by phone, in person, or the way people behave with them. Because I'm a pretty durable person anyway, I can brush it off and say its part of the struggle. And of course I've become unemployable. Some people, and some businesses just don't deal with me. If I move around the country there's usually a couple of people with me, checking up. If it gets a bit heavy people might stay. Sometimes the costs are intangible, sometimes they aren't, like the abuse or threats on one's life, which was pretty regular last year. The continual harassment by the police, whether it be by sophisticated machinery - bugging and that, and that's not paranoia, that's the reality of being in the struggle - or police following you around the country. In another sense I don't tend to highlight the personal side or cost of things, or how people think of me because its not about me, its not about personalities, its about dealing with the issues.

One of the spokespeople for the occupation also told me of some of the consequences for Mair resulting from the representations of him circulated by media:
Ken's become the most hated man in the country which is really sad, because here we've got a man who's one of the most sensitive Māori men I know in terms of relationships with women, really respectful of the dignity of all people, I've never heard him make a personal attack on anybody, ever, and a wonderful father.

The time I spent with him challenged assumptions I had made about him which were informed by the media's caricature. I have a discomfort in writing about the context in which we had this conversation and the way in which my assumptions were unsettled (We are sitting in the sun on the porch. The backyard is scattered with kids' play gear and the garden is flourishing. Mair throws a broom up into a plum tree beside us to dislodge the fruit. He offers plums to his son and me. The toddler is tired, tearful, and shy of me. But he is soon asleep in his father's arms: how can I be "objective" in the presence of a sleeping baby?). My description is "soft" and signals the gendering of what may be told: the "private" lacks academic rigour, it is imagined as exclusive from public and political life. Aside from Mair's explicit eschewing of his personality figuring into his political action, to represent my experience of Mair may be read as my attempt to present an "authentic" version of Mair. Rather, my intention is to signal that his identity is not as static as the media image.

Mair's "authenticity" was at stake throughout the ensuing occupation. One of my (Pākehā) respondents, who disapproved of the occupation, told me:

People here hate Mair's guts. I don't know of Māori who like him either - their feeling is that he doesn't belong here. His father's side and tribe come from Whakatane and his mother's side are from Taranaki so he actually has no connection to here - he's just living here and being a trouble maker.

Conversely, a participant in the occupation told me "Ken certainly belongs to Wanganui but has never lived here. He lives here now, he's come home recently. Sometimes it takes a long time to get home". The media's focus on Mair's "authenticity" was recounted to me by a
member of the clergy who spent time at Pakaitore during the occupation at the request of some of his parishioners:

[Local media] have viewed with outright contempt and hostility Ken Mair's returning to Wanganui. He continues to be portrayed as an outsider whereas he has explained again and again that he has intimate family links with the Wanganui Iwi. He is tangata whenua - he wouldn't have any status to be the spokesman he is unless he had that authority within his own tribal network. But the media continues to portray him as an outsider, a trouble maker, and what I think is worse, a "part Māori". They have really emphasised that, and he had again taken a lot of trouble to say that "yes he is part Māori but I choose to relate to my Māori-ness". He's been portrayed as everyone's "favourite" left wing Māori radical agitator. There really has been no local attempt to understand what he is doing or why he's doing it. The fact that he has been a trade unionist for most of his life means he knows the way the media works, and the law and government agencies work, which just makes it worse as far as the white community is concerned. He knows how to play the media, he's a good orator, he's always got a very political line, but that shouldn't make him everyone's negative stereotype.

This respondent perceived a continuity between the actions of Te Ahi Ka and Māori protest action of the 1970s. He explained to me that his involvement at Pakaitore was facilitated by his history background "and coming across people like Nga Tamatoa who were the equivalent in my youth of Ken Mair and the rangatahi". He elaborated:

And it doesn't mean that I agree with Ken Mair, I think he's an idiot at times, but you need the hard headed so-called radicals out the front pushing the boundaries, and he knows what he's doing, he knows the price he pays. I admire him even if I don't agree with him.
This Minister, who was conversant with the Treaty and the role it played during the occupation, was rendered by another of my respondents (a prominent news worker) as "a looney on the Treaty of Waitangi", while a respondent from local law enforcement told me "he has a history background which I think at times blurred his analysis of what was going on." As I shall elaborate, the role of history, or the legitimacy of different versions thereof, was contested throughout these events.

A press reporter from outside of Wanganui explained to me the way in which he was able to contextualise Mair's position:

I wrote a feature on him, about who he is and what he's about because I figured that if you listen to Radio Pacific the guy is public enemy number one, but in this feature he talks about the plight of his people and the whole concept of tino rangatiratanga. Restoring mana is the way in which Māori are going to start saving themselves, because the way that Māoridom is going at the moment - losing the language, not having skills and education, always being the statistics, Māori women with lung cancer, the prisons numbers - he says that the first thing you have to do is stake your territory, reclaim your natural resource, reclaim the mana of the Iwi, get back to those traditional tikanga and start building from there, that's what he really believes in. In that sense it's been called organic socialism. I think he's aware of all that because he does have a trade union background. I got to learn all that as time went on, but it didn't immediately appear that way. He's wary of the media, he likes to keep people guessing because he knows that once he's on record as having said something then his enemies are going to seize on it.

An article featured in the *Sunday Star Times* several weeks prior to the occupation, "Just who is Ken Mair?" also provided background on Mair rather than selecting only the "hard angle".
"I'm just as surprised at all the attention I've been getting as everyone else. I've been articulating these issues for a long time now. We've been asking for the Ballance statue to be removed from our land for years. He was part of a Wanganui Cavalry which pillaged and burned down villages and murdered people. To ask for his monument to be removed from our land, I don't think that's too extreme" (Sunday Star Times, February 5, 1995: c1).

According to the article, Mair's "radicalism stirred" when he was doing voluntary work among Auckland street kids in the early 1980s:

"Seeing all those kids out on the street had a heck of an influence on me. I had to ask what the heck was going on. The majority were Māori kids. I realised that there must be something better for these kids than was being offered, though I wasn't all that clear what it was" (ibid).

In 1985 Mair became a probation officer. It is apparent that his experience in this role led to a disillusionment with the ability of state structures to address issues pertaining to Māori:

"In one's naivety you look at mechanisms that you think will empower your people and support the kids. But what I learned about the probation service was that it was an ambulance at the bottom of the cliff. It was also a very powerful mechanism when it came to sentencing ... One came to understand that the probation service isn't about empowering and supporting Māori people. It's to keep the wheels rolling within the justice system and I didn't want any part of that" (ibid: c2).

Subsequently Mair spent seven years as the Māori Officer with the Post Primary Teachers Association, through which, according to the feature he became "increasingly radicalised through association with longtime Māori activists" (ibid). Mair thus explained his present position in relation to the redressing of Māori grievances:
"There have been a lot of words spoken and a lot of pieces of legislation. But what's happened in reality at the end of the day? What has actually come back to us in terms of land, in terms of rivers, in terms of the education system? I think there is a greater awareness. I accept that. But I still don't think people have accepted that there have been real wrong doings and there certainly hasn't been an acceptance that these wrong doings should be rectified" (ibid).

I asked Mair if he believed there was an image of him that the media relied upon which differed from the way he experienced himself. While he stressed that he is direct in the way he addresses issues he also contended that the media manipulated his image to produce him as "evil". This suggests that the way in which he is contextualised by media (through editorial stance, for example) renders him objectionable. He told me:

Not that I've sat down and analysed the image, but in a sense what you see and hear is what you get. I don't have a tendency to flower it up and make it palatable for every Tom, Dick and Harriet - there's the issue, I've done a bit of analysis in regard to that issue, the questions come across, respond to the questions and basically that's it. I'm pretty laid back. I know the media in some cases, the Chronicle is a good example, have deliberately gone out of their way to mould me into something quite evil, that's through their manipulation. I've always said to people that I'm more than willing to sit down and talk it through. We may not agree, but at least we're talking. Whereas some of the politicians refuse to meet me and they gain that perception, just as much of the community have, through the media. I don't see myself as being aggressive or over the top and I see myself as being approachable.

While news providers outside of Wanganui at times provided a context for Mair's politics, I would not argue that the image of Mair publicised by the Chronicle was simply a "distortion" or "misrepresentation" of him or his politics. While these arguments have a degree of validity,
it is perhaps more instructive to interrogate the manner in which this coverage served to mythologise Mair as the presence of racial tension in Wanganui.

Barthes and the production of myth

Barthes' most famous example of the production of myth concerns how French imperialism is made to mean:

I am at the barber's and a copy of Paris-Match is offered to me. On the cover, a young Negro in a French uniform is saluting, with his eyes uplifted, probably fixed on a fold of the tricolour. All this is the meaning of the picture. But, whether naively or not, I see very well what it signifies to me: that France is a great Empire, that all her sons, without any colour discrimination, faithfully serve under her flag, and that there is no better answer to the detractors of an alleged colonialism than the zeal shown by this Negro in serving his so-called oppressors (Barthes, 1972: 116).

On the first level of meaning this is simply a picture of a black soldier saluting. This is analogous with the way Saussure theorised how language works; a signifier is the term which we learn denotes a signified; the concept the signifier refers to. Together the signifier and signified make up the sign, or the word and its meaning. In Barthes' example an image is the sign: the signifier is the form on the page and the signified a black soldier saluting. On the next level of meaning, the sign of the black soldier saluting becomes a signifier of something more, it becomes a form which is filled with a new concept. Barthes calls this signification. The signification of the black soldier is that French imperialism is supported by its colonial subjects. Barthes calls this the production of myth. This is a process whereby "one must put the biography of the Negro in parentheses if one wants to free the picture, and prepare it to receive its signified" (ibid: 118). The Black soldier is alienated from his personal history and his image is used to tell a particular story from a range of possible stories. At the time Barthes was writing France was at war in Algeria; French imperialism was not "just a fact", but a
contested political process. On the cover of Paris Match a meaning of French imperialism which serves the interests of the coloniser is pinned down.

In a way that is analogous with Barthes' soldier, Ken Mair's signification is historically contingent; as Barthes' soldier performs a function for the French state in a moment of crisis for French colonisation, Mair becomes an embodiment of violence against Pākehā history at a time where grievances against the Crown are hotly contested. Thus on one level Mair performs a function as a generic Māori activist, rendering the incident an issue of "black versus white". On another level, rather than relying on the anonymity of the photographed subject to tell this story (as in Barthes' example), the prior (mythical) production of Mair's public biography ("the unruly trouble maker") works to substantiate the myth. The mythical function performed by Mair's image is to reinscribe the legitimacy of colonial dominance by rendering its detractors as the producers of "racial tension"; concealing the imperial presence within this encounter.

polysemy

"Polysemy" is the quality that all texts have of signifying many meanings; there are potentially as many meanings for a sign as there are readers (which is something quite different from there are as many meanings as readers). Barthes' later work concerned the instability of meaning due to this potential of texts, however in Mythologies there are limits to a text's signifying potential and Barthes theorised three ways in which myth can be read (ibid: 128). The first position is where the myth is put together; Barthes imagines the journalist looking for an example of French "imperiality" and choosing the image of the soldier as a symbol. Other signifiers might just as easily be selected for this concept: "a French General pins a decoration on a one armed Senegalese, a nun hands a cup of tea to a bed ridden Arab, a white school master teaches attentive piccaninnies" (ibid: 127).

---

1 As I outlined in the previous chapter, there has been resistance to colonisation since its inception. In December 1994 the National Party Government's proposal to settle all Treaty of Waitangi claims with a capped financial package was released. Prior to its release dissatisfaction with this proposal was expressed (Dominion 29 November 1994: 1); and at a series of hui in 1995 the "fiscal envelope" was rejected by all Iwi.
This is the role of the Chronicle's editor who selects the image of Mair. Rather than characterising the editor's choice as an intentional manipulation to produce Mair as myth, the editor is a reproducer of myth; his choice of the "good news shot" reflects his professional and cultural assumptions. It is how he supposes his readers will expect this event to be translated and what he imagines will sell the paper; it is "hard news". "Hard news" is favoured because it generates affect in the audience. The coding of protest as constituted by violent "natives" reveals the ethnocentrism and profit imperative of news codes; they can only ever render protest from and for the point of view of Pākehā wary of difference. News media has circulated many images prior to and after this event which tell a similar story of the challenge "wild" native masculinity poses to colonial iconography and practice: Mike Smith's chainsaw attack on One Tree Hill in 1994; Tame Iti spitting at the feet of the official party at the Waitangi celebrations in 1995; Ben Nathan's mangling of the America's cup in 1997. In this sense Māori masculinity is already constituted: news media functions to efface the histories which may render these initiatives intelligible and instead reinscribes protest as menacing. The editor then, is not the author of myth, but the transmitter of myths already in circulation.

Barthes' second reading position is that of the mythologist who understands the political deployment of the image: "the saluting Negro becomes the alibi of French "imperiality"(ibid: 128). This is the position I take up in questioning the representation of Mair, which suggests that he becomes the alibi of state recalcitrance to deal with Māori grievances. This is a problematic position to assume: it suggests a privileged access to "truth" and places the mythologist "outside" the processes of image consumption employed by "ordinary" readers. What must be made explicit about this role is that it is politically motivated in its agenda to reveal the relations of power which structure the production and reception of publicised meanings. As I discussed in the previous chapter, the consequence of abandoning the privilege of this position in favour of celebrating the creativity of readers in the variety of meanings they make, is that the ability to engage in cultural critique is undermined. Further, it would be a mistake to assume that the meanings revealed by the mythologist are not also in
circulation outside the academy (where they are rendered "political" in relation to dominant meanings which pass as "common sense"). One of my (Pākehā) respondents told me:

It was as though the media and the public needed someone to hate - its a real media trait to individualise something. Ken is a diminutive young man with a mischievous twinkle in his eye who speaks well and is charming. Yet people like Helen Clarke, who made a statement in parliament referring to "the Ken Mairs of this world" use him as a focus of hatred. I was very disappointed in [her] statement.

The third position Barthes identifies is that of the consumer of myth who sees the soldier as "the very presence of French imperialism" (ibid: 128): "The French Empire, its just a fact: look at this good Negro who salutes like one of our own boys" (ibid: 124). By analogy it may be argued that the Chronicle’s "enraged readers" also fail to identify the mythical use of Mair. However, consuming myth is not as simple as being "duped". Just as these ideas are already in circulation for the press to reproduce, they also constitute the social knowledge the readers who respond to Mair’s image rely upon. They inhabit a society where "whiteness" is usually invisible. The initiative Mair represents publicises white privilege. The readers’ participation in a discursive production of Mair which insists on the opacity of colonialism is not passive, but an active defence of privilege.

linguistic analysis

My analysis of the press copy which contextualises the image of Mair attends to the way the selection of language and sources to attribute meaning to the event is implicitly exclusionary. We have no access to the "real" event, indeed neither did the press; what is "news" is that the head of the statue has been toppled. No one photographed this happening. What is substituted as "news" is Mair’s support of the initiative. The event is discursively produced, leaving traces of competing discourses, which reveal the representation as ideologically produced. In this way discourse which constitutes Mair as producing racial tension is authorised.

2 Unless specified, all citations in this section refer to the front page articles of the Wanganui Chronicle 22 December, 1994 (see figure 1).
Beneath the smaller introductory headline "Mayor calls for calm" is the main headline "Decapitation triggers racial tension fears". This linguistic selection is sensational in that it fails to specify the statue as the object of the attack, and personifies the statue through the selection of the term "decapitation". While literally the head of the statue is removed, the historical deployment of the term "decapitation" (referring to legal punishment and the public display of sovereign power) lends drama to the headline. "Racial tension fears" pluralises, and renders as fact, the Mayor's opinion; he refers in the article to "activists who are creating racial tension and disharmony in Wanganui". The leader to and first section of the article elaborate the Mayor's perspective that this is "wanton vandalism" and "nonsense".

Rather than characterise this act as "wanton", which implies a lack of purpose or reason to the action, we might interpret it as considered, planned and explicitly intended to disrupt the statue's intended meaning. The statue's head, hand and foot were cut off and red paint sprayed on the neck and back, connoting blood. The Mayor's assessment excludes the possibility that the statue may convey meanings other than those understood by him; for him it is an object deserving of reverence and respect, a signifier of heritage worthy of a privileged position. However, for the culprits one might assume it signifies a privilege which masks an alternate history; an icon of coloniality stands on what was once a marae. The "truth" of Ballance's historical role is patently contested, and what contextualises this act of iconoclasm is the meaning experienced and circulated among Nga Iwi in Wanganui. A press report on the trial of the two men who pleaded guilty to wilfully damaging the statue cites testimony presented at the trial that the men had read *I Shall Not Die* by historian James Belich. On the evening of the incident they had discussed the book and its account of offences committed by Ballance against Māori. Mr. Takarangi, counsel for one of the defendants, told the court that his client was "not contrite and offered no remorse for his action as he regarded the statue as offensive and his actions were deliberate and calculated. Belich's book shows Ballance was racist and anti-Māori. He regarded the only good Māori to be a dead one." Mr Rowan, counsel for the second defendant, elaborated that "they knew their actions had to be directed at the head of the Ballance statue as a symbol of taking away Ballance's mana". (*Evening Standard* July 29,
1995). As I elaborate below, according to testimony presented in court, the action has motives common to political iconoclasm which are inflected by local preoccupations.

The Mayor's dismissal of the attack as "nonsense" is self contradictory in relation to his elaboration that it is also "an appalling and disgraceful display". The act is rendered at once powerful (an explicit violence against Pākehā history), yet dismissed as trite and reactionary; the Mayor assumes the power of such an action is wasted as the motivation behind it is neither "authentic" or legitimate.

The nature of the "nonsense" referred to by the Mayor is clarified by the author of the report who explains that at two hui in the Gardens the statue was mentioned, by Mair who calls Ballance a "despicable person", and Eva Rickard who suggested "painting the statue brown, giving him a moko and putting a huia feather in his hair". This sourcing from both the activists and the Mayor (as representative of "the people") renders the report "objective".

The four sub headings which organise the remainder of the article are "hard" words which summarise the content of the following copy. The headings "obliterate", "no support", and "destruction" summarise the "facts" of the text while the heading which summarises the position of Mair, "patriotic Māori", is put in quotation marks. This functions to problematise its intended meaning and represent it as Mair's opinion. This section of the report conveys Mair's understanding of Ballance's historical role: "History has shown that John Ballance was a person who was clearly responsible for the thieving of millions of acres of Māori land, therefore his monument never deserved to be erected". The next two paragraphs convey that Ballance was a legitimate political figure (Premier of New Zealand) and honoured by Wanganui citizens who paid for his monument. These two versions of Ballance's significance may both be true but the latter is authorised in this context through the accounts given by both the Mayor and the reporter. The men who vandalised the statue were, according to Mayor Poynter, "fired up" by the talk of the "activists who are creating racial tension and disharmony in Wanganui". This explanation on the one hand implicates Mair as responsible,
and on the other neglects the culprits' familiarity with alternate versions of history through their reading and participation in Iwi activities.

In the following section, titled "obliterate", the Mayor's rejection of proposed retaliation through "obliterating historic Māori carvings" gives him the appearance of being moderate. His desire to avoid the escalation of violence ("I don't think the people of Wanganui or New Zealand should fall into that trap") is contrasted with what he imagines is the motivation of protesters: "it appeared that was what the activists wanted". The report continues with the Mayor's comment that "Those statues and artefacts are part of our history and we have not had any problems before". This use of "our" effaces that the "shared history" he refers to positions Māori and Pākehā differently and consists of competing meanings. The Mayor's next comment, "they will use any excuse to gain media attention", reduces the act to a publicity stunt. This disdains the offence experienced by local Iwi at the statue's presence.

The next section, titled "no support", comments on the lack of support for the action from two state representatives. The Race Relations Conciliator John Clarke, commented to the paper "such actions are not only criminal in law, they are also indicative of an intolerance that has no place in Aotearoa / New Zealand". The state representative whose mandate is to deal with discrimination on racial grounds; who is authorised to produce discourse about issues regarding racism, renders the action "beyond the pale". The local M.P. Jill Pettis, is quoted as saying "this is just the kind of ammunition the National Government needs to drive the fiscal envelope through. By their actions the men have probably alienated those people who may have had some sympathy for their grievances." This assumes these actions are representative of Māori, or at least will be read as such by the public and the Crown. It is anticipated that the action will be used to delegitimise Māori claims in general. One might imagine the most politic move, in light of the tendency for these actions to be read as allegorical, would be for Iwi representatives to distance themselves from the actions of the two men. The heading "no support" is misrepresented of the position of local Iwi who have not commented on the issue. The section states that Archie Taiaroa, chair of the Whanganui River Trust Board "could not be reached for comment" and that Rangitihi Tahuparae was not prepared to
comment on the issue "until he had spoken further with the elders". For Māori of the rohe, the sentiment behind the act is representative, while the method of expression cannot be rendered as such (nor do the men claim to act representatively). However in a climate where Māori are disadvantaged by the judicial system, and where Pākehā read a lack of consensus among Māori as evidence of a culture in chaos, a failure to support the "offenders" becomes problematic.

The lack of comment from local Iwi representatives was the subject of the Chronicle's editorial in the same day's paper. Entitled "The Moutoa Outrage"; the editorial reproduces the language of the front page report and makes the stance of the paper explicit:

If Māori radicals think their gross act in Moutoa Gardens will advance their cause they are sadly mistaken. This was not a political act. It was an act of wanton destruction that had absolutely nothing to do with righting past wrongs. Indeed, it could have a negative effect on the settling of genuine Māori grievances. It should have come as no surprise that the statue of one of Wanganui's most famous sons would be vandalised. Veteran activist Eva Rickard and her fellow travellers clearly signalled it at the Moutoa Gardens "hui" on Monday [my italics] (Wanganui Chronicle December 22, 1994: 6).

The paper's stance reproduces that of the Mayor's; the role of Ballance in local history should be venerated and the perspective of local Iwi is specious. Placing the word hui in inverted commas signals at best the author's discomfort with the Māori term, at worst his disdain. Commenting on the lack of response from "major figures in local Māoridom" the editor writes:

We will be charitable and say that perhaps they need time to address the issue.

The alternative, that their silence applies tacit support to this sort of criminal

---

3One of my respondents told me: "there is a lot of dissension within the Māori group, there is not one person who speaks for them all. Not even one person seems to speak for each Iwi. And they've all got an opinion - its confusing for us so I wonder what its like for them".
activity does not bear thinking about ... Why can the activists and their ilk ply the media and the public with outrageous nonsense while the people we know and respect remain mute? (ibid).

The final section of the lead article on page one, headed "destruction", provides commentary on the event from Chairman of the New Zealand Māori Council, Sir Graham Latimer. His perspective is that this type of action is counter productive. When asked by the paper if the action might increase racial tension (as intimated by the headline) his response is that this "need not be so". The headline then, represents only the perspective of the Mayor.

Above the photograph of Mair is another article on the beheading, "Police keeping watchful eye", the leader to which explains that "police were alert to any tension caused by the attack on the monument". The role of the police in performing surveillance and promoting communication is outlined by Superintendent Alec Waugh. His opinion on how the issue will be resolved concludes the article: "It will not be a conservative backlash and neither will it be a radical move which will resolve the issues. The law will stand firm and deal with any incident which moves outside the parameters". The police, as agents of "law and order" are constituted through Waugh's comments as the moderate "centre" which imagines an absence of "politics".

The article at the bottom of the main report, " More Māori action predicted", provides a perspective on the events which challenges the perspective of the Mayor and Police Superintendent. While Tariana Turia does not explicitly condone the action, she contextualises it as "part of a much wider issue" rather than as incited by Mair. She told the paper "young Māori were angry because they had sat through the Waitangi Tribunal hearings and had heard what injustices had been done by the government [and] when many of them had be tried in the justice system [they had been] jailed for minor offences". This provides a context for the action which allows a differential experience of history, and contemporary state structures, by Māori. Rather than creating racial tension, as the coverage by the paper implies is the effect of the beheading, it may be argued that long nursed grievances are being
voiced in a manner that can no longer be ignored. Turia is identified only as "mother of one of the men accused of the attack", although she was also a prominent figure in local health service provision and well regarded in Iwi circles. Turia draws on discourses which call the authority of the state and judicial system into question, the very institutions through which the attack on the statue is rendered illegitimate. This positions her in opposition to what is constituted as the licit manner through which to express grievance; through the agencies established by the state. Her suggestion that this is the "beginning of action by young Māori in the region" speaks directly into the fears raised by the Mayor. The layout, and the context of the articles on the page, function to represent sides: Mair and Turia are positioned in opposition to state structures and lawfulness which is represented by the Mayor, who calls for calm (the voice of reason), and the police, who are keeping a "watchful eye", and "communicating" to prevent an escalation of events.

The removal of Ballance's head and the reporting of the event by the Chronicle signifies the divergent histories which underpinned the occupation of the park in which the statue stands several months later. The position taken at the marae assumed a specific understanding of an oppressive colonial history, it assumed there is a "true" history that is withheld or ignored by the state and its agents. Within this history, the guarantees of partnership, resources and rights under the Treaty of Waitangi have not been honoured. This history is the source of the legitimacy of protest. Conversely colonial history must be understood as irrelevant, redressed or in some process of redress by those opposed to such protests.

political iconoclasm

As Freedberg (1989) discusses, the destruction of icons has, in many contexts across cultures and histories, served as a means of acting out against a despised regime. The explicitly political motives underpinning the beheading of the Ballance statue (and the attacks on the America's cup and the tree on One Tree Hill) find continuity with these modes of expression:

The aim is to pull down whatever symbolises - stands for - the old and usually repressive order, the order which one wishes to replace with a new and better one.
One removes the visible vestiges of a bad past. To pull down the images of a rejected order or an authoritarian and hated one is to wipe the state clean and inaugurate the promise of utopia ... For example, following the general iconoclasm of August 1566 in Antwerp ... the statue of the much hated duke of Alva was pulled down with great fervour and celebration. The great funerary monuments of the English aristocracy suffered during the Commonwealth and immediately before it ... the statues of Napoleon III were pulled down by the Commune; and the destruction of monuments during the Russian Revolution and after the fall of Stalin had very clear political purposes. This form of iconoclasm is one of the oldest as well as the newest: it is found in Egypt and Byzantium and in the Anabaptist Utopia of Munster in 1534 -35, but also in those countries which wish to shuffle the imperialist yoke or cast it off more vigorously: as in the Philippines in 1986, Iran in the years from the fall of the Shah until the present, and any number of other countries which perceive themselves to be the victims, in one way or another, of American imperialism (Freedberg, 1989: 390).

Freedberg contends that "by damaging the representation one damages the person whom it represents. At the very least something of the disgrace of mutilation or destruction is felt to pass on to the person represented" (ibid: 413). In the case of the attack on the Ballance statue, although the man signified by the monument is long dead, the action serves to problematise the significance of the man and the history that produces him as an object of reverence. While a "success" for Pākehā, colonial history signifies conversely for many Māori; it is a process which has produced contemporary inequities. Thus the beheading of the statue expresses anger at the deeds of the historical figure, the colonial process which he represents, and public sentiment which venerates him in the present.

Freedberg makes several distinctions between forms of iconoclasm, the politically motivated (as outlined above) vis-a-vis the forms which seek to challenge the very status of images (for example the casting out of iconography as a resistance to religious idolatry, or attacks on images motivated by fear of the power of images over the senses). An example of iconoclasm
detailed by Freedberg which he attests combines both moral and political motivations is the attack by Mary Richardson on the painting the *Rokeby Venus* by Velasquez. Richardson slashed the painting in March 1914 as a protest against the imprisonment of suffragettes in Holloway. Such reverence of the beauty of a painting was, she believed, hypocrisy while it was thought Emily Pankhurst was dying in her cell (Freedberg 1985: 15). Of this method of political expression Freedberg writes:

> Such motivation, of course, is an activist extension of the egocentric desire for publicity. To attack a well known picture may bring immediate notoriety to the attacker but he or she is usually forgotten. More long lasting and more immediately clamorous is the publicity that attaches to a cause when a well known image, one which has become totemic in one sense or another, is attacked, mutilated or even stolen. Hence the many instances where the letters of political organisations are incised, scratched, inscribed, and chalked on pictures, sculptures, and murals. Such actions go beyond the publicity that accrues from inscription or emblazonment on the waiting space (1989: 409).

However, in a 1952 interview Richardson revealed what Freedberg identifies as a motivation of "wholly different significance" from this political motivation as she testified "I didn't like the way men visitors to the gallery gaped at it all day long". To Freedberg this constitutes an example of "the commoner objection to a painting or sculpture which somehow offends propriety or morality" (*ibid*: 15). I am wary of assigning this meaning to Richardson's comment, unless of course it is assumed that all political agendas are informed by a moral agenda (that is, *the basis on which political claims are made is with recourse to illegitimacy or immorality of the dominant order*). It seems to me that Richardson's contempt for male patrons of the gallery may be because she views this as at the expense of their engagement with her feminist (that is, political) sensibilities.

A recent local example of iconoclasm which does not neatly allow distinction between moral and political imperatives was the attack in on the America's cup. On March 14, 1997
Benjamin Peri Nathan smashed the America's cup which, as his lawyer explained, "stood for everything he despised" (*Otago Daily Times* March 15, 1997:1). The report does not elaborate on what "everything he despised" might be. A March 16 report in the *Sunday News* elaborates that his lawyer explained in court that "the attack was a political act". Comment from the cousin of the accused explains that Nathan "had become increasingly passionate about his Māori heritage ... he's very angry with the way New Zealand's going. He has a lot of anger with the politics of the moment ... he's angry there are so many Māori behind bars" (*Sunday News* March 16 1997:1). One might assume that to Nathan the America's Cup is an icon of Pākehā privilege, which expunges the colonial legacy on which Pākehā privilege is predicated: this argument is at once political and moral; colonialism is rendered an immoral exercise of power. The cup was a symbol around which nationalist sentiment was rallied as parades greeted the triumphant sailors upon their return in 1995. The yachting victory was not read by the public in this context as a victory within an elite sport, but rather as a victory for "New Zealanders". That the cup becomes an icon of nationalism submerges issues of class, "race" and, as Matahaere-Atariki contends, gender, whereby Nathan's attack on the cup becomes "the antithesis of an approved masculinity that works to cover over the offence of past injustice" (Matahaere-Atariki, 1998).

Press coverage of Nathan's attack on the cup implied the very inequities which informed the iconoclastic act. Tau Henare told the press association that the attack on the cup was akin to "if somebody went to the National archives and burnt the Treaty of Waitangi" (*Sunday Times* March 16:3). These icons are utterly non commensurate, while one represents a wealthy sport the other is a legal document intended to define the relationship between the Crown and Iwi Māori.

The veneration afforded the cup is outlined in a press report "America's cup ready for London flight after police remove blood". The leader to the report elaborates that "blood has been

---

4 A television advertising campaign to promote the America's cup, which will be hosted in Auckland in the year 2000, features an advertisement of groups of "others" from around the globe clustered around television sets ("all eyes will be on New Zealand"). Another features crowds of New Zealanders furiously blowing so their combined breath produces wind to fill the boat's sails. The meanings here are clear: not only is patriotism demanded, but this is something that unites the world, across differences of class, gender, "race" and economic "development".
wiped from the bludgeoned America's cup and it is now being prepared to fly first-class to London" (Otago Daily Times, March 20, 1997:3). It is not specified where the blood has come from, and this omission, along with the term "bludgeoned" anthropomorphise the trophy. The manner in which the cup will be transported reveals that the cup itself is treated with the privilege of a dignitary: "under the America's cup protocol, the silver wine ewer must fly in a first class seat wherever it travels. Two squadron members must accompany it." (ibid)

In a letter to the Listener Nathan responds to an article about him run by the publication which contended that "Nathan had little political history". He responds to this, and other aspects of the article he believes are misrepresentative:

Although I do not have the same intellectual knowledge of Māori politics as Ranganui Walker, Mike Smith, etc, for the last five years I have extensively and intensely studied and written about Māori politics, history, customs, and language. More important, though, my political history has been formed through 28 years, as I have experienced what it is to live as a Māori in a country dominated by Pākehā .... I have been involved in my tribe's claim for a considerable number of years. I have attended numerous hui regarding the claim, during which I have always actively participated. I have also been involved in direct protest action ... Finally Ms White, you were obviously not interested in uncovering the truth about who I am, and what my political motives were. Instead, you have painted a totally false picture of me, making me appear to the whole of Aotearoa, as a schizo-maniac, hell bent on revenge. Perhaps if you had come to see me personally, you would have been able to give a more realistic and balanced view of me as a person. I conclude with these words by Robert Yoakum, in the hope that journalists will learn from them and not tear someone else's mana to shreds in the eyes of the nation: "This is one of the besetting sins of journalism: sensationalism at the expense of the dignity and truth of the common human experience (The Listener December 6 1997: 9).
A comparison between Nathan's motivation, as expressed through his letter, with the public meaning attributed to his action, renders the latter as constituting of the very sensibilities Nathan wants to destabilise.

Of the forms of iconoclasm described by Freedberg we might imagine varying degrees, and qualities, of sentiment are expressed between different iconoclastic acts. "History" has bestowed import on some; "we", from our contemporary locations imagine some to be justifiable; representing the desire for deserved freedom. Crowds have toppled monuments, not only to political power, but to a repressive surveillance of the populace. Conversely (as Freedberg's distinction between morally and politically motivated iconoclastic acts implies), the destruction of art; housed in the gallery, is an affront to "our" aesthetic sensibilities.

Often iconoclasm is rendered beyond the realm of "normal" response, as the product of the unstable mind or politically "extreme" individual. Both the local examples I have discussed were publicly rendered as displays of the individual's anger and wantonness. I prefer to render these acts as manifestations of deeply felt frustrations with the status quo. Viewed within this context such acts express political and moral agendas which reveal subaltern perspectives which cannot adequately be understood through simply casting them as "deviant".

From a particular a Pākehā consciousness (as expressed by the Mayor and editor of the Chronicle, for example) it is impossible to allow a continuity between "defensible" acts of iconoclasm and the action of two young Māori men who vandalise the icon of a "founding father". My reading of the act posits a correspondence. The men are affected by their reading of local history. I imagine they think they will receive approval from others who (to them) matter more than a bunch of white folks they don't know. I suppose that they know they will receive support from whānau. At the very least, I know that they were expressing political belief and performing a meaningful act. A statue representing the violence of a particular whiteness stands on land their whānau believes is theirs. Of course it is not my role to render judgement here, rather my desire is to reveal the locations from which meaning is attributed.
to Māori activism. Throughout the course of the succeeding occupation, these "authorised" locations represented the initiative of Whanganui Iwi in a consonant fashion.
chapter two

putting the community inside out

The occupation of Pakaitore was a way for Whanganui Iwi to represent their concerns regarding their subordinate status and experiences of exteriority in Wanganui. By taking up residence at the Gardens, and controlling access to the site, Iwi temporarily inverted their position in relation to the Pākehā community. A literal boundary was established, and members of the community who were not supportive of Iwi aspirations became "outsiders". As I detail the unfolding of these events, I draw attention to the range of "insides" and "outsides" to Pakaitore, and examine the competing meanings produced from these locations.

My concern with "location" expresses a preoccupation with the positions from which we produce knowledge: "every view is a view from somewhere and every act of speaking a speaking from somewhere" (Abu Lughod 1991: 141). Haraway urges that the situations from which knowledge is produced be rendered visible:

Positioning implies responsibility for our enabling practices. It follows that politics and ethics ground struggles for the contests over what may count as rational knowledge. That is, admitted or not, politics and ethics ground struggles over knowledge projects in the exact, natural, social and human sciences (Haraway 1991: 193).

The notion of "location" also invokes the anthropological orthodoxy of "insider" knowledge. The classical ethnographic method and sensibility emerged as a response to armchair accounts of "other" cultures, and assumed that one is only in a position to speak about or "for" "others" with a perspective gained through participation. While the limitations of anthropology's modern methods are well documented, the rationale behind them remains

---

1 Critiques of the ethnographic method have been levelled from a range of political locations, both from within and outside of the discipline: for example, Clifford and Marcus (1986) expressed the inequities in power
compelling. In contradistinction to the knowledge available to the distant and detached observer, one produces knowledge of a different (and more accurate) quality through a proximity to, and an engagement with, the "others" one seeks to represent.

These two renderings of "location" intersect in my evaluation of the representational practices of news media. This chapter details the way in which Iwi's perception of the Whanganui Chronicle's partiality led to the paper's ban from Pakaitore. This partiality consisted of biased reports during the early stages of the occupation, which were viewed by Iwi as continuous with the paper's history of representing Iwi Māori. In this rendering, the Chronicle was politically located; it was a conduit for the views of local Council, and disregarded the views of Iwi. This was the reason for the paper's physical exclusion from the marae. Within this context, ideological positioning produced a geographical positioning.

It may be assumed that "balanced" news coverage of the occupation would require a degree of "insider" knowledge of Pakaitore, in order to convey the meanings the initiative consisted of for its participants. In this chapter I detail the manner in which the Chronicle's "locations" prohibited an engagement with Iwi perspectives.

From inside the marae, Pakaitore was never simply about the Gardens site, but rather the multiple sites through which the "other" has been historically and discursively produced. It was a way for Whanganui Iwi to challenge the conditions of (post)coloniality within their particular context, and underpinning this was the acknowledged commonality of experience with Iwi of other regions and indigenous peoples internationally. Specific to the agenda of Iwi was that under the Treaty of Waitangi hapū were Treaty partners with the Crown. Accordingly, these should have been the negotiating parties regarding Pakaitore.

---

underpinning anthropology's projects, and drew attention to the literary constructions of ethnographic accounts. Rosaldo (1993) critiqued the assumptions of "objective" positioning: "the myth of detachment gives ethnographers an appearance of innocence, which distances them from complicity with imperialist domination" (Rosaldo, 1993: 168-9), while the work of Trinh Minh Ha (1989) suggests the impossibilities of anthropological representation.
The Crown's position was that the Iwi's grievance was with the Wanganui District Council as the title holders to the land. This circumvented that the issue for Iwi was that the land should never have been available to Council in the first place. When Crown representatives did acknowledge this broader agenda it was framed as an illegitimate attempt to sidestep the Waitangi Tribunal process for the hearing of grievances.

The Council repeatedly sought the intervention of the Crown when it became clear that Iwi would not leave the Gardens at the Council's request. The agenda of Council was to "resolve" the dispute, which meant proving their ownership through legal channels and if need be, evicting the occupiers by force. This agenda was explicitly condoned by the Wanganui Chronicle's coverage.

In the following chapters I pay close attention to the narrative of events produced by the Chronicle. Because Iwi's claim to the land was represented as specifically focused on the Gardens' site, the Chronicle rendered the initiative as an illegal seizure of land owned by Council. The intersecting preoccupations of Council, the Crown, police and the Chronicle meant that these events were structured towards particular outcomes.

Yet the role of the press within this cluster of interests is ostensibly to provide "objective" commentary ("we are here as the servants of the public to report the truth impartially and that's what we did" I was told by a journalist from the Chronicle). Objectivity, however, means evaluating events with recourse to discourses and processes which are both authorised by and available to this set of interests. The authority of (post)colonial structures is premised on a "rational" imperative: on the ability to evaluate the available facts. This requires a narrow focus on cultural expression comprehensible to these authorities and renders them as self referring systems. The media may operate within this set of interests to reflect and constitute wider social processes, as a forum for, and of, Pākehā culture. This is fundamentally at odds with the agenda of Iwi, whose prerogatives cast the very legitimacy of these structures and processes into question. On one level they exist at the expense of the historical marginalisation of Māori culture. On another level, the recourse to law and
rationality render only particular aspects of the occupation (that it was illegal and threatening) representable. The perspectives of those coded as "news", and through news as "other" to the community render the political status of news practice apparent. What the occupation meant within the marae was not news because it was coded as "soft". The agenda of decolonisation informing hui inside the marae would always be excluded from the ways of making sense from the outside.

But there is also an "inside" to the news room. The production of news can only be inferred through polemic, theoretical supposition or textual analysis, and thus I examine the way events unfolded in the locations where news was produced, drawing on "insider" accounts to elucidate the practices and decisions of which newsmaking consists. Media coverage of the occupation was not uniform, nor were news workers (including those at the Chronicle) unreflexive in their practice. The mechanisms through which news is produced are often experienced by news workers as transparent, sensible and without alternative. Yet, as I detail in chapter five, events at Pakaitore led some of my informants from news organisations to question their authority as reporters, or as Pākehā.

This chapter details the first two weeks of the occupation, focusing on the relationship between the Chronicle and Iwi. While a placard alleging the Chronicle's racism was posted at the beginning of the occupation, workers from the paper were not banned from the marae until two weeks later. I examine how the ban, the delay in its imposition, and the history of the paper's relationship with Iwi was understood both at the Chronicle and Pakaitore. My intention is to situate the ways in which events were comprehended "inside" and "outside" Pakaitore within broader discursive frameworks and reveal the disparate parameters for comprehension they conjure.
establishing locations

"About 150 people from young to old pitched tents and established cooking facilities while less than a kilometre away at the Bell St station police and the Wanganui District Council discussed what to do". This second paragraph from the Chronicle's coverage of the first day of the occupation of Pakaitore established that this was a story of two sides: the law and those who would challenge it. While the accompanying photograph (figure 3) visualised the occupation as constituted by kuia and clergy, with young men in the background of the shot beneath the placards, readers were told "high profile protestor Ken Mair" was also present. Mair stated Te Ahi Kaa was not behind the occupation, rather "it was Whanganui River Māori using the site to peacefully celebrate their Whanganui tanga and tino rangatiratanga". The reporter disputes this explanation of events: "Nevertheless a protest element was evident by the many signs which were erected, many claiming the land as belonging to Māori and not to the government" (Wanganui Chronicle 1 March 1995: 1).
That this was an issue of law and order was stressed throughout the article: the copy under the first subheading "police presence" includes only one sentence referring to the police's "monitoring role" with the remainder of the copy evaluating the perspective of Iwi spokesmen. The third subheading, "reinforcements", devoted several paragraphs to the coincidental (and thus irrelevant) presence of large numbers of police in Wanganui for the fiscal envelope hui, which, while both events pertain to the rights of Iwi under the Treaty of Waitangi, was not specifically related to the celebration at the marae.

The day's coverage also detailed the Mayor's hope for a resolution "which would act as a model for the rest of the country". The Mayor reported that at a meeting on the marae he was treated "very courteously and hospitably". Nevertheless readers were alerted to the potential danger of the Mayor's visit: "The police had asked Mr Poynter if he wished protection while speaking on the marae, but he refused" (ibid).

That the Chronicle's account was not the only way of rendering this "news" is illustrated through comparison with the same day's coverage from Palmerston North's Evening Standard. The latter paper's reports made no mention of the police. The lead article headlined "Occupation 'a celebration' of return to Iwi land", began "Whanganui National Park is included within the raft of land claims Wanganui Iwi are making in conjunction with their occupation of Moata Gardens in downtown Wanganui". This context was elaborated:

Wanganui Iwi were also laying claim to the 74 000ha national park, the 35,000ha Crown owned Waimarino Block and a string of reserves up the Whanganui River. Mr. Tangaroa cited a number of acts of Parliament, which he said had been used to illegally dispossess Iwi of their land, including the Coal Mines Act, The Railways Act and the Public Works Act. The Treaty had originally promised full

---

2 The "fiscal envelope" was a policy proposed by the National Party Government which sought to put a financial cap on Treaty claims. Hui were held with Iwi throughout the country at which the proposal was uniformly rejected. It is purely my own speculation, but I have a sense that part of the frustration for Whanganui Iwi may have been informed by this direction in Government policy; in effect the energy of the Crown was directed towards bounding the claims process at a moment when Iwi were still waiting for a response from the Tribunal. It is my belief that Crown resources may have been better directed facilitating rather than attempting to circumscribe the Tribunal process.

This is at odds with the *Chronicle* editor's understanding that Pakaitore "had nothing to do with the Treaty of Waitangi". I asked the editor about the paper's coverage of events at Pakaitore:

I happened to be driving past Moutoa Gardens and I saw these people arriving. And I knew a few people there, and while I didn't talk to them I stopped and I saw a young fella pull a sign out of a bus from one of the total immersion schools here out at Castlecliff, and tack it up on a tree and it said "the Chron is a racist rag". And of course I was interested in that, but I didn't know what was going on. I thought they had arrived in town to go to the fiscal envelope hui. I thought they were just taking in the sun because it was a beautiful day. Anyway, as you know the thing evolved from there and we asked repeatedly what was behind all this and we never did get an answer. I can tell you that we were approached by other Māori who were lending us support - saying they didn't agree with this, as far as they were concerned we had been part of the community for 139 years and we had always treated them very well. So I don't know why we were targeted as a racist paper. And in the end I got tired of trying to find out because I have other things to do that are far more productive than trying to find a spokesperson who can speak [for the protesters] and then find out if he has anything to say. One of the magazines linked it to a television column, but the column she is referring to was printed a week after the sign went up. The sign went up on the Tuesday, before 90% of the people even arrived ... and at that stage it was being touted as a celebration, but what they were celebrating no one has ever told me.

Sue: So you had never had any problems with the Māori community?
Never ever. We've done something in the *Chronicle* that no other paper in New Zealand have done. We've been running a special page weekly for Māori news for about 20 years. It sounds patronising, but the fact is that a lot of Māori news is so soft that if you put it in the general paper, well it wouldn't rate. But we put this page aside for local Māori news or whatever we can get. And in that time its waxed and waned according to the reporters that are covering it. We are easily the first paper in the country to run news in Māori for Māori - as long as we can find people to write it - a lot of them can speak it but not a lot of them can write it, it's a real problem. So I don't know why we were called racist and it surprises me.

The editor's task is to oversee the production of news which is, according to him, "objective, impartial and fair". Deciding what is newsworthy relies on the distinction between "hard" and "soft" stories. The *Chronicle*'s coverage of the first day of the occupation favours the "hard angle" by stressing the presence of police and "a protest element". The editor's account reveals his reliance on these structural orthodoxies (Māori news is "soft"). Further, his account suggests the distance implicit in the role of the "outside" observer who does not actively engage with the unfamiliar. Rather than seek participation with, or access to the "insiders" to the occupation, his role is imagined as one adequately served by speculation and assumption. The *Chronicle*'s front page coverage on March 1 explained that Iwi were celebrating "Whanganui tanga and tino rangatiratanga"; the editor's claim he has not been told what they were celebrating indicates it is *these terms* which he does not understand, revealing a lack of familiarity with the range of discourses of Iwi whānau. From his perspective, the paper actively caters for local Iwi by way of the Māori page: this page is understood as a concession to interests which do not "rate" as news.

The editor's version of the history of the relationship between Iwi and the paper is challenged by the account provided by one of my informants from Pakaitore. I asked her why the *Chronicle* was targeted as racist:
I think the *Chronicle* probably isn't any more racist than most other newspapers in the country, but in the situation that we were in we felt that if we couldn't trust the newspaper of this town to tell our story then we weren't going to let them in, that this was going to be a way of us asserting our rangatiratanga and saying to them "you've painted the negative side of Māori people for so long that we're not going to expose ourselves to you". That was the only way we felt we could maintain any power ourselves, because we knew we would have to go back to having a relationship with them in the long term and we felt that they had to know how we felt about them. And they were singled out because they are our local newspaper and have never been on the side of Māori people. No media has been because basically the media is part of this whole power structure that upholds all the other stuff that disempowers us. If we're going to be real about partnership why do we have to have a Māori page, why isn't Māori news just part of the norms and values of the town? They don't realise that their half Māori page clearly indicates the place of Māori people in this town, that they're valued to a half a page of news a week. We get more coverage in the court news than that. And I think the *Chronicle* needs to think very carefully about the way it provides news on Māori matters, because they just hone in on the negative things.

This commentary suggests that news coverage expresses broader inequities, in the context of which Pakaitore constituted a coincidence of cultural differences, not just in the sense that Māori tikanga and protocols towards land differ from Pākehā views of ownership and exchange, but specifically in terms of divergent experiences of the institutions of (post)colonial culture, in this case, those which produce the news. While it was conceded that other mainstream media provided similarly problematic coverage, the Iwi's stance regarding the *Chronicle* was a way for them to indicate their belief that they should be treated as integral to the community rather than as its "other".
My informant's comments explicitly render the codes of news problematic, particularly the preference for the "hard" angle. As Stam and Shohat (1996) contend "the negative things" that news media focus on function allegorically:

Since what Memmi calls the "mark of the plural" projects colonised people as "all the same", any negative behaviour by any member of the oppressed community is instantly generalised, as pointing to a perpetual backsliding towards some presumed negative essence. Representations thus become allegorical ...

Representations of dominant groups, on the other hand, are seen not as allegorical but as naturally diverse (Stam & Shohat 1996: 183).

For Whanganui Iwi the imaging of Māori as "news" was one level on which representation was contested. What was at stake around representation in this sense was the way in which the discursive production of Iwi Māori through media spuriously framed their aspirations. This signified a lack of control which was informed by and constituting of wider contexts in which representation in political, legal and cultural contexts was also sought. In all these senses what is evoked is that something is inadequately "standing in" for the interests of Iwi Māori.

I asked the reporter who covered the "Māori round" for the Chronicle why he believed his paper was singled out:

I don't know - it happened in April, its now September and I still haven't figured out what the hell went on. Chronologically I came to work one morning past Moutoa Gardens and saw all these tents going up. It was a nice morning so I parked the car, wiped the sleep out of my eyes, mentioned to the news editor that there was something going on, wandered down with my notebook in my back pocket - got welcomed onto the marae and was told to go and talk to Ken Mair and Niko Tangaroa. I hadn't met Niko but I had met Ken when I was covering other protests - so I spoke to Ken and said "What are you guys doing?" he said
"Come and speak to Niko". We hongied and sat in the sun on the bank under the trees and spoke about what it was they were doing there. They were celebrating their Wanganuitanga, I said "Okay that's great, what does it mean?" I was just trying to fit the picture together. I went back, wrote the story, and that was good, the paper came out the next day, I went down again to do a follow up to the story, everything seemed to be rosy and they had a sign up - "the Chron is a racist rag", so again I sat down with Niko and Ken and said "Okay guys, I've had a good relationship with local Iwi, as far as I'm concerned the paper has - we've had this Māori page going for some years and it seems to have a reasonable amount of mana - do you have a problem with that - what have we done wrong, what don't you like?" And the only response I could get was that I think they were insulted that I was asking those questions and it wasn't our editor - they asked for our editor to go down and talk to them - they wouldn't say anything other than it was a problem with our editor, whether that meant personally or they wanted the head of the organisation I don't know - and to this day I don't know why they were upset with us. The relationship soured, probably the next day - I don't know why - we started to call them occupiers and protesters and they didn't like the terms, they would have preferred tangata whenua, and I said to Ken "You are here to celebrate Wanganuitanga, but you have signs up saying Crown land is Māori land and various other political statements". And the fact that they were at Moutoa Gardens in a provocative move was a protest. And I said "You may not see it like that but that's what we call it, that's the way our readers interpret it", and that was probably the excuse for relations breaking down, though I suspect it went much deeper and further back than that.

While genuinely bewildered at the response to the paper, and frustrated with being put "outside", the reporter's comments exclude those at Pakaitore from the Chronicle's readership. Rather than viewing nga Iwi as people of Wanganui who are inadequately represented, they are posited "outside" and antagonistic towards "the community". It is this "community" which constitute the Chronicle's readership. He told me "you do have to have an idea of your
readership - you don't take a stance deliberately towards [them], but 95 percent of our readers are white, middle class, and aging." His comments also disclose the efforts of Iwi to (in a physical sense at least) diminish the editor's distance from events, and his final remark evokes a history to the present dispute.

The identification of these events as a "protest" simplifies the initiative in terms comprehensible for Pākehā. It reveals an inability for outsiders to reflect the range of meanings Pakaitore consisted of for its participants. This is illustrated by the following description of the way one of my informant's experiences at the marae were not "news":

The meals were like five star hotels - how they managed to do that with a little bit of a lean-to, I don't know, but we ate like kings, the people had never been so well fed. The young folk came off the street, we said "who are these people?" Nobody knew but they needed to be fed so we fed them. A lot of other things happened that unless you were there you would never know if you watched silly old Holmes. I never watched it, people told me about it and I've seen it on tape since. I couldn't be bothered with it. Mainly because we had enough to do just maintaining our rapport and our morale, keep ourselves buoyed up, especially when it got a bit cold and the rain came. There was no way we were going to move off rain, hail or snow. So when you were there, you were just doing ordinary things - cleaning up and helping with the cooking, helping with the mokopuna or just being on the paepae - we had 101 jobs we had to do, so you weren't concerned what the outside world was thinking about you until you maybe just saw it or heard the media - that's what people on the outside saw, but if you were on the inside it was just so different ... Pakaitore was wonderful - like a big extended hui - we sang, we danced, we cried, there were politics certainly, but we did all the normal things we would do at hui, that any normal group of people would do. And a cousin of mine came before we were forced off, and she said "nobody is angry" - and I said, "No. We are just enjoying being with each other".
This comparison of perceptions of Pakaitore from the "outside" and the "inside" illustrates the role of location in the production of meaning. Media reports were "what people on the outside saw", and from this distance Pakaitore was rendered as "protest". From "outside" locations the initiative was comprehended as a spectacle to be interpreted by and for Pākehā. This was conveyed by the Chronicle's reportage.

Over the first week at Pakaitore, the Chronicle's reports focused on the legal ownership of the site, running sparse comment from the Iwi perspective. Several reports were featured on the position of the Council. According to Council, Iwi had a right to use the land for their celebration and Mr Poynter was "looking forward to meaningful dialogue in a courteous manner with the elders and kaumātua of Wanganui but not with the activists who are continuing with their theatrics which we can do without [my italics]" (Wanganui Chronicle March 7, 1995:7). The report "City determined to avoid another Bastion Point", stated the Mayor's belief that "the cross section of Māori at Moutoa Gardens included a small number of activists who were wolves in sheep's clothing" (ibid).

The editorial on March 2 commended the Mayor's approach: "discussion is the way to go and Mr. Poynter is right: it is time for Māori show boating to stop and for the parties to get around the table, to hammer out their differences in good faith [my italics]" (Wanganui Chronicle March 2, 1995:6). These perspectives indicate that from the outset differences were imagined among Iwi whānau: some among their number were, if not dangerous, at least staking an illegitimate claim to grievances. The terms "theatrics" and "show boating" convey that the occupation is perceived to be a display "staged" for Pākehā spectatorship, which implies its "inauthenticity". While one aspect of the initiative was indeed to convey Iwi perspectives to the Crown, Council, and Chronicle, this took place within, and was expressed from, the cultural and political prerogatives of Whanganui Iwi.

Yet the stance taken by the Chronicle's editor, coupled with the reporter's comments regarding the paper's largely Pākehā readership, suggest that rather than simply expressing an
"anti-Māori" opinion, these newworkers view themselves as acting as representatives for their readers. Phone calls and letters to the paper largely expressed hostility towards the occupation. In the previous chapter I discussed the "enraged" reactions from the public, and the censuring of the editor by his employers in response to the photograph of Mair. Within this milieu the expression of "opinion" by the editor is mandated by his employers and the majority of his readership, and will, as the occupation proceeds, be vindicated by legal process.

the effacements of hard news

A television reporter explained the distinction between hard and soft news to me:

Within an ongoing big hard news story like Moutoa Gardens there are usually serious weighty stories, institutional stories. Within the on going story there are hard and soft stories. A hard story on a daily basis might be, for example, police come on to the Gardens after their surveillance cameras had picked up weapons. A soft story might be what some of the people there are doing to pass the time, people of interest who have turned up. Hard news stories sit up the top of the bulletin, usually in the first quarter, and soft stories are down the bottom.

This distinction between hard and soft angles is also made by the press. This news value meant that the events at Pakaitore were framed in particular ways so that the aspects of the occupation which may have been perceived as threatening were afforded disproportionate coverage in relation to those aspects which constituted the substantive experience and intention of those at the marae.

A comparison between the angles favoured by Chronicle reports and perspectives from the Evening Standard and Pakaitore provide insight into the Chronicle's emphasis on hard stories, a reason why Chronicle staff were banned from the marae. On March 4 the Chronicle's lead story reported that police were investigating reports of shots fired at "a group of Māori people camping at the city's Moutoa Gardens". The report detailed complaints to the police about
power being drawn from the court house, the erection of fencing and concerns over sanitation, all of which had been directed to the relevant authorities. The only comment from the marae was that according to a spokesman "the incident had strengthened their resolve to carry on with the celebrations of their Wanganuitanga" (Wanganui Chronicle 4 March 1995: 1). Conversely, the coverage from the Evening Standard did not make reference to complaints about the occupiers, but rather elaborated on the concerns of those at the marae who were frightened by the incident: "the shots were heard by a private security patrol nearby, not connected to the occupation, who immediately called the police. Many of the 170 people occupying the site saw a slow moving car across the river at the time the shots were fired" (Evening Standard 4 March 1995: 1).

The next week in the Chronicle the Mayor's comments on this incident, which disregard the fact a call to police was made by a security patrol independent of the occupation, were quoted from a radio interview:

"The allegation of shots being fired at Moutoa Gardens in the early hours last Friday came after two days in which the occupation received virtually no national news media attention. Residents in the area have told me the alleged shots sounded more like a car back firing" (Wanganui Chronicle, March 7 1995: 1).

The reporter added that "police investigation could find no cartridges or bullet holes" (ibid). This account implies that Iwi were seeking publicity through devious means, and illustrates the shared inclination of Chronicle staff and the Mayor to discredit Iwi perspectives. A television column, written by the editor of the Chronicle under the pen name "Mac James" (referred to by the editor above) offered a perspective akin to the one articulated by the Mayor. The editor made explicit that he viewed the occupation as exploiting the community:

There's something to be said for camping out at Pakaitore marae, a mere stone's throw from the city centre. What could be more pleasant these lazy summer days than sitting in the shade of the Ballance statue contemplating the nature of the
Treaty of Waitangi while watching all the suckers go off to work to earn the money to pay the taxes to keep the social welfare machine operating. And if you want a bit of kai, just plug into the nearby courthouse which has kindly offered a source of power ... and if things get a bit quiet, a report of shots fired is guaranteed to galvanise the eager media (Wanganui Chronicle, March 9, 1995: 17).

From "inside" the marae the gun shots were evidence of the danger implicit in challenging Pākehā attitudes, particularly when this entailed the attempt to conduct a private life in a public space:

There were rages created in this community, so that we had people coming down and being really aggressive and abusive, who were throwing petrol bombs at us, saying the most racist things to us every day and night, shooting at us over the river - you hardly read about it but that's what happened .... We had the incident of the chap shooting from across the river. The police treated it as if we had made it up to get media attention. And that is how it came out in the media. As if we had pretended we had been shot at! We couldn't believe it. We had evacuated the old people in the middle of the night and taken them across the road to the kōhanga reo, but it was all made to look as if we had done it to get media attention. I was actually up in Auckland at a conference that night, so I wasn't on the marae when that happened. But they rang me in Auckland with terror in their voices. They were really distressed and I just came straight home. I couldn't concentrate, I was sick, I really was physically ill.

In response to the coverage provided by the Chronicle, the first press release was issued from Pakaitore on March 9th. This was an attempt to inform the wider community of Iwi perspectives on the occupation. The press releases were often written by Sister Makaretar Tawaroa, who had a long involvement with nationalist struggles in New Zealand and the
Pacific. She described to me her role in circulating information within and outside the marae, which she viewed as integral to wider projects of decolonisation:

Trying to keep our people up to date on what was going on was a big job. Many people hadn't even begun the journey - even knowing about the Treaty - lots of young people particularly. And then there was the hard core, I'd probably be part of that - we've been talking about this for 25 years and part of our life's work is about how we can pick up our rangatiratanga in little, concrete, manageable ways ... Decolonise the mind to decolonise the planet - that's really what I've been a part of in some small way over the years: how do the systems work, how do media work? That whole problem of decolonisation which is so important.

The following excerpts from the first press release, entitled "Police Harassment", illustrate that while the Council were preoccupied with defining the parameters of discussion and the legality of the initiative, the concern of Iwi was to problematise the marginal position of Māori within the community, in this case with regard to their treatment from police:

This morning at Pakaitore Marae in Whanganui police have been acting very provocatively. They were deliberately inspecting the cars around the marae, trying to find fault with any vehicles parked there. A little later four police came on to the marae allegedly to protect the headless statue of John Ballance. They have shown, at least their ignorance of Māori tikanga, if not their arrogance, by ignoring the protocols of welcome. Yesterday the police came to remove tarpaulins the were supposedly the property of NZ Rail. The tarpaulins under question have been the property of some people for at least 20 years. Last night police came on to the marae ... [and] took away a rangatahi and incarcerated him for the night for breaking a curfew placed upon him by the court. However, the court allowed him to be on the marae in the presence of kaumātua or his parents. Large numbers of kaumātua, including his parents and family were present ... The Whanganui Iwi is now on their ninth day of celebrating their Whanganuitanga on
their ancestral lands. There is a wonderful atmosphere. Large groups are joining in every day. The Iwi are in very good heart. Their resolve to see this struggle to a successful outcome is very evident. Tangata Whenua Whanganui are a peaceful and loving people who extended hospitality to the early settlers over a hundred years ago. They maintain this tradition of hospitality in the present. However, they know that any non violent struggle cannot escape the legitimate violence of state authority. This has been historically proven, during the Anti-apartheid movement in South Africa and the Black Civil Rights movement in the United States.

The following day the Chronicle report, headlined "Police dismiss harassment claims", delegitimised the Iwi perspective by stating that "the validity of the press release was unable to be confirmed" (Wanganui Chronicle, March 10:1). The police district commander, Mr Waugh, was however "taking the allegations seriously enough to issue a statement of his own, rejecting "outright" suggestions that police had acted in any manner other than one which was proper and lawful" (ibid). In accordance with the preference for the "hard angle", the allegations of harassment from the press release are listed, while reference to the atmosphere at the marae and the hospitality extended to visitors are omitted.

The Police Superintendent commented to me on the press releases from the marae:

The propaganda machine from those in the Gardens was an interesting phenomenon, they definitely churned out a remarkable amount of stuff. From my perspective it was highly emotional, it had elements of truth through it, but there were enormous distortions and I think it was either fed by anger about everything or it was meant to be so provocative that it would attract attention, but it definitely wasn't reflective or professional.

The terms through which Iwi press releases are evaluated by the Police Superintendent reveal his location. The purpose of the releases was to provide an Iwi perspective of the occupation,
which included emotive material. The ostensible "professionalism" and "objectivity" of the press largely excluded perspectives from the marae, motivating Iwi to issue their own accounts. The Police Superintendent's view of this process as a "propaganda machine" reflects his faith in those under his command (despite evidence of misconduct), and his investment in the established channels of information production. My intention is not to romanticise, or render as passive, the position of Iwi within this story. The final section of the press release, cited above, prohibits representatives of the state from engaging with Iwi concerns. Evoking the explicit racist practice of other histories and locations is likely to be dismissed as hyperbole (or propaganda), particularly as the intention of the police and Council was to avoid physical violence. The rhetoric of this passage functions to obscure the more oblique, and locally specific, manifestations of Pākehā privilege.

"Hard angles" favoured by news media throughout the occupation included the presence of gang members at Pakaitore and the building which took place on the site. The Chronicle's first report on these issues, "Tensions rise over Moutoa Building, gang presence" stated that:

An illegal building and the presence of gang members increased tensions between authorities and more than 200 Whanganui River Māori occupying the city's Moutoa Gardens yesterday. Iwi are racing ahead with the construction of a meeting house for which there is no resource consent and Nomad gang members are restricting public access on to the site ... The Nomads established a chapter in Wanganui late last year and are a nationally spread organisation ... They came to prominence following the death of a doctor in Foxton which involved gang associates. The gang had "held Horowhenua communities to ransom" police said (Wanganui Chronicle, March 10:1).

The representation of both these issues was contested by Iwi. A press release, dated March 14, claimed that "the inference relating to the murder of Doctor Teppett of Foxton was an attempt to scare the wider Whanganui community. The person who murdered Doctor Teppett
was not Māori". The media focus on gangs was criticised by one of my informants from Pakaitore:

They went on and on about gangs, it was ridiculous, if you wanted to talk about gang factions and kids that might align themselves to gangs, of course they were down there, but the interesting thing was, if you know about gang behaviour and the way they view one another, the amazing thing was that they were very supportive of one another and were there quite strictly with a kaupapa. It was laid down very clearly on the first night that we were there that there would be no tolerance of gangs wearing patches, that they would be there under the kaupapa of Whanganuitanga, which was about our tikanga here in Wanganui. If they weren’t there about that then they would have to leave. And we didn’t have any incidents between gangs at any time. 200 people living together is no mean feat to manage, and particularly when you’re talking about young people who historically have thumbed their noses at the whole of society really. I mean, the mere fact that they were there, and were willing to keep within very strict tikanga which wasn’t easy for them. We had a couple of things that happened down there where young couples had arguments. Screamed and yelled at one another - that was addressed in front of everybody - that’s a really powerful deterrent to make sure you don’t behave out of line, and it was really disciplining. Nobody got away with anything - you just knew if you did anything that it would be raised in front of everybody - nothing was discussed outside of the main forum. If you did anything it would be discussed - it didn't matter how big or little it was: if there was any thought that what you were doing would undermine what was happening there, or would create any risk for everybody there then it was dealt with in the open forum. And in the situation where a couple of our young men did hit that guy at the gate, that was considered to place everybody at risk. And so they were disciplined roundly in front of everybody.
Another of my informants told me of her encounter with a reporter from radio. Her account reveals both the reporter's desire for the "hard angle" and the intrusiveness of media presence. The reporter endeavours to connect the hard angle he perceives with fictional discourses which render Māori as violent:

I was half asleep and walking over to the toilet. [A reporter] said: "It's like a scene out of Once Were Warriors ... tensions are rising in Wanganui", his voice was very excited, "people are up in arms". That was the general tenor. I looked around and said "well, its very peaceful here", I said "the cooks are just stirring the pots, uncle George is just waking up, people are going out on the marae doing tai chi, and some of the women that are kiato are just getting all the mokopuna for kōhanga, it seems very peaceful here". He said "I believe you've got gang members here, the Black Power. So I looked around and I said "Well, we've got the whānau from Wellington, the Bay, Taranaki, and kaumatua, they came in last night, and I think we only have whānau here". He didn't like me one bit. He wanted to excite me and he wanted me to fight him but I didn't. And he said "Its all a bit sudden, why didn't you go through the right channels?" So I said "We've been talking to the Crown for over a hundred years now. We've been to the High Court, Supreme Court, Appellate Court, Waitangi Tribunal, Planning Tribunal". He didn't want to hear any of that. I was laughing at him really because I knew what he was trying to do. Most interviews were like that.

Another of my informants also provided insight into how the "hard angle" functioned within news making, and explained this in relation to the stories about the structures built on the marae:

3 Once Were Warriors is a New Zealand novel by Alan Duff, which was made into a film directed by Lee Tamahori. The reception of this film by New Zealand audiences was disquieting, in that the film was widely lauded as "realistic". The narrative attributes violent native masculinity to a residual warrior instinct in the "blood", eschewing a colonial context in which violence is reproduced. As Matahaere-Atariki (1998) elaborates: "Jake, as contradictory hero, is presented as the ultimate in native pathology, his subject-constitution a powerful motif for invoking what we already know about native men and domestic violence. Violence in this context was rendered explicable, an effect of misplaced masculinity and native deviance. The realism purportedly attached to this film both in terms of cinematic direction and context, is easily digested by mainstream New Zealand thought. Such feigned authenticity works precisely because of its ability to tap into the colonial consciousness."
The media honed in on things they knew would upset the Pākehā community. Like for instance the first thing they honed in on was when we went to build the whakaruruhau to shelter our people, and that was put in specifically for that purpose. They honed in on that and the fact we never had a permit. And of course what we were saying was, if we are going to assert our rangatiratanga then we don't need to ask the Council for permission to put a whakaruruhau on the piece of land. Well that got up everybody's noses - you know they can't build a chicken coop without asking for permission, and so they got really angry and didn't really understand exactly what it was that we were talking about when we were saying we had an inherent right to the land.

"Inside" the marae, the building of a whakaruruhau was an expression of entitlement. Rather than wait for concessions to be made to them, Iwi acted in a manner they felt appropriate to their status as tangata whenua. This was read by "outsiders" as simply a provocation directed at Pākehā. This perspective, reiterated by the editor of the Chronicle, fails to acknowledge the function of the buildings, which were necessary in order for Iwi to conduct community life inside the marae:

Māori, who had never expressed any particular concern over Moutoa Gardens, should have waited until the ownership question was settled before acting .... meantime the occupation continues, with increasing provocation which can only be construed as trying to force the hand of authority. The District Council is to be commended for the low key approach it has taken, but there has to be a limit. When laws that apply to us all are flagrantly broken, citizens demand action. But that would appear to be what the occupiers want. They know there is much mileage to be had if the authorities come in mob handed" (Wanganui Chronicle, 11 March 1995: 6).
The editor's argument comprehends activism as calculated to provoke dominant culture into a public display of oppression. Assuming Iwi are willing to subject themselves to state force, for such a response to be understood by the wider community as oppressive, a transformation of public "vision" would be required. The opinion was widely voiced in Wanganui that forced eviction was the appropriate course of action: "the Council have been receiving up to 1000 calls a day about the occupation with almost all urging the Council to take some action, such as evicting the occupiers or cutting off their power and water" (*The Evening Standard* 13 March, 1995: 3). For Iwi, racism already plays out in public, but is invisible from the locations where racism is inhabited. More accurately, this form of activism may be understood as impelling a shift in the "middle ground". Sister Makareta explained:

I've learned over the years if you want to get to the middle, if the issue is in the middle, you've got to bring the thinking of the people as far as you can. So you need that extreme, just to keep pushing the boundaries further and further, so we can eventually get to the middle.

During the second week of the occupation Mayor Poynter visited the marae to give a speech outlining the Council's position. Commenting on the Mayor's visit to the marae, Moon writes:

A speech Poynter delivered at Pakaitore Marae on 10 March highlighted his conciliatory approach, while at the same time affirming the Council's position. He delicately, albeit briefly, navigated through the contentious issues and received a generally favourable response. In some ways, this speech lay the groundwork for continued dialogue throughout the occupation, and so as a scene setter was very important (Moon, 1996: 53).

In his speech the Mayor stated the Council's position that Moutoa Gardens was public land and was not for permanent occupation:
"We understand that you have different views on this issue and we accept that an appropriate forum to hear your views needs to be set up. We are prepared to do that with local kaumātua and elders but not with activists or Māori from outside the district ... The safety of the people of Whanganui is of paramount importance to the Council and we hope that together we can ensure the safety of the district for all citizens. The Whanganui District Council will not accept permanent occupation of the site at this stage and requires it to be accessible to all members of the public. There is [sic] to be no structures built and those built must be taken down. Trees, structures and monuments must not be damaged. In short, we are asking that you observe the laws of New Zealand and Whanganui, the same as all other citizens. We believe that these discussions can only progress once the celebrations have ceased and the site is vacated." ⁴

A press release from the marae, and Tariana Turia's response to the Mayor, refute the meaning Moon attributes to the Mayor's reception. According to Iwi perspective: "[the Mayor] was full of bureaucratic bullying and innuendo and does not want to negotiate with so-called "activists" and Māori from outside the district". Turia replied to Poynter on the marae:

"You have no right to come here and tell this Iwi who should be here and who should speak to you... I want to point out to you that all the people who are here are here with the welcome of this Iwi ... The kaumātua of this Iwi have been meeting down here at Pakaitore and have made it very clear to you what the process was for discussion. You have chosen to ignore that and have carried on this discussion through the media. That is not what was requested of you and very clearly you are not listening to what the kaumātua are saying ... We resent the kind of scare mongering that is going on in the media. To suggest to this community that there are gang members here who are providing security to this marae is both false and a discredit to our old people ... The problem for us is that

⁴A copy of the mayor's speech and the reply from Tariana Turia was circulated on the marae for those who were unable to be present: this is the my source for this section.
most people don't know the true history of this country. We have been here for many, many years before the citizens of this town came here. And therefore we believe that our rights precede those of others, particularly in terms of this block of land. We are asking the Council to take that into account in their deliberations. Because the truth is we are not prepared to pack up and leave."

Rather than this encounter setting the scene for continued dialogue (as Moon contends), it reveals that the authority on which each side premises its legitimacy is explicitly irreconcilable. The Mayor draws recourse from the rule of law, while Turia's account renders this authority illegitimate, contending that the rights of Iwi "precede those of others" (namely the Council).

While Iwi perceived media reports to be "scaremongering", the "hard angle" was preferred by the Chronicle. This functioned to reinforce the legitimacy of the Council's stance. On March 13 the Chronicle's lead story conveyed that the occupation was dangerous:

Wanganui police are advising the public to avoid the Moutoa Gardens if possible following the alleged assault on a male Caucasian on Saturday. Police senior sergeant Gary Smith said yesterday the 50 year old man had attempted to walk through the Māori occupied Gardens with his wife when they were approached by about 10 male Māori ... He was then allegedly assaulted with bamboo sticks and suffered grazing and bruising to his arms and legs (Wanganui Chronicle 13 March, 1995: 1).

A second article explained that while awaiting an opinion from the Waitangi Tribunal, legal advice already received by the Council contended that Moutoa Gardens was included in the 1848 deed of purchase signed by 207 Māori. According to a local historian, the area of land which was once Pakaitore "was swept away by floodwaters in the 1900s" (ibid).
On March 14 the *Chronicle* reported that Mr. Poynter, feeling "unable to deal with the issue himself", had asked the government to intervene in the dispute. The Prime Minister, Mr. Bolger, believed however, that "the issue should be resolved at local government level". In the article the Mayor comments that "right across this country we're having tremendous problems with young people, street kids and burglaries ... it's hard enough for the police and ourselves to deal with this sort of thing without activists like those people down there saying "don't take any notice of the law" (Wanganui *Chronicle* 14 March 1995: 1). These comments explicitly constitute those at the marae as criminals and infer this sets a precedent for young (presumably Māori) offenders. The report continues "Mr Poynter said Wanganui had had a special relationship with local Māori for years but supporters of the activist group Te Ahi Kaa had changed that. "They're dividing not only European and Māori but Māori and Māori, because a number of people complaining about them are Māori people themselves" he said' (ibid). This perspective, which renders activists as dividing the city, was contrary to the view of those at Pakaitore. One of my informants explained:

In general most Māori people in Wanganui have always felt that their relationships with Pākehā people have been real. I think that what Pakaitore did was expose that the relationships weren't real, that there was no real understanding between the people, that there was no knowledge of the real history of this town in the Pākehā community ... The media honed in on what the Mayor was saying, and he was way out of tune, quite dishonest really in how he presented his relationship with the Māori community, which is really very limited and only with select people.

The lawlessness of those at Pakaitore was substantiated by the *Chronicle's* report "Eighteen crimes alleged", which ran in a column alongside the lead story about the Mayor:

Moutoa Gardens occupants stand accused of 18 separate crimes, including assault, intimidation and wilful damage, Wanganui police said yesterday. A 50 year old man who was allegedly attacked as he walked through the Gardens with
his wife received more serious injuries than first thought. A radio report said the 
man ... was to see a dental surgeon for injuries to three front teeth and he was sore 
around his midriff after being forced to the ground and kicked. A separate report 
quoted Nik Tangaroa as saying the man provoked the attack when he tried to 
knock down a gate to the area Māori have declared as a marae (Wanganui 

This incident at the gateway was recounted to me by one of the spokespeople:

This guy came to the marae one night about 9.30 and was really drunk ... We had 
two women at the whakaroa we called it, the gateway, and he was swearing and 
abusing them, and some of our young men who were right back by the court 
house, and I'm talking about the front along Taupo Quay there, heard him, 
swearing and abusing these women. And he went to pull the whakaroa down. 
That particular night these young men got into a fight with him over that and they 
did hit him, that was true they did hit him, after quite extreme provocation. He 
had pushed the young women to get to the gateway, which as far as I am 
concerned constitutes assault anyway, and yet when it was reported it was as if it 
was the middle of the afternoon and he had attempted to stroll through the park. 
The next morning a chap from up Durie Hill, we recorded his name and address, 
came down, he'd heard it come over the air in the morning. And he was really 
disgusted because he had been at the hotel where that chap had been in a fight and 
he knew him. He said that he was really quite shocked, until then he believed the 
media.

On March 14, the Chronicle was banned from Pakaitore. The editor, expressing his 
disappointment at this stance, was quoted in his paper:

"Since the occupation began we have endeavoured to obtain Iwi comment but it 
has been a frustrating business. Calls are not returned and efforts to reach Iwi
leaders have been thwarted. It is interesting that they are quite willing to talk with out of town media, particularly television, but for some reason seem reticent about explaining their position to their own paper" (*Wanganui Chronicle* 14 March, 1995: 1).

The rationale behind Iwi's stance was presented in a press release: "The Chronicle are not invited onto the marae as they have, from day one, provided an imbalanced view of the situation. There is no confidence in the newspaper to provide a fair assessment of what is actually happening" (Press Release, Pakaitore Marae: 14 March, 1995). I asked my respondents from the marae if there had been problems with the *Chronicle* prior to Pakaitore:

We've always been unhappy with them - they have one Māori page a week, if they have 5 or 6 articles, 4 will be out of town, not of concern to local people. It's just a chronicle of events really, it isn't thought provoking or helping people to understand what is happening in the Māori world, its just reporting. But not only that, it's just the whole ethos of the paper - what they have on the first page and the back page every other day of the week. Someone put up a poster - the Chronicle is a racist rag - I don't know who did it, one of the kids I think. They were angry so they wanted to do something. The paper loves to report anything negative about Māori on the front page. If there are too many letters to the editor it gets bigger and bigger and the Māori news gets smaller. In today's paper [they reported] some violence somewhere and they said he was "a very light skinned Māori" or something to that effect. So half the time I don't want to read the jolly thing. We don't consider it a friend certainly. There's too many people saying the same thing for it to be wrong. Its general treatment of Māori people is very negative. By and large all we read are the deaths on the back page. That's the only reason I buy the paper. To see who's dead.

A reporter from outside Wanganui told me why he believed the *Chronicle* was banned:
They shot themselves in the foot early on by being biased and getting themselves banned. They decided to do that, it didn't happen by accident; I don't think you can say they were way under speed and got caught out, I think they had a preconceived position, kept the blinkers on, went into it and got shot down.

This journalist told me of how his approach to reporting on Pakaitore differed from the Chronicle's practice:

It was really a case of getting to know people like Tariana Turia, Ken Mair and Niko Tangaroa; they were at the centre and were doing most of the talking. And being judged on your stories and being fair - if you reported accurately what they said then it didn't matter if you printed comments that negated that point of view, as long as you got the Māori side right.

The press release of March 14, which cited the reason for the ban of the Chronicle, was handed out to local businesses and shoppers. The document was reproduced in its entirety in the Chronicle on March 15 under the headline "River Māori state views on occupation". This was positioned beneath the lead article "PM calls on Māori leaders to oppose protesters". Mr. Bolger's stance on the protest was made explicit in the latter article:

"I do not want to go back to 1978" Mr Bolger said, referring to the clearing of protesters at Auckland's Bastion Point by police. "But to prevent that will require that traditional Māori leadership reclaim their mantle of authority and tell the Ken Mairs of this world enough is enough" ... Those who want to "radicalise the concerns of the past" should not presume too much (Wanganui Chronicle March 15, 1995:1).

This report provides a frame for Iwi's views: the reproduction of the discourse produced by those at Pakaitore is rendered specious, by the rejection of the Iwi's stance by the Prime Minister, and by the Mayor's response to the content of the press release: "It's hardly worthy
of comment because it is absolute nonsense and I completely reject the content of this unsigned provocation" (ibid: 3). The release, largely dismissed by Moon as "dominated by fairly turgid rhetoric" (1996: 20), detailed concerns about the Mayor's attitude and behaviour towards Iwi, drawing on discourse which assumed the rights of Iwi under the Treaty of Waitangi. These rights had not been honoured through the mechanism established to deal with them (the Waitangi Tribunal) and the expression of this is constituted by Mr. Bolger as "radicalising concerns of the past". While ostensibly providing coverage of the protesters' views, the effect of reproducing the press release is to discredit Iwi's stance, which is juxtaposed with the "authorised" perspectives of elite political figures.

I read the press release of March 14 as reflecting the frustration of Iwi with the range of (colonial) structures and processes through which they are represented. The following three paragraphs from the document express the multiple contexts in which representation is at stake:

The Mayor's continual accusations that activists are spearheading our occupation is a reflection of his inability to grasp the severity of the issues, which is Whanganui Iwi reclaiming ownership of their ancestral lands and asserting Rangatiratanga over it ... Whanganui Iwi have returned to Pakaitore under their own tikanga. Whanganuitangata is the sovereign right of our people to manage and control their resources and affairs as guaranteed under article two of the Māori version of the Treaty of Waitangi.

The Mayor and Councillors have not responded to offers of Treaty training by the Rowan partnership .... They continue to expect Māori to provide the access and information to them without any changes in their own attitudes and behaviour, which can only come about by working with and through their own Pākehā structures. This confirms their reluctance to enter into meaningful discussions.
The Mayor continually reverted to the law and to the rights of the citizens of Whanganui and New Zealand, reasserting his position of power, supported by the Whanganui police and the Whanganui Chronicle. This is an affirmation of the old boys network holding hands to maintain their power base. Colonisation is alive and well in Whanganui.

The first paragraph invokes the representation guaranteed under the Treaty. The "sovereign right" of Iwi signifies the desire and intention for self representation; to name and discharge their own interests. In the second paragraph the Council is identified as eschewing the Iwi's aspirations for self representation. Iwi's criticism of the Council's reliance on Pākehā representational structures correlates with Lorde's (1990) contention that:

[I]t is the members of oppressed, objectified groups who are expected to stretch out and bridge the gap between the actualities of our lives and the consciousness of our oppressor ... Whenever the need for some pretence of communication arises, those who profit from our oppression call upon us to share our knowledge with them. In other words, it is always the responsibility of the oppressed to teach the oppressors their mistakes ... There is a constant drain of energy which might be better used in redefining ourselves and devising realistic scenarios for altering the present and constructing the future (Lorde 1990: 282).

The third paragraph identifies the interactions and intersections of colonial structures and expresses to me that the "authorities" which presume to represent the public interest (the media, legal process, agencies of the state) are perceived to do this at the expense of the interests of Iwi. In a broader context, the Crown must appear to "accommodate" Māori, but evades the right to self representation guaranteed by the Treaty.

The position of Iwi could not be authorised by the set of interests identified by Iwi in paragraph three, because to do so would undermine the very authority of these institutions. The disparity in the way each "side" made sense of its position is raised by Moon (1996):
The issues being raised by the occupiers were in some ways beyond the scope of the institutions whose authority was being challenged. The Wanganui District Court had no authority (and certainly no precedent) for dealing with claims of sovereignty. Because the normal channels for establishing land ownership had been by passed by the occupiers, an eventual stalemate was inevitable. Even the language used by the two main parties to the dispute was frequently incomparable, thus furthering the communication gulf that was evident throughout most of the occupation (Moon, 1996: 20).

My particular interest here is the manner in which this "communication gulf" has been historically produced, and is reproduced in the present through the bounding of debate by "the authorities" (including media). It is my contention that the particular circumstances at Pakaitore must be understood as informed by the wider contexts in which sense is made of "native" bodies and cultures. We cannot imagine the present as somehow cast adrift from the colonial imaginary which required the conceptualising of indigenous peoples as a threat to the authority of imperial culture and white sensibilities.

At the end of two weeks into the occupation "sides" were firmly entrenched. The desire for an "objective" solution to events at Pakaitore meant that the wider community and its representatives evaluated the stance of the occupiers from the historically authorised processes of Pākehā law. This perspective was given precedence through the press, and the lawlessness of the occupation, and its participants, was the "hard angle" favoured by the Chronicle. This orthodoxy effaced the recourse Iwi drew from the Treaty of Waitangi (which I discuss in the following chapter); "positive aspects" of the occupation, and the meanings Pakaitore consisted of from the "inside". The editor of the Chronicle told me:

---

5 I expand on these concerns in the following chapters, claiming, in line with some of the recent work on "whiteness" that it is the (post)imperial imaginary that must be interrogated rather than reproduce the "native" as object of scholarship. The focus here should not operate to deny the agency of people of colour, nor collapse into a scrutiny of white guilt. Rather, the imperative is to deconstruct the manner in which the "native" is produced, with a view to problematising institutionalised authority.
I saw some positive stuff myself. This bank down here used to be littered with glue sniffers; all Māori. But during Moutoa they disappeared. They took them into the Gardens and we haven't seen one since. Did we get a comment on that? Don't make me laugh. So they've only got themselves to blame.

One of my informants from Pakaitore told me of the way newsmakers' preference for the hard angle and their service to Pākehā consumers underpinned coverage of the occupation:

When you are dealing with the sales side of newspapers, stories based on people's emotional ties to something isn't really "good" news. The only "good" news was that we had chosen to go there and stay there. It pushed the law and community to the wall. That was the news. The reasons and all the other issues involved wasn't news, they didn't care about any of that.

This was of concern to Iwi because it meant a failure to represent Iwi perspectives. Further, the emphasis on "sensational" aspects of the occupation was a factor in the intimidation of those at the marae. Although the prospect of violence toward Iwi was "hard news" for those at Pakaitore, it was not covered by the press. I was told:

While we were at Pakaitore all of us received death threats, and Ken more than others. One thing that came through after one of the media reports was a really ugly wizened up doll, it was all bent and it looked like a mummified thing, it was all black and really gross. It was sent to him and he was told that was what he was going to look like when these people had finished with him. You could think that people are just loonies, but at the end of the day the media has to take some responsibility. That's a dreadful position to put people into because they believe in justice for their people.

This account suggests that "hard angles" contributed to the way events at Pakaitore played out, providing impetus for galvanising the public into response. "Outside" perspectives
assumed that Iwi induced racist responses; that they created racial tensions by occupying the Gardens. I contend that a more precise rendering is that racism was revealed, not to a "public", for whom it was a justified response to the provocation from the marae, but to Iwi.

The predilection for the "hard angle" was hailed as a deployment of an "objective" news category by the editor of the Chronicle. I have illustrated that it is a value attributed to events, which in the coverage of Pakaitore revealed the paper's partiality. It proscribed the terms through which publics could make sense of events within their community, by reinforcing the limited frame through which difference might be comprehended. Thus, the Chronicle represented a Pākehā majority who were vocal in their opposition to the occupation. This corresponded with the paper's economic imperatives. The Chronicle's representation of readers who believed the initiatives of local Iwi were an affront to "their" community constrained what constituted "news".

In comparison, the Evening Standard's coverage, which served a community a thirty minute drive from Wanganui, included Iwi perspectives. The reporter who gathered the Standard's stories was not constrained by an editor's agenda, and the fairness of his stories allowed him consistent access to Pakaitore:

My editor was totally supportive of me all the way through, he made a decision early on that it was going to be big for readers in our region and I was given support. We had a stringer over there, she was very useful because she gave me some introductions, and our police reporter would go over sometimes, but they often had trouble because they weren't known. If you were there every day you were known and nodded in. I was never really questioned on my editorial line, both sides felt I gave them a fair run.

From inside Pakaitore the Chronicle "were singled out because they are our local newspaper and have never been on the side of Māori people". This challenged the paper's preference for "hard news"; and the recalcitrance of Chronicle workers to seek insider perspectives on the
occupation. For the Chronicle the story of Pakaitore was already determined as a challenge to legitimate authority.

By bringing an anthropological sensibility to bear on the Chronicle's positioning, I suggest that the editor's deployment of news categories promoted the legitimacy of "selves" and the threat of "others" (conjuring anthropology's imperialising history). This position was (literally) self-consciously assumed and resulted in the paper's exclusion. Newsworkers were not uniformly compelled by exclusionary editorial agendas (as the Standard's coverage illustrates); and I return to this issue in chapter five. The Standard reporter's positioning, whereby he represented Iwi perspectives, was respectful of the protocols his "insider" access to Pakaitore entailed, and was allowed to run these stories by a supportive editor, disrupts the imagined coherence through which media studies may imagine institutions produce news about "others". As Hartley writes of the Australian context:

"Open, offensive prejudice is rare. Racial malice on the part of individual journalists or editors may occur, but it is just as irrelevant to the routine production of news as are the voting habits of journalists who interview politicians. Racial stereotyping and racism in the media is institutional not individual. That is, it results from news values, from editorial policies, and from routine newsgathering that are not in themselves racist or consciously prejudicial. It results from the fact that most news stories are "already written" before an individual journalist is assigned to them, even before the event has taken place. A story featuring Aboriginals is simply more likely to survive subeditorial revision or 'spiking' if it fits existing 'definitions of the situation' - that is, if the story represents Aboriginals as 'they' rather than 'we', and makes sense of them as in need of protection, correction, or welfare, and not in terms of what they may wish to say and do for themselves" (Hartley 1992a: 210).

Hartley's account accurately locates the problem of representations within broader cultural frameworks; yet I wish to draw attention to the manner in which "culture" is differentially
inhabited and discursively reproduced. While tropes of "others" are pervasive, they are not compulsory. The *Standard* reporter's journalistic practice, and the editor who employs him, challenge the inevitability of negative representations of "others" as beyond the control of individual news workers. This suggests an institutional responsibility to recruit workers on the basis of intercultural competency.

In the following chapter I examine the manner in which the *Chronicle* represented events at the marae following their ban, elaborating my analysis of the cultural praxis of newsmaking. I anatomise the ambivalent positioning of the *Chronicle's* chief reporter on Pakaitore, and drawing from insider accounts of the occupation, reveal the way media presence, and the skewed narratives they produced, were experienced at the marae.

---

6Hartley's role with the Australian National Media Forum engages the differentiation of journalistic practice in relation to the reporting on Aboriginal issues (Hartley and McKee 1996).
Following their ban from Pakaitore, the Chronicle continued to produce daily coverage of the occupation. The paper’s exclusion from the marae was conveyed through their rendering of Iwi, which I compare with sympathetic coverage afforded “One Law”, a counter protest group.

The Chronicle’s position outside Pakaitore made it necessary to rely on other news providers to present the perspective of Iwi. I pay particular attention to the experiences of the reporter tasked with covering the occupation, whose testimony conveys a complicated positioning which speaks to the broader ambivalences informing the production of representations in a (post)colonial context. This elucidates the particularities of representational practices which charges of “racism” elide. Further, I suggest that the ban enabled the reporter to displace his criticisms of news practice; his frustration with the stance of Iwi conceals the restrictions on what gets to count as “news”.

The concerns of Iwi relating to news media were not confined to the Wanganui Chronicle’s reportage. News media in general were believed to be complicit with local and state authorities (“the media is part of this whole power structure that upholds all the other stuff that disempowers us”). Further, the demands of news crews significantly affected life on the marae.

As the occupation had become a major news story, crews from TVNZ and TV3 were based in Wanganui, as were many press and radio reporters. Eighteen days into the occupation, Sixty Minutes, a national current affairs program, filmed a story on Pakaitore. At this stage there

---

1 I analyse reports produced by One Network News and Sixty Minutes in chapter five.
were at least thirty news workers in Wanganui. "Insider" perspectives from Pakaitore displace the assumption that the initiative simply reflected a desire for publicity.

My informants elaborated the significance of the influx of news crews for Iwi, and described their discomfort at becoming a spectacle:

Even in the middle of the night they were running around taking photos, I suppose they wanted to see these funny people protesting in the middle of the city. It was just a freak show. Trucks and things that would normally go along the other side would come past, and some workers would come past and yell all sorts of obscenities, but at that stage it was water off a duck's back. But the media worked up a whole heap of people by their very presence and their numbers and their ignorance. So many cameras. They hired the place over the road, the Sea Scouts. They bought in their own satellite dish and gave them a thousand dollars. Just so they could be handy; if anything untoward happened they wanted to be there.

In the following passage, one of the spokespeople makes explicit that attracting media exposure was not the purpose of Iwi's initiative. "Being the news" compromised agendas inside the marae, and as a response regulations were placed on news workers:

We found it really invasive, every day they were there when we woke up right until we went to bed at night ... they hindered [our reflections on what we were doing] because we were unable to be natural, we were exposed to them ... Pakaitore was not about exposing ourselves to the media ... Media presence on the marae was in a way destructive to our whole cause. In the end we had to put quite strong rules down for them, and we only allowed certain people on to the marae and we asked them to come at certain times of the day, because we just didn't have the time to do the things that we were there for. We saw it as an opportunity to rebuild our rangatahi, because the rangatahi that were there were not the rangatahi that normally go to the marae, and they had a sense of something that
was theirs, a sense of belonging to something, an affirmation really, that it was okay to be Māori, that it was valued down there, that their opinions were valued. And so we wanted to foster that as a really positive thing, to try and move those kids out of all the negative things they are involved in, and they are involved in negative things, things that have nothing to do with our tikanga, our values, our philosophies, and we wanted to have that time with them to rebuild all those things in them ... So we had to come up with some rules for the media, and that was really good because it did give us more time during the day. But then they got up on buildings and got up in helicopters, you couldn't get away from them.

These accounts elucidate that the imperative of news making to "represent" meant the desire of Iwi to regulate media presence was only partially successful. Further, the hard stories sought by media meant that much of what was happening within the parameters of the marae was not represented by media. Besides, the agenda of Iwi within the marae was not intended for public consumption, but to foster relationships within Whanganui Iwi. This does not mean that it was not important for Iwi to have their perspective and rationale for the occupation circulated. Toward this end they circulated press releases and accommodated journalists who respected the protocols of the marae and were courteous in their conduct. Such journalists were allowed relatively unfettered access on the marae.

Life on Pakaitore consisted of the mundane activities of any community, such as feeding, housing, and organising community members. The logistics and pleasures of communal life on the marae were described to me by a participant:

What really saved us was the fact that the kaumātua were there, because we knew if they weren't there the police would have moved us off. So they were wonderful. I don't think they realised the effect of their presence. That became a little bit clearer as time went on, and by that stage [the kaumātua] weren't going to leave. Even if they left just to feed their pets, or see how their house was getting on, they were scared they might miss something ... They might go just to recover
often, because they were sleeping in the whare and I think the children, especially the mokopuna, made a lot of noise for them, but not too bad considering. But it was makeshift, the structure was reasonably solid, but then they had a tarpaulin, and the wind would blow it up, a few drips, but they were certainly dry on the floor, they had these squares so you put your mattress on that. They would go away for a bit and recover and come back a little bit strengthened and start over again. So I think they were so essential ... We had our own timing and our own agenda, and the Council just wanted to get us off as quickly as possible, and they could only work with their own channels and within their own constraints. We all understand that, but time was not of the essence for us. We were just being there and being together and having fun. We played games, told stories, heard all the gossip. It wasn't all hard political talk. During the day we had Tahu and others helping with the kōrero and others doing the haka, and rākau tapu. So there were a lot of things going on, some just sitting around chatting, wanting to catch up on what's going on and to understand it all. It was very busy. It was wonderful to be there.

The lack of common ground between Council and Iwi is evinced within the preceding account. For Iwi, "time was not of the essence", meanwhile Council sought to remove Iwi as promptly and expeditiously as possible. This lack of convergence between the parties was expressed within documents exchanged between Council and Iwi at the end of two weeks into the occupation. The Mayor submitted a "five point plan" to Whanganui Iwi, which sought an end to the occupation. The Council proposed that:

- a trust be established for the management of Moutoa Gardens, the members of which could be appointed by a judge of the court
- research into the sale of the land and the circumstances surrounding it could be worked on by Council and completed
- protocols be established to identify all significant sites over which there were Māori grievances
monuments at Moutoa Gardens offensive to Māori be resited
- Moutoa Gardens be shared by Māori and non-Māori and a solution to the issue be reached within the Wanganui community (Wanganui Chronicle 16 March, 1995: 1).

Iwi reciprocated by presenting the Mayor with Iwi's "Declaration of Nationhood". This document was not explained in the Chronicle's report, nor was mention made of Iwi's response to the plan. However, the perspective of those at the marae was the angle of the day's coverage from the Evening Standard. The Standard's story, "Lukewarm reception to Poynter's plan", explained that according to Iwi, "to accept any of the points without ownership being negotiated would be difficult" and that the "declaration of nationhood" expressed that Iwi wished to have their "full authority over the land and a right to make all decisions controlling the land" recognised (Evening Standard, 16 March, 1995: 3). A comparison between the stories covered by the Standard and the Chronicle reflects that the ban of Chronicle workers affected what counts as "news" on a given day. The news gathered by the out of town reporter was a function of his relationship with Iwi, whereby he had access to their comment. It was Press Association copy (written by the Standard's reporter) which provided the basis for the Chronicle's report, titled "The protesters' view" the following day:

Iwi spokes woman Makareta Tawaroa said to accept any of the points without ownership being negotiated would be difficult. "According to the meeting I attended we would certainly not be considering any of these points -- to do so would diminish our understanding that this land is ours" ... Whanganui Iwi consisted of three Iwi -- each controlling a different sector of the river -- and full consultation on the Poynter plan would take some time, she said. "Iwi does not operate like a District Council" (Wanganui Chronicle March 17, 1995:1).

The "protesters view" was countered by another front page article of the day's coverage, "Second legal opinion says Crown owns Gardens". The first opinion received by the Council had been prepared by Wanganui lawyer Stephen Taylor. The second opinion is cast as
authoritative (it was prepared by an expert), and readers are reminded that Iwi are not concerned with the legality of their stance:

The opinion came from Carrie Wainwright, a partner in the Wellington legal firm Biddle and Findlay Barristers and Solicitors, and who is an expert on Waitangi claims ... "There is no evidence that it was reserved from sale in either 1840 or 1848, nor that its not being reserved was the result of any oversight on the part of either the vendors or the purchasers" the legal opinion stated. "There was a clear intention at the time to concentrate the Māori presence in Wanganui on the other side of the river and that is where the reserves were located." ... spokesman Ken Mair has previously indicated that Iwi are not concerned with what the legal position is perceived to be. In a television interview with Bill Rolston, Mr. Mair said that Māori history recorded that the land belonged to the Iwi (Wanganui Chronicle March 17: 1&3).

The legal language in this passage is euphemistic and conceals the nature of the process of colonisation. The phrase "there was a clear intention at the time to concentrate the Māori presence in Wanganui on the other side of the river and that is where the reserves were located" elides the violence of Pākehā settlement. As I asserted in my introduction, the legality of land transactions which awarded excess land for which no payment was received, renders attention to the specifics of "reserve" allocation problematic. According to Judith Binney, a New Zealand historian:

The particular piece of land (about sevenpence halfpenny worth of the 1000 pounds paid for the entire block in 1848) was a papakainga (Māori community) where Māoris (sic) from all the hapūs (sic) of the Whanganui river came together to fish and eat well (as the name tells us), near the river mouth. It was a shared fishing and camping place: hence its emotional importance to the tribe. The Whanganui land purchase of 1848 was agreed to immediately after a war which as long ago as 1968 was recognised as having been a military invasion, using the
murder of a settler's family as the pretext ... Fourteen Māori land reserves were
accepted, but not the block in question ... It was an agreed sale but one made "at
the end of the barrel of a gun", in which the bill of sale had been determined by
the buyer (New Zealand Herald, 17 April 1995).

Aside from the coercion which underpinned the sale, Iwi versions of history were not
sanctioned through the legal processes engaged by Council, and are simply acknowledged by
the Chronicle's report as contesting the legally authorised perspective. A television reporter
explained to me the manner in which he felt Iwi versions of history were inadequately
represented through Pākehā processes, including the news organisation he worked for:

The lesson for me was that it was a clash between Māori lore and Pākehā law, and
at the end of the day, the Māori version of history and events doesn't have a lot of
value, mana, in Pākehā institutions like courthouses and that sort of thing. Which
was sad to me. There was some amazing data that I saw that wasn't necessarily
being generated by the occupiers, there was a Reverend, Gary Clover, who
showed me some amazing pieces of history about the dodgy acquisition of the
land and that sort of thing, which unfortunately didn't really have a lot of impact
on my editors when I tried to include it in my stories. I tried to pitch it up at one
stage, doing a 3 or 4 minute feature mid way through the occupation, as to why
this occupation was taking place, trying to put the whole occupation in context,
and a lot of my editors doubted the validity of this account of history so as a result
it didn't see the light of day.

The Iwi's understanding of history was the basis for the "Declaration of Nationhood" which
they had presented to the Council. As the Chronicle reported, Iwi would not accept the
Mayor's five point plan until the Council accepted that:

Māori had "supreme authority" over all the Iwi's rivers, lakes, streams, mountains,
lands and all other taonga. They also want the Council to acknowledge the Iwi's
right to fully take part in benefits from, and make decisions about, the use of existing and future industrial, commercial and technological advances relating to rivers, streams, mountains, lands and other taonga (Wanganui Chronicle, March 18, 1995: 1).

The stance of Iwi was "balanced" with a story about the Mayor, "Protest part of strategic plan, Poynter says", which explained his perspective that:

"It's pretty obvious now that the networking of certain people and the planning and the strategy is all coming together, not just here but in other places, to fit in with the fiscal envelope". He said this was not realised when protesters first camped in the Gardens, claiming the land belonged to Māori and calling it Pakaitore marae. But as events unfolded, he said, "and certain things were done by stealth, like building structures underneath tents and that sort of thing," Wanganui people had begun to realise the event had been staged. "The issue of the sovereignty document, which they said they've been working on for two years, puts some credibility on what had been told to us previously" (ibid).

This account assumed that the agenda of those at the marae had changed, and by implication that this was duplicitous. Commenting on the situation at Pakaitore at this time, Moon (1996) also contends the agenda of those at the marae had changed, but in a manner which differs from the Mayor's rendering:

Despite the growing acrimony of some of the opponents of the occupation, the protesters themselves seemed to be softening their formerly militant stance, and gradually began to redefine their purpose - perhaps because of the uncertainty bought about by the absence of a quick resolution to the occupation and the claim for the land. Significantly, from mid March, Ken Mair ceased to use the term protest to describe the actions of the occupiers. The emphasis had become more positive and constructive: "The fact of the matter is that we've returned [to our
Moon's assumption that the agenda of those at the Gardens had changed does not reflect that the position described by Mair was the one articulated by Iwi whānau from day one. Rather than the purpose of the occupation being "redefined", or as the Mayor suggests, part of a broader and hitherto concealed agenda, the position of Iwi consistently drew authority from the Māori version of the Treaty of Waitangi. This was reported by the *Evening Standard* on the first day of the celebration. The assertion of nationhood refers to the partnership between hapū and the Crown, as specified by the Treaty of Waitangi. The Māori version of article two of the Treaty reads:

Ko te Kuini o Ingarani ka wakarite ka wakaee ki nga Rangatira ki nga hapū - ki nga tangata katoa o Nu Tirani te tino rangatiratanga o o ratou wenua o ratou taonga katoa. Otiia ko nga Rangatira o te wakaminenga me nga Rangatira katoa atu ka tuku ki te Kuini to hokonga o era wahi wenua e pai ai te tangata nona te Wenua - ki te ritenga o te utu e wakaritea ai e ratou ko te kai hoko e meatia nei e te Kuini hei kai hoko mona (Kawharu 1989: 317).

Kawharu (1989) translates this as:

The Queen of England agrees to protect the Chiefs, the subtribes and all the people of New Zealand in the unqualified exercise of their chieftainship over their lands, villages and all their treasures. But on the other hand the Chiefs of the Confederation and all the Chiefs will sell land to the Queen at a price agreed to by the person owning it and by the person buying it (the latter being) appointed by the Queen her purchase agent (*ibid*: 321).

Kawharu points out that the "unqualified exercise" of their chieftainship "would emphasise to a chief the Queen's intention to give them complete control according to *their* customs."
"Tino" has the connotation of "quintessential" (Kawharu 1989: 319). It was the Māori language version of the Treaty that the majority of chiefs signed; therefore in international law it is this version of the Treaty which is binding on the Crown.

In order to address claims of breaches of the Treaty, by, or on behalf of the Crown, The Waitangi Tribunal was established in 1975. In 1985 the Tribunal was granted retrospective powers to investigate alleged breaches since 1840. The Tribunal is empowered under the Treaty of Waitangi Act (1975) which states that any Māori individual or group can bring a claim of alleged grievance against the Crown or Crown agency. The process for seeking redress requires Māori lodge a claim with the Tribunal. The Tribunal then establishes whether the claim fits with the Act, and if so the claim is researched and hearings carried out. Following this the Tribunal prepares a report which offers recommendations to the Crown. If the Crown accepts the Tribunal's recommendations, a settlement is negotiated with the claimant group.

Whanganui Iwi have been working on their claims since the mid 1980s. Their claims to the River were heard in 1993. The Tribunal's report was forwarded to the Crown, and made public, in June 1999. The Crown has yet to act on the recommendations made.

The stance of Iwi at Pakaitore can only be understood in this context. However, from the perspective of Crown and Council the dispute simply concerned the land at Moutoa Gardens, despite the contrary assertions of Iwi whānau. From this perspective, the process for resolving the dispute entailed proving the Council's title to the Gardens and the Crown was not, therefore, a party to this. This explicitly eschewed the contestability of the deed of sale of Wanganui and thus the Treaty of Waitangi was not the authority through which recourse could be drawn. The legitimacy of the Council's position within this narrow conceptualising of the issue was drawn from the two legal opinions they had solicited, and later the judgement of the High Court. However, that the Iwi grievance lay with the Crown was recognised by the author of the first legal opinion, solicitor Stephen Taylor, who came to represent a group of business people who believed the dispute should be settled by the Waitangi Tribunal and
that the Council's "protracted negotiation with the occupying Māori is really a waste of time" (Wanganui Chronicle March 21, 1995: 1). This is not to say the perspective of Taylor was sympathetic to Iwi, rather that it was more appropriate that their grievance be dealt with by the Crown.

**reporting from the outside**

The reporter who covered the occupation for the Chronicle told me that he would have liked to report on Iwi perspectives of history and the Treaty of Waitangi, and move beyond the "hard angle" and the views of state officials. He was incapable of pursuing these projects, both through his ban from Pakaitore, and due to the conventions of news practice deployed by his editor. He explained that despite the ban he endeavoured to produce balanced reports:

> The coverage that we were able to generate was one sided, in the respect that we were able to talk with the Mayor Chas Poynter, and lawyer Stephen Taylor and various community people but we weren't able to talk to the Iwi so we were relying on the NZPA copy that was being generated by their reporters here, and we would try and balance up our reports but it wasn't our own copy. We went to extreme lengths, excruciating lengths to make sure that we were as fair as we could be given that they weren't talking to us - but just because someone won't talk to you doesn't mean that they gag the whole story - which was their intention. We always gave them the opportunity to have their say on a daily basis. After a while we did stop ringing them, we stopped trying to go down there because it was getting very unpleasant.

The reporter felt that his paper produced exceptional coverage of the occupation, and criticised other news providers for failing to make better use of their access to the marae:

> I thought television coverage was like 99.9 percent of all media reports - shallow, reactionary, TV1 especially, it's so tabloid, TV3 is a little bit better. But no one really delved into it and they had access - TV1 had their reporter living there, they
could have done something. I think we did an okay job, we reported what was happening when it was happening accurately and fairly.

Sue: do you believe you could be objective and fair under those circumstances?

Yes, as far as I'm aware. We do it every day writing pre-election blurbs when you abhor people's politics - I did a very fair job. In fact I went the extra distance. I used to come in and search for all the Moutoa stories on NZPA on the wire and I would put everything in that we didn't have, and I would say that we gave the most comprehensive coverage of any media in the country, and I deliberately made a beeline for anything the Iwi were saying - we used to tape the radio bulletins and if there was anything on them I would transcribe it and shamelessly plagiarise the radio. I didn't have to do that. Remaining impartial and objective is what our profession is all about. It is the cornerstone of what we do. I think I remained true to that throughout the Moutoa coverage.

Within the preceding passages the reporter's critique of the news practice of other organisations refers to features which the majority of editorial staff believe constitute good news making. As I examine in chapter five, the Television One reporter was similarly critical of the preference for "sensational", or "hard" stories and the superficiality resulting from the requirement for concision. I suggest that many editorial staff demand these orthodoxies because they are mindful of the imperative for profits, via circulation and ratings. Hence it is stories which will attract and hold the attention of readers and viewers which are favoured. When the Chronicle reporter attests that "no one really delved into it" he indicates a desire to produce, not "good" news, but something more than the conventions of "news" allow:

One of my biggest frustrations was that I didn't feel I was able to educate, enlighten, lead or direct anybody and often I feel that is the function of the media, and you know when you've done it, you feel really good, fulfilled. This has just left a big empty void.
He told me that he may have been able to produce the stories he wished to if his editor was more conciliatory in his approach to Iwi, and if time wasn’t a constraining factor. Rather than perceive features such as superficiality, sensationalism, editorial control and concision as fundamental to what counts as "news", and prohibiting the possibility of "enlightening" readers, he was able to view his own reproduction of the features he critiques as the fault of the occupation’s spokespeople who banned him from Pakaitore. This is not to say that what I am rendering as a displacement clarified his positioning in relation to Iwi, or diminished his desire to engage with Iwi concerns:

(I wanted) to tell people that while what they’re doing is a bit provocative and out of the ordinary, they’ve actually got some pretty amazing things to say, we should listen to this ... I wanted to get on the marae and do atmospheric pieces on their daily lives, I wanted to interview some of the normal people there, I wanted to interview the kuia - it was amazing - there were old people there doing a radical demonstration that gave it some credibility and I wanted to explain that. I wanted to look beyond Ken Mair, delve into the history of Pakaitore marae, where it actually was geographically, and we did a lot of that but without Māori input and even to this day its been proven in a European court of law that Moutoa Gardens is not Pakaitore marae ... but the Māori still say that’s not right, and that annoys me, I would like to get in and find out. These are the sorts of things I wanted to be able to do, I didn’t have the time, and as soon as they locked me out I didn’t have the tools either.

These comments reflect the reporter’s ambivalent positioning. His desire for an "insider" perspective stemmed not only from the journalistic imperatives for "balance" and "truth", but also from an intense interest in the status of Iwi Māori; yet he comprehends members of Iwi whānau as discomfortingly "other". The reporter wanted to convey the logic of Iwi’s initiative for a public who similarly condemned Ken Mair. His description of Mair attributes

---

2This was the stance taken by two journalists I interviewed, who left their respective news organisations.
him with a lack of credibility: "I think he's a very shallow, a hollow sort of guy and not all that genuine, but he touches on themes and issues that I think will have increasing importance in this country". This opinion perhaps speaks to the reporter's unwillingness to identify with the spokespeople he believed responsible for the Chronicle's ban, and conveys a perspective shaped by mass mediated renderings of Mair. My assumptions about the reporter are corroborated within the following passage, which elaborates the ambiguities of his positioning:

I came to NZ when I was 8 and I went to a predominantly Māori primary school and it was a huge culture shock - I made a lot of good friends at time, I've lost contact with them since, I remember going round to Barney's place, they had a 26 inch colour TV in the corner; bare floor boards, no furniture, never had anything to eat. I grew up in the Pepper block, which is the poor, predominantly Māori area of Wanganui and I had a lot of friends - I identified with Māori but when those guys turned against my paper and against me for no apparent reason I felt quite hurt because I still don't think that Ken Mair and Te Aahi Ka and Tariana Turia speak for the majority of Māoridom - they don't, but it still hurts. And I went through a lot of personal soul searching about my beliefs, am I racist? I wouldn't call myself racist but there are cultural differences between myself and Māoridom and sure I have to ask them how to spell their names, but I don't mean any offence by it.

The reporter reveals a fascination for the "other": the implicitly sensational priorities of the poor Māori he knew (the status afforded television); the desire to access "authentic" insider perspectives. He expresses distance, yet reviles this distance. Rather than reduce this to "racism", or as evoking a tradition of the imperialising desire to penetrate the "other", I am interested in the particulars of his positioning. This enables a more productive assessment of the limits of representational practice within a settler society.
The reporter was able to run some features in his paper about the broader context of Treaty claims; yet he imagines a readership unwilling to engage with these issues:

I don't think, had I been able to do those atmospheric pieces and interview kuia and children, it would have made a spot of difference. I went out of my way - the Rowan partnership here helped explain the Treaty and I did a story on that. Justice Paul Temm came here and gave a very informative speech to Polytech students, and I was so moved by it that I went and got his speech and we ran it as a three part feature over three days. It was about the Treaty and how it isn't being honoured and what it really means. It was terrific material. But there was no feedback on the stories. I doubt if anyone even read all three.

Here the question becomes not one of representation within media; space is made for views which do not make "hard" headlines; it is the antipathy of publics that is at stake. The reporter articulated an impassioned interest in the status of the Treaty, and identified a broader reluctance to heed the centrality of the document within national culture:

The government is tying the Treaty into the constitution and policy of every government department and social agency in the country and its there at the root as a founding document but no one's adhering to it, they're only paying lip service to it. If they were made to implement it as it stands it's got some massive implications. [At present] it's not a genuine attempt by the government, but the obligation is there, and some day they'll be accountable. People have to wake up.

Yet the reporter's defence of the *Chronicle* precludes his identification of the organisation, and his role within it, as similarly tokenistic. He had received some training in tikanga Māori: "two or three cultural awareness courses during the course of my journalism training but I don't have daily contact with Māori people so courses are one thing ... ". This lack of contact with Māori would appear to compromise, or reflect a lack of commitment to, his
coverage of "Māori news", yet he was mandated to do so by his paper and had compiled the Māori page for two years.

Within this context, the deficiency of the term "racism" to name what is in play is conspicuous. While the reporter may participate in a broader culture where racisms prevail, labelling him "racist" covers over the specificities of his positioning. In a broader context, my sense is that while there are similarities across racisms, it is easy for publics or individuals to assume they do not deserve this label because it is imagined to correspond with overt or extreme manifestations of racial prejudice. In response to the persistence of "racial" disadvantage within liberal democracies, theorists have offered various permutations of how we might comprehend contemporary racisms. Entman describes "modern" racism as "a compound of hostility, rejection and denial on the part of whites toward the activities and aspirations of black people" (Entman, 1992: 341). "Modern" racism differs from "traditional" racism in that the expression of overt anti-black sentiment, drawing on supposed biological differences, is replaced with antagonism towards affirmative action policies and the denial of the persistence of inequities (ibid: 342-3).

Wetherell and Potter (1992) critique this manner of accounting for racism. Approaches such as Entman’s, derived from psychological theory, locate racism "within the emotional and cognitive apparatus of the individual" (Wetherell and Potter 1992: 197). Wetherell and Potter’s approach posits racism as the deployment of culturally specific narratives:

"Discourse analysis locates the conflicts and dilemmas within the argumentative and rhetorical resources available in a 'liberal' 'egalitarian' society such as New Zealand. The conflict is not between a feeling and a value, between psychological drives and socially acceptable expressions or between emotions and politics, but between competing frameworks for articulating social, political and ethical questions. These conflicts and dilemmas could be said to be realised..."
in a 'psychological' form when the members of a society begin to discuss, debate, explain, justify and develop accounts in the course of social interaction and everyday life [my italics] (ibid).

This Foucauldian derived rendering performs useful intellectual labour in my analysis of media: it shifts the focus from labelling individuals, and suggests interrogation of institutional contexts and the manner individuals positioned within them engage broader discursive frameworks. Further, it accommodates Stam and Shohat's observation that "since racism is a complex hierarchical system, a structured ensemble of social and institutional practices and discourses, individuals do not have actively to express racism to be its beneficiaries" (Stam and Shohat 1996:19).

With these points in mind, I do not account for the reporter's positioning as "racist"; rather his lack of cross cultural expertise reflects the ethnocentrism of the cultures he inhabits; the prevalence of "white public space" (Page and Thomas 1994:111):

Any analysis of racism calls for certain distinctions. First, racism differs from ethnocentrism. Any group can be ethnocentric, in that it sees the world through the lenses provided by its own culture. But to see the world through the lenses provided by one's culture is not necessarily racist ... What is racist is the stigmatising of difference in order to justify unfair advantage or the abuse of power, whether that advantage or abuse be economic, political, cultural, or psychological" (Stam and Shohat 1996: 22-3).

The distinction I make then, is that the reporter acts as a conduit for Pākehā ethnocentrism, which in broader contexts manifests "racial" disadvantage. He occupies, and reproduces, cultural positions which do not encourage productive engagement with the specifics of settler identity (he told me "I have trouble with the word "Pākehā", I am English, or European"); where differences between Māori and Pākehā are consigned to history (his interest in the Treaty does not translate to the claims of Whanganui Iwi under Article Two, whereby the
historical site of Pakaitore pa was part of a broader claim to the way tino rangatiratanga was compromised through Pākehā settlement); where symbols of "Māori-ness" are publicly deployed to conceal profound national exclusions. My claim here is not the inevitability of the reporter's role, rather it's comprehensibility. Crucially, he was viewed by Iwi as represented by his editor, who publicly expressed racist views. As I have discussed, the reporter for the Evening Standard was not constrained in this way, and produced reports on the occupation which included attention to Iwi aspirations and perspectives. I have accounted for this as resulting from his editor's support, and his journalistic practice, which entailed facilitating relationships with Iwi. His experiences of "others", which led to an interest in Pākehā identity, was also relevant to his praxis at Pakaitore:

I'd been living overseas for ten years, and I came back to New Zealand and decided to be a journalist, and did the Wellington Polytech course, etcetera, and then I got into all types of issues, environment, science, regional council type things and the Māori component was always there. At the same time, coming back to New Zealand - I'd been in a lot of different countries - spent three years in South East Asia, looking at a lot of different traditional cultures, particularly in Borneo and places like that, where I got a real kick out of discovering different values and ways of life. When I got back to New Zealand it really struck me that I was raised a Pākehā, went to a country school and knew very little about the indigenous people, so I went out of my way, I didn't enrol in courses or anything, but when opportunities came my way I followed them ... Being a Pākehā and not speaking Māori was obviously a problem (at Pakaitore) but I found that if you got to know people, the key players, and reported them fairly, that doors were open to me. I think its well known what happened to the Wanganui Chronicle, the way they got banned, and I think [the occupiers] did that because [the paper] took the Wanganui District Council's view. But I found it all quite fascinating, the concept of tino rangatiratanga, recovering their Whanganuitanga.

4 I elaborate this argument in chapter six: Māori art/language/cultural displays are use to signify a bicultural national identity; when Iwi disrupt this imagined unity by drawing attention to breaches of the Treaty, or contemporary socio-economic disparities between Māori and Pākehā they are rendered as creating racism or radicalising the past.
The *Standard*'s reporter entered his relationships at Pakaitore, and performed his job, using conceptual resources; or familiarity with discursive frameworks, which compete with the parochial imperatives of the *Chronicle*'s editor.

The *Chronicle*'s tacit support of the "One Law" group provides an example of its complicity with an organisation advocating racist principles. Supported by the "One New Zealand Foundation", One Law's rhetoric objected to Iwi's initiative, and the relationship between Māori and the Crown specified by the Treaty, on the basis that it was "special treatment". These assertions of ostensibly liberal arguments (everyone is equal) fail to comprehend that equality was imperiled through colonisation; that breaches to the Treaty have compromised equivalence of opportunity through legally and ethically dubious means.

The *Chronicle*'s coverage of the first counter protest staged by One Law was contextualised on the front page by the lead article, "Council plans firmer stand on protesters", which referred to the Council's decision, as explained by Mayor Poynter, to consider "firmer action" if the "illegal structures" erected by the occupiers were not removed (*Wanganui Chronicle* March 20 1995: 1). The article outlined the illegality of the occupation: "Council as the legal owner of Moutoa Gardens on behalf of the people of Wanganui has the legal right to have the tents, illegal structures and fences removed and is entitled to ask the police to ensure the reserve is available to the general public without them having to go through Māori protocol to enter it" (*ibid*). Any discussion will commence only after the occupiers have left. Thus, the parameters of the dispute are clearly set as a narrow interpretation of Iwi's stance and the available legal discourse.

Next to this was the article "One Law Group wins support", an account of the counter protest held across from the Gardens. The organiser of the protest, Brian Turner, detailed the "amazing support" received from passing motorists; he estimated ten thousand people showed support by tooting. This was supported by the reporter's comments: "At the time the
*Chronicle* spoke with Mr. Turner it was almost impossible to hear what he was saying because of the noise of the horns" (*ibid*).

The editor of the *Chronicle* told me about this demonstration:

[The One Law group] had their first counter demonstration across the road on a Saturday, and I was coming back from the golf club and I called in to see how it was going, because I'd done the original story. And as I was talking to the organiser some people arrived from Tauranga from the One New Zealand foundation. The One Law people's philosophy was very simple - one law for everybody. If we have to get a permit for building then so do you. And the answer from Moutoa was of course to put more up, and put fences around it. I still think that if they hadn't put the fence up it would have been settled a lot more amicably. People saw it as the final act of defiance I suppose.

Sue: so it divided the community?

Well there was a huge majority opposed to it - divide suggests some balance.

The counter protest was visualised with two photographs which convey the disparity between the "citizens" of Wanganui engaged in peaceful counter-protest (*figure 4*), and "some of the Māori occupying the Gardens", as the second photograph was captioned (*figure 5*). Three men, one of whom is "giving the finger" (a gesture I interpret to mean "get fucked"), are cast as representative of Iwi whānau.
The selection of this type of image was described to me by one of my informants from Pakaitore:

And in our own way we knew that Wanganui could have been a stronger community if we were able to deal with a lot of issues that were confronting our young people in that setting. But people didn't see that of course, they saw these kids as angry, confrontational young people and that's how the media portrayed them, and they followed them around taking photos of them, and aggravating them generally. These are young people who don't have the ability or the skills to deal with those sorts of situations, and it developed into a really confrontational situation generally with the police and everybody else, and the media capitalised on that and sensationalised those aspects of us being there which was really ugly and awful.

The photograph of the three men was taken from outside of the marae; the men are behind the perimeter fencing. In this sense it expresses the relationship of the photographer to the occupation: he is an outsider and looks from this location. The manner in which images of angry rangatahi effaced an insider view of their participation on the marae was described to me:

The effect it had on young local Māori was extremely positive, I've worked on courses run by Education Training Support and N.Z.E.S. (N.Z. Employment Service) for 2 years, and a lot of young Māori are going through those courses. Many have been unemployed for many years. And a lot of young unemployed Māori went to the marae and they seemed to get a feeling of self worth out of it. Young men and women who I personally knew had drug problems or personal problems, alcohol related problems, went on to the marae, either visited daily or stayed on the marae, were drug free, started learning Māori. And that was so obvious to anyone who went on to the marae and I have yet to see any kind of reporting of that.
On 22 March the *Chronicle* ran their only story over the course of the occupation about what was happening on the marae. It was sourced from Press Association copy, and was the type of story the *Chronicle*’s reporter wished to access for himself:

There are tents for dining and cooking, a small media tent where statements are prepared and interviews conducted, and a meeting house, where many of the group’s children can be found sleeping ... outside the meeting house, kaumāna and kuia sit to greet visitors, who are welcomed on to the marae in the traditional fashion. Visitors and supporters are greeted warmly, and are immediately ushered to the dining room for a cup of tea and something to eat ... Teenagers volunteer their services for security duty at the garden’s entrances, the only way they can get to stay up at night ... there had been some instances where people opposed to the occupation had tried to cause trouble, but security was well organised and those on the gate could signal by torch to alert the others. Generally, though, the mood is peaceful and laidback. Pakaitore, meaning "shimmering lights and food", was a major fishing settlement occupied by Whanganui Iwi for hundreds of years. A major battle between Taranaki and Whanganui tribes took place there and it is seen as a sanctuary where police cannot enter and arrest any Māori. After European settlement it became known as Market Square and was used by Māori for trading" ("Moutoa tent city has plenty of activity" *Wanganui Chronicle* 22 March 1995: 3).

That this story ran on page three, and the lead story of the day was "Council officers, Ministers meet on Moutoa Issue" reflects the privileging of "hard" over "soft" news. Galtung and Ruge (1973) note that one of the determinants of the newsworthiness of events is that they refer to elite persons (Galtung and Ruge 1973:66). In this case the presence of state officials takes precedence as news over an account of daily life at the marae. This angle is favoured even though the lead article offers no "developments": "Wanganui Mayor Chas Poynte is *keeping to himself* details of a meeting held yesterday between Wanganui District
Council representatives and three Cabinet Ministers concerning the occupation of Moutoa Gardens" [my italics](Wanganui Chronicle 22 March 1995: 1).

An "emergency" meeting of council was the Chronicle’s lead story on March 23, which ran under the huge headline "Seven Day Ultimatum: Māori prepare to dig in after Council gets tough". The report explained that Council had voted to "give the Māori at Moutoa Gardens seven days to remove illegal structures, make good damage and leave the site". The Mayor’s five point plan was withdrawn until this had happened. The paper reported that "there were loud cheers from spectators when the decision was reached" and the two Councillors who contested the decision "were met with catcalls". Responding to this decision Ken Mair told the press that "we are calling on all our network and support to stand with us in our time of need" (Wanganui Chronicle 23 March 1995: 1).

The Council’s eviction of Iwi from the marae was scheduled for March 30. The Chronicle ran daily front page coverage as a build up to this event. A front page story on 24 March, "Northern activists preparing to join Wanganui protest", stated that "at least two well known Māori activists indicated yesterday they were "answering the call" to come and support the Moutoa Gardens occupiers" (Wanganui Chronicle 24 March 1995: 1). Hone Harawira and Eva Rickard had both said they would support Whanganui Iwi. The remainder of the article was devoted to a range of views about the resolution of the occupation, with the head line referring only to the "hard angle" of the first paragraph. The Evening Standard also reported on the arrival of supporters to the marae and, in a different tenor from the Chronicle’s coverage, included that "around 2000 Pākehā from Wellington, Auckland and Taranaki had visited the Gardens in the past three weeks to express their support and understanding". Those at the marae acknowledged there was a lot of support by the non-Māori community. Many letters of support had come in "interestingly, many of them from Pākehā women offering support and money" (Evening Standard 24 March 1995: 1).

The angles favoured by, and available to the Chronicle over the duration of the occupation largely failed to represent support for Pakaitore. Despite the negative rendering of Iwi, and
the media attention detractors received, there were pockets of support for the occupation within Wanganui. As I detail in the following chapter, members of the clergy spent time at the marae in support of their parishioners, and were courted by the press. Subsistence on the marae was enabled by donations from the wider community. An employee of the electorate office told me:

Regular meals were served every day to hundreds and hundreds of visitors, that was only made possible by the massive support they got, mainly from Māori, and I have no proof of this, but apparently Foodtown gave food to the marae, but I'm sure they wouldn't let that be known in the community. I went there one day and they were serving seafood. That was bought in fresh daily by support groups. And the more substantial structures like the fence were made from donations of wood.

A participant from the marae contested the angle, taken by the Chronicle, that the occupation adversely affected the local economy:

Extraordinary people came, even the koha, the amount of financial support was incredible. I forget the last figure, 70 or 80 thousand; a lot of money, just straight koha. Feeding them was a logistical feat in itself, and hiring things. All the businesses around that part of the city were all losing custom! Absolute bullshit. Some thrived, particularly the hire people, tent people, garages, eating places.

One supporter was motivated by media coverage to go to Wanganui. In this context, national media provided publicity for the initiative, yet the boy reasoned that to understand what was happening he should be present:

A lovely young boy came from Christchurch, and he just happened to end up at my house. I said "why on earth are you here?" He said, "well I saw [the occupation] on the TV and I read about it in the paper and it struck me that this is
one of the most important things going on in the country, I better get up there". He stayed for about two months. I thought it was incredible - most people would think "those Māoris, never satisfied". Not a bit of it! He had trouble getting used to the ways, the tikanga, he was a bit scared of that, I said, "just be yourself, listen hard and don't say much". He had some hard times and he had some good times - he stayed to the bitter end, and even a couple of weeks later when it was time to talk he wanted to stay around for that.

This anecdote suggests a differentiated audience of national news; the character of news coverage did not automatically translate into fear, or a lack of support of Pakaitore. As I suggested in my discussion of differentially situated newsworkers, we comprehend events, or in this case representations of events, with recourse to our competencies and investments in the range of discursive possibilities. Yet, for my informant, the uniqueness of this response made it worthy of comment. According to a supporter of the occupation, Iwi's willingness to accommodate visitors prevailed throughout their initiative:

Anyone who went to Pakaitore and observed the protocol of the marae was welcomed warmly. I was constantly amazed at the tolerance and kindness of Māori at Pakaitore towards visitors. There were visitors from all over the world; they were welcomed and stayed on the marae. The people at Pakaitore were amazing in the aroha they showed towards the community. As you can see I am biased, I was totally supportive, its a shame it was treated so negatively, as most Māori actions are. I never saw anything on TV that ever came to grips with what was happening. That whole thing of Wanganui as a place under siege, where it was no longer safe to walk the streets! Anyone could have walked around Pakaitore at any time of the day or night, and they would have been more safe than if they were in other parts of town. Unless you got too close to the police.

The Chronicle provided one story about supporters of the marae, which covered a visit to the marae by a group of women, organised by Women Concerned for a Peaceful Process. It
explained that more than one hundred women had come from around the North Island and were welcomed onto the marae. "But a Chronicle woman reporter and woman photographer who went down to cover the event were refused entry and were later also prevented from taking photographs from the street" (Wanganui Chronicle 29 March 1995: 1). A visitor from Wellington told the paper that the visit had achieved its objective to show that the marae was a safe place: "It was a really good experience with ordinary women and children meeting face to face with the people on the marae and they listened to what the Māori had to say - their hurts and grievances and while all may not have agreed with what was said they listened" (ibid).

The lead story of the day's coverage, "Another emergency meeting: More talks as Moutoa deadline looms", explained that although the ultimatum expired the following day at 5pm, Iwi showed no signs of leaving the site. The Mayor would not tell the paper what the Council planned to do if Iwi did not leave, but Council would hold another emergency meeting an hour before the deadline expired. Press Association copy was used to cite the view of Western Māori MP, Koro Wetere, who explained that over the weekend many visitors to the marae had voiced a range of opinions: "It was a good opportunity for those at the Gardens to hear the views of the wider community of Māoridom. Māori realise it is not just Moutoa. It is far wider". The report continued "He said those at the site had received a lot of encouragement to carry on and to look for ways and means of seeking a resolution". This report was visualised with a photograph of Mike Smith captioned "Mike Smith, above, the man charged with the attack on Auckland's One Tree Hill pine, arrived at Moutoa Gardens yesterday to support Whanganui River Māori" (ibid). While this did not relate to the written copy it was positioned in the centre of the story and provided a "face of protest". It expressed that the support Iwi were receiving was not only from the Māori M.P., but also from "radicals", mitigating the "positive" coverage of the women's visit.

A photograph of Mike Smith was also featured in the Evening Standard on March 29, however this visualised a story which consisted of an interview with Smith. The article began "Māori activist Mike Smith believes the Government should fund a series of television
documentaries aimed at bringing Pākehā up to speed on why actions such as the occupation of Moutoa Gardens are happening." Smith was quoted:

"For those drowning in their own prejudice, we clearly need an intrusive media to break through. It's too much to expect people to leave the comfort of their homes and study things they already have preconceived ideas about. I'm sure if the government embarked on an education campaign, using the television media, then we could cut through those entrenched positions and make some real progress" (Evening Standard 29 March 1995: 2).

Smith explained to the reporter his belief that there was a dearth of understanding of New Zealand history and the processes through which Māori became marginalised, a context which would render the present state of Māori intelligible. "Let's face it, Māori don't like being a millstone around society's neck. It is not a situation they have chosen to be in. Solutions are linked to access to resources, what Māori see as a place to stand" (Evening Standard, 25 March 1995: 2).

The reporter who wrote this report explained to me the process and rationale behind his story:

I recognised Mike Smith and got an introduction and talked to him, he's quite infamous, but I found that what he said actually made a lot of sense. He talked about the need for education because Pākehā do not understand these issues, or the history of Māori being fed poisoned wheat and so on. Meanwhile I was talking to people like Mason Durie, I did a feature on him, and he was talking about the actual facts of what Māori is facing as far as their social status, the changes they're going through. So at the same time I was getting the academic background from people like him, and that was quite interesting really because even though Smith is considered to be a radical, in fact what he was saying was parallel to what the academics were saying.
While the *Chronicle* used an image of Smith as an icon of the radicalism Pākehā should fear, the *Standard’s* reporter had the opportunity to talk with Smith and move beyond his assumptions. His access to the "inside" of Pakaitore enabled him to dispense with the trope of the "infamous" "radical" and engage with the substance of Smith's politics.

On 31 March the decision not to evict Iwi from the Gardens the previous day was a national news story. The *Chronicle* featured four stories and three photographs on the front page under the banner headline "No eviction from Moutoa". Stories about the occupation were also run on page three, and on page nine a full page of images from the march down the main street was featured. The lead story, "Council taking dispute to the High Court", explained that "the Council's decision to seek legal clarification in the High Court is a necessary step before forcible eviction could take place". The Council resolved that meanwhile Iwi and Council would jointly determine a process for continuing dialogue and the Council would seek "immediate and definite" involvement of the Crown (*Wanganui Chronicle* 31 March 1995: 1).
The photographs on the front page visualised the march down the main street of Wanganui, where supporters from Taranaki met Whanganui Iwi to march with them in support. The march was reported under the headline "Haka mars march by protesters" (figure 6). The leader to the story contended that:

An ugly incident outside Wanganui Mayor Chas Poynter's central city bookstore marred an otherwise peaceful march by more than 600 Māori protesters through Victoria Ave yesterday ... Apart from that incident it was essentially a good natured display of unity and determination by the marchers, who were met with an obvious lack of sympathy among observers..."I like watching them walk up the street making a fool of themselves" one woman said. "The government has to intervene at this stage" said another (Wanganui Chronicle 31 March 1995: 1).

The haka was the hard angle plucked from a march down the entire length of the main street. One of my informants commented: "when they did the haka they made sure to put a camera on those young people who looked the most aggressive, they placed their own values and standards on those young people". The haka represented a challenge to the power of the Mayor and is a culturally specific display of sentiment. Joseph Rauhina, the man with dreadlocks, was arrested for performing this haka. He was charged with "disorderly behaviour likely to cause the start or continuation of violence" (Wanganui Chronicle 6 April 1995: 3).

The other two photographs on the front page were colour rather than black and white; as the only colour photographs used throughout the Chronicle's eighty days of coverage they marked this as a special occasion. The first photograph was of a group of Taranaki Iwi. Three of the four men in front have full face moko (figure 7). The man in the centre gazes into the camera.
Auckland activist Mike Smith (with megaphone) led the chants as the marchers moved down Victoria Ave.

Figure 8
The second photo was of Mike Smith and Tame Iti, who also has a full face moko (Figure 8). Significantly all Māori depicted in the two pages of photographs were male. This is the hard angle; the images are icons of what protest, or "native" masculinity, means to Pākehā authority. The selection of this angle conceals that the majority of marchers did not look like these men, and nor do these men look like themselves. The selection of the head shot of Tame Iti by the photographer cuts out his body, which if included would show that he pushed a toddler in a stroller throughout the march. This would, of course, mitigate the menace he is intended to signify.

Figure 9
By way of contrast, the focus of the same day's coverage from the *Evening Standard* was on the mood of triumph at the Gardens as the eviction deadline passed without police intervention. The banner headline "Police close pubs" referred to the police decision to close three Wanganui pubs early as a pre-emptive measure. One publican was upset "it was a brilliant night until [the police] stopped it". Two photographs on the front page visualised the celebration. One depicted a large crowd and was captioned "In good voice - protesters at Moutoa Gardens sing as yesterday's 5pm deadline passes without any police movement". The second image (*figure 9*) was captioned "Shall we dance - Māori rights campaigner Eva Rickard happily leads a dance at Moutoa Gardens" (*Evening Standard* 31 March 1995: 1).
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Other national papers chose a different angle for the day's events. On page one, both the *Dominion* and *New Zealand Herald* ran images of a car being smashed by occupiers earlier in the day (*figure 10*).

The driver of the car claimed he had permission to go through the road block, while one of my informants from the marae told me the driver provoked the attack by swerving at some
young people. The editor of the Chronicle told me of his decision not to run the image of the car being smashed:

I had access to the photograph of the guys wrecking the car the morning it all blew up. But I didn't run it. Because if I had run that photograph I really believe that there would have been some sort of retribution. The other papers ran it, but what ever those at Moutoa Gardens think we are the local paper, it is the major media, and to run that photograph would do no good. We had a very delicate photo of the wrecked car later, but we didn't have the photo of guys in tattoos smashing it in. That was on the front page of the Dominion, and if it had happened in Palmerston I would have run that photo too, because it was a bloody good news shot. But my feeling was that the situation was so volatile that we wouldn't have helped the cause by running it.

However, a reporter from Palmerston North was critical of the use of the images of the attack on the car, not because of possible retaliation, but because he believed they were misrepresentative of the occupation:

There was one particular moment when the guy put the club through the window and it was on the front page of the Dominion. Now that was shaping up for some time and it was all quite tense at that time, there were hundreds and hundreds of people there, and a lot of people trying to get welcomed on, and there was no room on the footpath, so everyone was spilling on to the street. So the reason they closed the street was because there had been a couple of incidents where people could have been hurt, some Pākehā drivers weren't prepared to slow down and there were kids and everything. So when they blocked the street that was definitely gang related and they were out of the control of Ken and Niko, they didn't want that to happen. But it was such an isolated incident when that club went through the windscreen. It was a wonderful photo professionally because it says everything - but the problem was it didn't say everything about Moutoa
Gardens, it just reinforced all the prejudices because it was an isolated incident.

If I had seen that photo being taken I would have argued with the editor as to whether it should be published.

A photograph of the car incident was also run on the front page of the *New Zealand Herald*. Further images on page eighteen told a story of the polarity between protesters and Council, although the story which accompanied the images, and the headline "Saga of confusion, conflict" referred to the history of land acquisition in the region, not the present initiative.
On April 1 the *Chronicle*'s lead story, "Council decision not to evict protesters backed by Mayor", represented this decision as the only possible outcome because a forced eviction would in fact have served the interests of protesters and endangered the "innocent":

An estimated 1500 protesters crammed on to Moutoa Gardens on Thursday as the Council's 5pm deadline passed without the Council asking police to clear the site. Many hundreds of innocent bystanders and interest groups were also present around the Gardens, including women and children, and Mr. Poynter said this made it the worst possible time to ask for the site to be cleared. "There was also a certain element amongst the protesters who had come into Wanganui specifically for a stoush. Ken Mair and his cohorts wanted to be made martyrs and to be filmed being dragged away by police" Mr Poynter said. "This is what they have wanted all along and we weren't playing into their hands. The Council wants to discuss the issues through in a mature and thorough way with the genuine river Iwi - not out of town trouble makers". As much as some members of the public wanted the Gardens cleared, Mr. Poynter said he doubted if those same people would have wanted to witness bloodshed which would have been an inevitable consequence of a forced eviction. "Once violence erupts innocent people get dragged in and people get hurt. Nobody wants to see that happen and this Council has a responsibility to uphold the law and preserve the peace" (*Wanganui Chronicle* 1 April 1995: 1).

While the desire to avoid bloodshed is a reasonable position, the Mayor's argument is premised on the protection of the "innocent". This implies the guilt of others ("Ken Mair and his cohorts") and reinscribes the protest as gendered: women and children must be shielded from harm. This offers no agency to those who decided to stand in support of Iwi whānau: they are "innocent bystanders" rather than active participants. But to allow this active participation is to challenge the manner in which Pakaitore has been constituted as both masculine and threatening.
A discussion paper was circulated on the marae in response to the Council's resolutions of Thursday 30 March. Concern was expressed that the Council continued to insist the site be vacated because "reclamation of this land remains for the Iwi and expression of its Rangatiratanga". Iwi were however, pleased that the Council recognised the need for Crown involvement. While for the Council this was necessary to clarify their legitimacy in evicting the protesters it meant something quite different to Iwi:

[The involvement of the Crown] is essential because the relationship established within the Treaty of Waitangi is between Iwi and the Crown, not between Iwi and a subordinate Crown agency such as a district Council. Indeed, the basis of Whanganuitanga is that the hapū and Iwi of this rohe are sovereign nations and must therefore deal with the Crown. To deal only with District Council is to diminish the status of Iwi to that of an inferior agency to the Crown. Dialogue leading to resolution must therefore ultimately be between Iwi and the Crown because they are the high contracting parties to the Treaty. However, before such dialogue can positively begin, it is important that Iwi be able to complete the process of consultation with Hapū which was proposed in the earlier Iwi statement. The purpose of this kōrero with all the Hapū of this rohe is to pursue ideas and seek agreement for a common base of discussion with the Crown. Before any such discussion can occur it is important that the Crown also outlines the ideas and proposals upon which it is prepared to begin dialogue. It will also be helpful if both the Crown and Iwi could outline the constitutional basis upon which they will seek resolution. Upon the completion of these discussion starting points the Iwi of Whanganui invites the Crown to meet with it at Pakaitore to commence the process of wakawhitihiti kōrero. After this initial hui, detailed discussions will take place at mutually agreed upon venues.

This was not the process that was to unfold. Representatives of the Crown consistently asserted that the dispute was between Iwi and Council.
Within this chapter I have elaborated the manner in which what becomes "the news" may, under particular circumstances, challenge the orthodoxy of the imperative for the "hard angle". The Evening Standard's reporter conveyed perspectives from inside Pakaitore in his rendering of the proposed eviction. In contrast, Chronicle reportage continued to represent the occupation as a threat to the Pākehā community, visualising the initiatives of Iwi and supporters as (literally) embodied by rangatahi coded as menacing. I intensify my analysis of the visualing practice of news media in chapters five and six. In the following chapter I detail the process through which Iwi were compelled to leave Pakaitore, and the active role taken by the Chronicle in legitimising state authority.
Following the Council's decision not to evict Iwi by force, the Chronicle's coverage favoured the "hard angle" of the relationship between police and protesters and the Council's perspective on the High Court process. At Pakaitore, concerns focused on the role of police in compromising the safety of Iwi. Both Iwi and the Council continued to seek intervention from the Crown. Encounters between Iwi and police, the contesting of legal process by Iwi, and the rhetoric of clergy who supported the occupation, challenged the authority of the practices and discourses constituent of state power. Yet the interaction between media and the agencies of the state served to reinscribe the legitimacy of these authorities, by rendering protest "outside" the acceptable methods to express grievance.

My agenda in this chapter is to reveal the discursive production of police and legal authority; that is, the manner in which particular journalistic renderings of these authorities entailed the active delegitimation of contesting perspectives through silencing or discrediting them. This project concurs with the work of Ericson, Baranek and Chan (1987), who contend that journalists reproduce social order:

In effect, journalists join with other agents of control as a kind of 'deviance-defining-elite', using the news media to provide an ongoing articulation of the proper bounds to behaviour in all organised spheres of life. Moreover, journalists do not merely reflect others' efforts to designate deviance and effect control, but are actively involved themselves as social-control agents (Ericson, Baranek and Chan 1987: 3).

As I have discussed in previous chapters, within his editorials the editor of the Chronicle explicitly advocated the restoration of social order via the removal of the occupiers. While this column constitutes "opinion" within the paper, the sentiments it expressed were
reproduced as "news". The different ways in which the police may be comprehended, and the sanctioning by the Chronicle of a particular rendering, was illustrated by the paper's stories on April third. The lead article, "Mayor wields shotgun to defend home", detailed the terror of Mr. Poynter upon hearing intruders in his home. Mr. Poynter recounted his relief at the arrival of police: "I can tell you that when I found our house was full of police, Joy (Mrs. Poynter) and I were the happiest couple in Wanganui". Who the intruders were was not known, however it was stated repeatedly in the report that Mr. Poynter and his wife had received numerous threats from "extremists on both sides since this wretched affair began" (Wanganui Chronicle 3 April 1995: 1).
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Next to this story, the "wretched affair" was visualised with an image of women from Pakaitore protesting across from the police station (figure 12). Beneath this was the accompanying story "Arrest sparks protest march". These two stories constitute the role of police in disparate ways. In the first story the police provided welcome protection for the Mayor. In the second the role of police in relation to Iwi is challenged by the women's
protest. Rather than allow that, as Mayor, Mr. Poynter may have a different experience of police than Iwi (who challenge his, and state authority, and are Māori), the competing characterisation of police is reconciled by privileging the police's account, which renders the perspective of the protesters overstated, if not fantastic. The reason for the protest was explained by a police representative, and comment from Iwi was at the end of the article, which ran on page three. The article began:

About 50 women and children from the protest group occupying Wanganui's Moutoa Gardens marched on the Bell St. police station yesterday. They stood across the road for about an hour waving placards and shouting claims of police brutality. Their protest was sparked by an incident at 5pm on Saturday outside Moutoa Gardens during which a 30 year old male protester was arrested. Police inspector Harry Hawthorn said in a statement police approached two men who were armed with offensive weapons on the footpath outside the Gardens ... It is understood one man had a piece of timber, the other a mere (Māori club) and that they were threatening members of the public. "As a result of this approach a group of about 50 protesters gathered armed with knives, pieces of timber, clubs and rocks" Mr Hawthorn said in his statement. "A number of police officers were assaulted before the situation was bought under control. One constable received five stitches to an ear" he said. Sources told the Chronicle that police drew their long batons but did not use them against any of the protesters. Mr Hawthorn said he was deeply concerned, not only by the specifics of the incident, but also with the lack of control of protest leaders "over this group of thugs" ... He said that the police role at Moutoa Gardens was to keep the peace but that this could not be achieved "with armed thugs blatantly walking public footpaths ... Perhaps some of the protest group are now showing their true colours and demonstrating that they are not at Moutoa Gardens for a celebration, or even a peaceful protest, but for confrontation" (Wanganui Chronicle 3 April 1995: 1).

The perspective of Iwi was conveyed on page three of the report in the following manner:
Protesters outside the police station clearly disagreed with Mr. Hawthorn's terminology of thugs, saying "our men are in prison for no reason whatsoever" ... Protester Tariana Turia said on television's Marae program yesterday that the police actions throughout the affair had been "absolutely disgusting and intimidating." She said police did not merely arrest the 30 year old man on Saturday but chased him on to Moutoa Gardens, battoned him to the ground and stripped him before taking him away. Mrs Turia went on to allege that police beat up two 16 year old Māori in Victoria Ave on Friday as they walked home from work. Senior Sergeant Duncan MacLeod yesterday said police refuted the allegation and said no complaint had been made (ibid: 3).

Both perspectives of these events constitute a "hard angle", however, the perspective of police is given precedence: perhaps because it is imagined as more likely to be "true" (we already "know" through the paper's accounts that those at the Gardens are lawless and threatening). Further, police were a more accessible news source, they dealt with the paper directly and are a routine source for news. The Chronicle and police were both the object of critique by Iwi, who viewed the paper as complicit with police prerogatives. As I detail, the paper's willingness to represent the police as effectively restoring order was characteristic of the Chronicle's coverage.

The language used by the reporter in his characterisation of the protesters, who were "waving placards and shouting claims of police brutality", served to diminish the demonstration by connoting a disorderly rabble. I was given a videotape of this demonstration. It reveals that for the majority of the time the women performed waiata and several women, including kuia, made speeches. The moment in which the photographer chose to "click" portrays "Māori woman", from the vantage of the Pākehā imagination, as intimidating. The use of an image of women to visualise Iwi was exceptional in the Chronicle's coverage. This example was "a good news shot" because it constitutes "Māori woman" as confrontational in her performance.
of haka. This challenges both Māori and Pākehā gender roles, and for those who know the haka is usually male tikanga the woman's performance connotes a lack of "authenticity".

The perspective of Iwi on their relationship with police was the subject of several press releases issued from the marae. The release dated April 2 described the incident that was the subject of the above report in the *Chronicle*:

Police accosted an innocent person within the marae complex, accusing him of having an offensive weapon. The police then pulled out their batons and struck him to the ground. They dragged him along the ground, stripped him of his clothes, and hauled him quickly out of the marae. He was thrown into the paddy wagon and taken to the police cells where he is being incarcerated until Monday. He was not read his rights. Women formed an armed chain protecting the rangatahi, blocking the police, who by now numbered well over twenty. The head of the police said to the crowd "you are harbouring criminals". This was part of a litany of lies as they could not name who they were looking for. It was alleged that the accused was carrying an offensive weapon, but was carrying a taonga, tucked away out of sight in a back pocket. Later the accused was wrongly charged with obstruction and possessing an offensive weapon and should be released immediately.

Like the police account of this incident, this version is sensational. However, this rendition was not authorised as news. Another document produced for whānau and supporters at the marae stated that the Channel Nine Network from Australia were present at the time the incident occurred, filmed it, and sent a copy to Iwi. This may suggest a legitimacy to Iwi accounts of these events: "documentary evidence" from an external source exists.

"Protesters claims of police harassment are denied" was the lead story on 4 April in the *Chronicle*. Wanganui district police commander Alec Waugh stated there was no evidence to substantiate the claims by protesters of "inappropriate behaviour" by police. "We have seen
from the protest area abuse and people wandering around with all sorts of weaponry. I think the facts speak very clearly as to where any potential provocation comes from" (Wanganui Chronicle 4 April 1995: 1). The perspective of Iwi was given through comments from Ken Mair, who claimed police had been making racial taunts, picking on protesters, and that Iwi were considering taking their concerns up with the Police Complaints Authority. Mr Waugh responded that he would be surprised if police had been acting in such a manner, and that "the accusations smacked of a "typical sidestep approach" by the occupiers in an effort to shift the focus away from them" (ibid).

The following account was written by an older woman at Pakaitore. It was among the documents prepared during and after the occupation that were given to me by one of my informants. This was one of the stories collected about the experiences of whānau at the marae, and was not for public circulation. In this sense it is not intended to convince the public of the improper actions of police, as were the releases from the marae. Rather it is intended as an expression of experience for sharing with whānau:

I was mostly involved with the security section and if I had foreseen that this would be the front line of all verbal abuse and police intimidation I probably would not have been such a willing participant. Because I felt our rangatahi were exposed to a lot of intimidation and harassments, I wanted to experience their experiences through my own eyes and ears - whew! What a challenge that was! Security was manned 24 hours around the clock at 6 hourly breaks. There were six security points allocated at weak spots around the outside perimeter of Pakaitore. This was to ensure that our people and our belongings were safe. The first week of the occupation was heavy duty stuff and of course we started with a "hit first talk later" sort of attitude. Our instincts at the time told us that survival was the name of the game. We had our Security Coordinators who allocated and delegated the roles of Kaitiaki, Kaimanaaki and Kaiwhakahaere to those people rostered on duty. My role was mainly as a Kaitiaki (who manned the security points) and then relieved as Kaimanaaki (relieve people for kai, etc) whenever I
was needed. Oh yes - we had our A team as well. These ladies roamed the inside and outside perimeter of Pakaitore to ensure that everyone was behaving themselves and abiding by ALL the rules which were discussed and agreed upon at the nightly Iwi hui. Look out if anyone misbehaved! Unfortunately, a lot of our security people were unable to attend these meetings as most of us were on permanent shifts, so we missed out on a lot of kōrero.

Some days, helicopters would be hovering over us and I felt like I was plonked in the middle of a war zone! On the outside perimeters there were always the cops. I am so glad we had the awa to look at! Having the police cruising around, whether they were on foot or in patrol vehicles, became very intimidating. While I was on security I was to witness verbal abuse by both police and the public. To be called "niggers" or "bastards" definitely challenged our inner souls this required DISCIPLINE - NOT TO REACT IN ANY WAY!! To be called "black bitches" also added to the insults and hurts of some individuals. What sort of people would take this barrage of abuse, I asked myself? Although we all knew why we were there, security people took everything from verbal abuse, to threats, intimidation and harassment by the police, to standing in the bloody pouring rain for hours on end! Yes I have changed. My inner soul has been hurt and I do a lot of crying now. I can still hear our voices calling out to one another Kia kaha wāhine mā! Kia kaha koutou! (when something was going down) I used to say to myself - Oh God please give us strength and protect us from harm!

This "insider" account of maintaining order within the marae, and guarding its boundaries, was not the manner of discourse on these subjects which became public. Within the account the feeling of being in a "war zone" was produced by media helicopters and police presence; a rendering antithetical to their publicised roles of reporting, and remedying, disruptions to social order. Positive accounts of the police's role were actively publicised, and within Wanganui the Chronicle was the vehicle for this.
In response to the accusations from Iwi which did enter public discourse, a "specialist police media liaison officer", Graham Bell was "temporarily assigned to Wanganui for the duration of the Moutoa Gardens affair" (Wanganui Chronicle 6 April, 1995: 3). The Chronicle reported that Bell's role was to do his "best to see the police position is accurately and positively portrayed" (ibid).

The first issue addressed by Bell was reported in the Chronicle the following day under the headline "Police question whether haka is misused":

Wanganui police have questioned the role of the haka in modern society, expressing concern over what they regard as its misuse by protesters. Senior Sergeant Graham Bell said yesterday police were on the verge of arresting protesters who used the haka as a means to intimidate others ... "Other than ceremonially one wonders whether the haka has a place in society in 1995" (Wanganui Chronicle 7 April 1995: 3).

Mr Bell told the paper that the performance of haka in the context of protest "borders on the violent especially when it is accompanied by eyeball to eyeball, grunting and spitting and hissing that we've witnessed here" (ibid). The report was visualised with the image of a woman performing a haka during the demonstration against police conduct.

A press release from the marae dated April 7 expressed the displeasure of Iwi that Senior Sergeant Bell believed he was equipped to comment on Māori tikanga: his "efforts to reduce the haka to disorderly behaviour, and therefore a crime, is bizarre and shows his deep ignorance and arrogance". The release provided a perspective on the meaning of the haka within Māori tikanga, provided by Henry Bennett, a local kaumātua and head of the Māori Studies Department at Whanganui Polytechnic:

The haka expresses the thoughts and feelings of a group, and can be done in a variety of different settings. It is about showing a sense of unity. Rolling of the
eyes, poking the tongue and facial grimaces are all part of the haka. Being intimidating and fierce is part of the haka. The more "ihi" (inner strength) you put into it, the more of your tupuna would come out of you. To do the haka well is to do all of these things.

The press release concluded by posing the following questions:

Why do the All Blacks and other sports codes perform the haka? What is the difference between their performance of the haka both nationally and internationally, and rangatahi of our Iwi performing the haka as an expression of their identity?

These questions raise the issue that the context in which the haka is performed, who is performing it, and who is witness to it, determine its signification, and that this involves relations of power. Bell reads the haka as appropriate as spectacle or ceremony; as an expression of national rather than cultural identity. This relegates tikanga to the safe space of exotic performance, rendered adrift from the substance of cultural practice (it is not okay to be Māori, only to perform Māori). The offence of Iwi at this stance connects with the history of the peripheralising of kawa through the colonial encounter.

The Police Superintendent told me about Bell's role:

I carried the burden personally of the media for this event for a long time, until it got on top of me because there was too much on. I then bought in a police officer trained in media, from Rotorua, ex Auckland, Sergeant Bell. He's a character I hadn't worked with and he bought a homely, country style, very direct approach to police comments which I thought was risky but interesting and here I used him quite deliberately to test the propaganda coming from Moutoa Gardens, to challenge things that came out. It worked quite well but the risk was he fell into two holes - one was making comments on the haka which he should never have
got into, and two, he himself was frustrated by what he thought was the unfairness of the propaganda coming from the Gardens. As he left he made a few parting comments against my instructions, which weren't helpful, and if I had been here the day he made them all hell would have broken loose.

One of my informants from Pakaitore characterised Bell's role in a different way:

Bringing in Graeme Bell for propaganda was a direct response to Makareta, Tari and myself. We were getting too much exposure and Sister's press reports were undermining their integrity. He came in to try and undo all that work. We were only reporting what we had seen, felt and heard. Every time we bought up an issue they would work out a strategy to counter it. Some of the police behaviour was dreadful. So it was interesting they bought in a police media expert - I call him the police propaganda machine - to react and undermine the work that was done by our media. The intervention of Bell elevated it to a level of higher tension - we were now patrolled by gangs, it was rubbish and they knew it. They were using the goodwill of the media machine which was already biased, racist, because of their educational backgrounds. They shifted him on when they realised he wasn't conducive to keeping good relations between us and the police because he was a very aggressive character. I don't think the police had encountered a situation before where we were trying to use media mechanisms to get our position out. I know at one stage they were deeply concerned that we were able to concentrate on police behaviour, and it was beginning to filter into media forums.

The preceding "insider" accounts, from police and Pakaitore respectively, demonstrate that each party views the other as producing of propaganda; there is no middle ground here. For Iwi, Bell's aggression towards them is rendered by the Police Superintendent as a "homely, country style" of policing; an innocuous manner of characterising his parochial
ethnocentrism. The perspective from Pakaitore identifies the complicity of media with police, yet all media workers were not supportive of Bell's role. A Māori journalist told me:

I got [flak] from the cops as well. Graeme Bell is a nasty bit of work, was intimidating me all the time - "what was that crap you were pulling last night, I'll be writing to your editor". One thing I'll always remember is they had a media conference at the police station one day and he was commenting on a story I had on the night before, and he made some comment "as for that rubbish on the news last night, [the reporter has] obviously got political aspirations, he is trying to get in good with his people". And I had him on about that and said I wasn't aligned to any political party and he said "yes you are you're running for NZ First" I said "That's Tuku Morgan - do we all look the same do we?"

The experiences of police harassment of a group of visitors from Auckland featured in a press release from the marae dated 7 April. One of the group was the music editor for the New Truth, a national tabloid, and his account ran two weeks later in that paper. The headline, "RACIST COPS 'NIGGER LOVER' TAUNT", took up most of page one (New Truth 21 April, 1995: 1). The author of the story, John Dix, recounted his experience in Wanganui with twelve friends, some of whom belonged to Ponsonby's King Cobra Social Club. Dix wrote of his experience on guard duty:

It was about 5am when the vehicle tore around the Gardens in a blaze of burning tyres and verbal abuse. The word "nigger" was still resounding in my ears while I strolled to the 24 hour tea urn. I joined the trio at the main gate. "Hoons from the nightclub, was it, that racket just now?" The kaitiaki all burst into spontaneous laughter. "Yeah, Hone, hoons all right. Cops". The abuse I'd heard was, I discovered, par for the course ... Strolling across Queens Park I was confronted by two separate duos of policemen. They thought I was smoking dope, but they knew I was part of Ngati Pasifika. After giving my name, address and date of birth, it soon turned nasty. "What are you doing here ... what's it got to do with
you...gang members are trouble...liberal whites get in the way...blah blah blah". And then it came: "What are ya, if you're not a gang member or a do-gooder? Just another interfering nigger lover?" (New Truth 21 April, 1995: 6).

As a tabloid, the New Truth seeks sensational angles. Yet it is also its distance from events in Wanganui, as an Auckland based paper, which enables this rendering of police. Further, as a news worker Dix had the necessary connections to publicise his story. When similar allegations of police misconduct were made by Iwi in Wanganui the "news" was the police's perception of the unreliability of Iwi accounts. One of my informants, a press worker, told me of an incident where three police from Wellington, who when patrolling the perimeter of the marae called an older woman "nigger mama". The kuia went to the police station and laid a complaint with her nephew, who was a local police officer. She waited at the station until the police in question returned, and Police Superintendent Waugh sent them back to Wellington. Anecdotes such as this did not make news in Wanganui.

A local clergymen, who perceived a moral obligation to participate at the marae, became an advocate for publicising the Iwi's perspective of police behaviour. He explained to me:

From quite early in the piece I was requested by kaumātua who I respect, to be there, to stand with the people, I was told very clearly and quickly that I had a role as a presbyter of the Methodist church to stand with the Māori people who are my parishioners...I chose to take a fairly public role in an attempt to get through to the white media and the white community. To convey what Māori were feeling and thinking and saying, because I was aware from early on that what the media office was printing was not getting through, particularly in the Chronicle.

Clergy from local Baptist, Methodist and Catholic churches had spent much time at the marae with their parishioners, and their perspectives featured several times in the Chronicle's coverage. The perspective of clergy advocated "peace, moderation and justice for all in the
Gospel tradition”. Reverend Clover’s view was that a solution to the dispute must acknowledge the rights of Iwi under the Treaty, and that "the issue is not ultimately about ownership. Rather it is about the Iwi not any longer being marginalised and ignored by the agencies of local, central and regional government" (Wanganui Chronicle 21 March 1995: 1).

The day following the Council’s ultimatum for Iwi to leave the Gardens the Chronicle’s lead story was headlined "Clergy claim Council too hasty". Reverend Clover, representing the Anglican, Methodist and Catholic churches, was cited: "the gospel perspective is to allow grace, space and time. The Iwi have asked for that but the Council have not given it to them". Dave Metcalfe, Central Baptist pastor, contended that forced eviction would constitute "law acting without mercy". The Mayor’s response to clergy was that they "do not understand the legal obligations and responsibilities of the Council" (Wanganui Chronicle 24 March 1995:1).

The invocation of moral and spiritual imperatives by the clergy was at odds with the "rationality" and "objectivity" of the law, and had little status with the "authorities". The director of police operations at the Gardens told me that Reverend Clover "was very up front throughout with what I’d call a liberal rose-tinted version of events. I admired his courage in stepping into the arena, because I know some of his parishioners found it uncomfortable, but he was definitely unable to look pragmatically at Moutoa Gardens". The association of clergy with the occupiers was apparently not seen as legitimising the stance of Iwi, in fact, according to a reporter I interviewed, "people deserted the churches because they saw church people linking hands around the Gardens".

Reverend Clover approached both the Chronicle and the police regarding the inaccuracy he perceived in the following report:

Police senior sergeant Graham Bell accused the protesting "fanatic brigade" of pushing officers to the limit through eighty days of false accusations and personal abuse. “These people with their propaganda machine - Sister Makareta and Ken Mair in particular - have accused us of trumping up charges, planting evidence,
batoning people on the ground, arresting a toddler, calling people niggers and holding guns to their heads. These allegations are all completely untrue" Mr Bell said ... Their rhetoric has been anarchic and slanderous" ("Post Occupation clean - up of Moutoa Gardens under way" *Wanganui Chronicle* 21 May 1995: 1).

Because some of his parishioners did not approve of his presence at the marae, Reverend Clover was reluctant to allow the *Chronicle* to use his name to "hang a story on". However, the *Chronicle* would only agree to run a story on Iwi perspectives of police behaviour if he consented to the use of his name:

Finally I said "this stuff has got to come out, all right, if you need it put what I say against my name, but I'm merely coming in to reinforce what Iwi are saying" and the result was the article with the headline which entirely focused on my criticism of the police and their rebuttal, and entirely ignored, still, the Māori's refutation of Bell's comments.

The story, headlined "Police reject Clover Moutoa Claims" once again privileged the perspective of police. The leader to the article stated "Wanganui police have dismissed a Methodist minister's claims about the accuracy of their statements during the 80 day occupation of Moutoa Gardens" (*Wanganui Chronicle* 23 May 1995: 1). Within the article Reverend Clover's perspective was conveyed:

Mr Clover said he saw police doing "wheelies" outside the Gardens, stopping and leaning out car windows and abusing the occupiers, calling them niggers and black bastards. "I have witnessed the search lights aimed provocatively into the Gardens during evening prayers and have seen bruises resulting from swaggering, provocative, baton-swinging forays aimed particularly at rangatahi, usually after aggressive incidents and haka demonstrations" he said (*ibid*).
The article concluded with a further refutation by police of these allegations. The Reverend told me that he did not press his points because "[the Chronicle] are not able to perceive why I would even consider taking that stance". The publicity that ensued from his complaints against the police meant "I am seen as a "traitor". I've received letters calling me a traitor to my own race".

The Chronicle ran two stories about the policing of Iwi at the local court house, which reiterated the threat Iwi posed to the community. On April 4 it was reported on page one that the public were searched for weapons before entering the court house. The paper reported that "quite a few refused to be searched", and although searching the public was an uncommon procedure in Wanganui "it was one of the security measures adopted by court houses throughout the country over recent years" (Wanganui Chronicle 4 April, 1995: 1).

The following day the Chronicle's lead story "Police search all Wanganui court visitors with metal detectors" explained that the search was intended to ensure concealed weapons were not taken inside the court house:

The police move was described as in the interests of public safety as the legal system dealt with those arrested during a confrontation between police and Māori occupying Moutoa Gardens at the weekend. On Monday Māori activists slammed police search tactics, claiming only Māori were searched when entering the court house ... "it is incorrect to say the search at the courthouse was made of the basis of race" Mr. Waugh said "This is not an issue with police" (Wanganui Chronicle 5 April 1995: 1).

This was confirmed by the reporter: "Police conducting the search offered no favours and in fact stopped high profile local defence lawyers Peter Brosnahan and Roger Crowley as well as Caucasian and Māori entering the building". However, it was not lawyers pictured in the accompanying photo: this would not tell a story which justified the police position. The image run by the Chronicle depicted a young man in casual clothing and a head scarf; his
attire and complexion marking him as young and Māori. The report highlighted the role of Ken Mair in "taunting" the police, a linguistic selection which renders his perspective illegitimate. Mair was also represented as contradictory:

Māori activist Ken Mair did not miss the opportunity to press home his claims that the police were acting in a racist manner. In front of a barrage of local and outside media Mr. Mair taunted police with accusations of racism, claiming the police were nothing other than gang members dressed in blue. He and other activists at the scene yesterday urged Māori not to "justify" the actions of police by undergoing metal detector searches. A short time later Mr Mair subjected himself to a search before entering the courthouse" (Wanganui Chronicle 5 April, 1995: 1).

The Dominion (based in Wellington) and the Auckland Herald also reported on these events, but neither of their reports focused on Mair. The Herald reported that protesters chanted "shame" as kaumāua Niko Tangaroa was searched. The Dominion reported that "police using a metal detector on Tuesday [4 April] found a knife on a 22 year old man they described as a white power supporter". Within this report the threat to the safety of patrons of the court comes from Pākehā rather than Iwi. This was confirmed by the reporter's account that "the only incident during the morning was when a small group attempted to raise the Māori independence flag on the courthouse flagpole. This was stopped by the police and the Māoris [sic] quietly withdrew" (Dominion 6 April 1995:1).

My recounting of these experiences of Iwi whānau, their supporters, and the police, highlights the dramatic. For Iwi (and the tabloids) police behaviour made a "hard" story. I do not wish for the "extreme" examples of police racism to stand in as representative of police conduct in general, as this is problematic on several levels: I do not know how widespread such practices are; I do not assume a naive "innocence" of Iwi; and a focus on the "extreme" obscures the more mundane mechanisms which reproduce racisms in contemporary society. Indeed, the
bounding of "hard' angles on police conduct within mainstream press is the story I wish to
tell.

Despite the preceding assertions of one of my respondents that the perspective of Iwi was
filtering through to media, the Wanganui Chronicle ran sparse comment from their
perspective, and national press coverage was limited to the often sensational angles detailed
above. My intention to elucidate the manner in which some perspectives on police conduct
became "news" is to reveal a power differential in the access to public representation. The
Corresponding interests of police and the Chronicle: their role in representing Pākehā
communities with regards to the occupation, the symbiosis of their relationship in making
news stories, and their shared criticism from the occupiers, rendered them complicit in
discrediting Iwi. Press coverage functioned to render Iwi as threatening, in response to which
the police represented the restoration of law and order. In this context the "news" actively
produced the legitimacy of police authority.

legitimating authority

Over the weeks leading to the High Court verdict the Chronicle printed a range of views
regarding the imperative for government intervention. Broadly right wing perspectives
opposing the occupation were sanctioned through highlighting the lawlessness of occupiers.
The target of criticism from these perspectives extended to Wanganui M.P, Jill Pettis, who
sought Crown intervention with recourse to the Crown's Treaty obligations, rather than its
ability to invoke the rule of law. Pettis had expressed her views during a parliamentary
debate regarding the Gardens:

"I call on the Government to act as a facilitator, because it as sure as goodness has
contributed to and been a catalyst in this tragedy that is occurring at the moment.
The Waitangi Tribunal is the right vehicle for this grievance to be aired and I call
upon the Government, as strongly as I can, to act and assist in its role of
leadership" (Wanganui Chronicle 16 March 1995: 1)
In a public meeting about the occupation, a group of five hundred people opposed to the occupation gave Ross Meurant, leader of the Right of Centre party, the mandate to convey their desire for intervention to the Government. Meurant's perspective on the need for Crown intervention was that "If the State fails to show the nation that no one is above the law - regardless of the political implications and in spite of force that might be put against the Government - then we are on the road to ruin" (Wanganui Chronicle 15 May 1995: 1). During the meeting Pettis was criticised by former Wanganui M.P. Cam Campion, who told the crowd she was not present because she was "out the back of Moutoa doing dishes". Lawyer Stephen Taylor also criticised Pettis and rendered her perspective as "fence sitting" (ibid).

The contact person between Council and Government, designated by the Prime Minster, was Minister of Social Welfare and Waitaroa MP Peter Gresham. Mr Gresham's perspective on his role was explained in a report in the Chronicle:

"The government will not interfere in respect to an ownership issue concerning land under freehold title ... I do not pretend to be a 'mediator' as I have no intention of making an official visit to Moutoa Gardens while they are occupied by a group when tenure is in question" ("Stop fuelling Moutoa tensions, Gresham says" Wanganui Chronicle 18 April 1995: 1).

Thus, the role of the Crown's representative was not to negotiate between parties, but rather to advocate the Crown's predetermined position.

Calls for a substantive Crown intervention also came from the "One Wanganui" group, who were affiliated with "One Law". The perspective of a member of the One Wanganui group was represented as fact by the Chronicle's headline "Occupation of Moutoa costing city millions". Within the report it was explained that the group "which opposes the occupation and seeks one law for all people irrespective of ethnic origin" was polling people in
Wanganui with a view to soliciting Government intervention (Wanganui Chronicle 20 April, 1995: 1).

Meanwhile, Iwi were discussing the implications of the High Court case and continuing to lobby the Crown. On April 4 the High Court affidavit was served on Niko Tangaroa, Tariana Turia and Henry Bennett. Over the course of discussions with representatives from the Māori Law Society it was decided that the Iwi defendants would not appear in the court because the jurisdiction of the court was not recognised. When this was reported in the press, the rationale behind this stance was not elaborated. A document prepared by lawyers for circulation at the marae explored the implications of the court case. On one level it was decided that the sovereign status of Iwi rendered the present dispute of a constitutional rather than judicial nature. If Iwi went to court, it would signal an acceptance of the sovereign status of the Pākehā judicial system¹. More immediately pragmatic, however, was that it was anticipated by Iwi that the Crown would be more likely to engage in dialogue with Iwi if they did not appear in court. Recourse was made to a precedent set in another case between Council and Iwi in Tauranga. In that case the named defendants did not go to court and as a result the judge would not hear the case to remove Iwi from the local Town Hall. Instead the court went to the Government and asked them to intervene on the basis that it was a Treaty issue.² Because the stance at Pakaitore was a way for Iwi to express their desire for dialogue with the Crown it was decided that there was a better chance of this happening if Iwi did not go to Court.

The Court was advised that Iwi would not appear. The Court responded by asking Wanganui Barrister John Rowan to act as amicus curiae. Mr Rowan’s offer of representation was

---

¹ Under Article One of the Treaty of Waitangi, hapū ceded to the Crown the right of governance (kāwanatanga). Under Article Two hapū were guaranteed chieftainship (tino rangatiratanga) over resources and taonga. Taonga includes ancestral lore and whakapapa (Kawharu, 1989: 320). The claim to the Gardens was based on ancestral lore and whakapapa, and it was not viewed by Iwi as appropriate to subordinate the authority of Iwi to own and control whakapapa and lore by allowing a Pākehā structure to pass judgement in these matters. Later in this chapter I discuss the Ngāi Tahu claim. Ngāi Tahu interpreted the Treaty in a different way from Whanganui Iwi by allowing that the ceding of the powers of governance to the Crown meant recognising the jurisdiction of the court. Whanganui Iwi instead rendered this a constitutional issue whereby the powers granted to the Crown in Article One are subordinate to the powers granted to Iwi under Article Two. This comparison was clarified for me by Donna Matahaere-Atariki through personal communication.

² "Should Whanganui Iwi go to the High Court?": document prepared for circulation at Pakaitore Marae, April 1995.
declined by Iwi due to their aforementioned stance. Hugh Rennie, a Wellington barrister, was subsequently appointed by the Court as amicus.

On April 12 a delegation from Iwi went to Wellington to discuss their concerns about the lack of Crown intervention with Peter Tapsell, the M.P. for Eastern Māori and Speaker of the House. This was reported the following day in the Chronicle. The story explained that Iwi had asked Mr. Tapsell to arrange a meeting with the Prime Minister, on the basis that they believed the dispute was between Iwi and the Crown rather than the Council. A spokesman for Mr. Bolger said this would not be granted. ("Meeting unlikely spokesman says" Wanganui Chronicle 13 April 1995: 1). Mr Tapsell’s perspective implied both the necessity of Crown intervention and an interrogation of the Tribunal claims hearing process:

"I think its well known that the Wanganui people have sought to put their claim - and they have very good claims - over a long period of time. And they have become frustrated, they have used up all their resources and I think to a certain degree, out of sheer desperation, they've embarked on a step which they might otherwise not have taken." While the Tribunal was doing a very good job the number of claims before it tended to give people the impression it might be many years before theirs was heard. "That is really detrimental to good race relations in New Zealand. Justice delayed is not good justice "(ibid).

The Tribunal process was also criticised by Ngāi Tahu, however the emphasis in the Chronicle's coverage of this critique is on the aspects which discredit Whanganui Iwi. The headline to the lead story on 24 April ran "Protester's actions verging on anarchy: Ngāi Tahu". The leader to the article stated "South Island tribe Ngāi Tahu says it is dismayed at North Island Māori protesters using intimidation and occupation to get land back" (Wanganui Chronicle 24 April 1995: 1). Ngāi Tahu policy branch chairman, Charlie Crofts was cited:

"It is with great a great deal of consternation that we see the successes gained by those who abandon the Waitangi Tribunal process and instead take the law into
Ngāi Tahu’s criticism of North Island Māori must be understood as more accurately a criticism of the Crown. As the *Chronicle* states, the anxiety of Ngāi Tahu was over "sympathetic noises the Government was making toward anti-Treaty proposals of the pan-Māori architects in the North Island". This "sympathy" was not the response Whanganui Iwi were receiving. The comments of Mr. Crofts were made in the context of a rejection of the proposed "fiscal envelope". The target is thus more appropriately the Crown rather than Whanganui Iwi. Mr. Crofts explained that the fiscal envelope forced a national expression of Māori dissatisfaction which should not be read as a desire for a pan-Māori structure to deal with grievances. The partnership under the Treaty is specified as between individual hapū and the Crown. Mr. Crofts’ criticism extends to the way Government was rendering the Ngāi Tahu claim. He explained that the Ngāi Tahu settlement sought only partial value of losses to the Iwi which would involve the transfer of some Crown assets to Iwi: "Yet the Government continues to give the impression that Ngāi Tahu is trying to extract vast and unaffordable amounts in a settlement" (*ibid*). The focus of the *Chronicle’s* coverage in this story creates a distinction between "good" and "bad" Māori, privileging Ngāi Tahu criticism of Whanganui Iwi when this is made by way of criticism of the Crown.

*Chronicle* coverage of a counter protest on Anzac day also served to delegitimise the stance of Whanganui Iwi. In contrast to their representations of protest by Whanganui Iwi, the counter protest was represented with the headline "Peaceful march against Moutoa occupation". The report stated:

Frustration with the Māori occupation of Moutoa Gardens manifested itself firmly but peacefully yesterday with a march by an estimated 1000 people ... there was
none of the unpleasantness that marked the March 30 central city demonstration by about 600 supporters of the Gardens occupation. However some of the marchers said later that they felt uncomfortable under the gaze of the mostly silent Gardens dwellers\(^3\). The placards were fewer and the content generally more subdued. There was no chanting: singing was confined to a limp rendition of "God Defend New Zealand" alongside the Gardens (Wanganui Chronicle 26 March 1995: 1).

The march was organised by the One Wanganui and One Law groups. A representative of the former group was asked by the Chronicle about the significance of the march being held on Anzac day. The man explained: "Our soldiers went overseas to defend this country and I believe we were defending our country by marching today" (ibid).

The image used to represent Iwi was of Ken Mair and two other men. Once again the "hard angle" visualised those at the marae as young, male and tattooed. Mair told me about this counter protest:

Our position was that we thought it was grossly insensitive that they would march on ANZAC day, desecrating the integrity and the mana of those who had passed on; Pākehā and Māori. Of course the media didn't highlight that, instead it was "hey there's a few hundred people marching against Pakaitore". We counted four or five Māori in the march and we found out later that one Māori person was pushed to the front to add a bit of colour to the procession.

As I have written elsewhere, a hard angle favoured by media over the course of the occupation was the presence of gang members at the marae. In the week before the High

\(^3\) I am particularly interested in this comment regarding the "gaze" of Māori upon Pākehā. To me, this connotes the politics of who gets to look at whom. While feminist theory has been preoccupied with the nature of the gendered gaze (eg. Mulvey 1975; Lewis and Rolley 1997), this work assumes a white gaze. I am interested in the manner in which the gaze is racialized: in the context of Pakaitore "the public" and media assume the legitimacy of their gaze upon iwi whanau as "the public's right to know". On many levels Pakaitore constitutes a gazing back at the structures of white society. The discomfort of the Pākehā marchers, for me, resonates with these considerations. It invokes the power of being the one who looks and suggests racist implications underpinning the anxiety of having the gaze returned. I elaborate these considerations in the following chapters.
Court decision was handed down, the Chronicle featured a lead story "Increase in gang member presence a real concern". The story stated that according to Inspector Harry Hawthorn:

Although there had been a Black Power presence at Moutoa Gardens for some time, the increase in their numbers over recent days was of "real concern". He estimated about 20 gang members were now at the Gardens and that what organisers described to be a "peaceful protest" had now been taken over by gang members. "It was evident to anyone walking past Moutoa Gardens this morning that gang members outnumbered other occupiers by a ratio of two to one" Mr Hawthorn said. Police numbers in Wanganui would be reviewed and reinforcements brought into the city by the end of the week (Wanganui Chronicle 9 May 1995: 1).

One of my informants, who was a supporter of the occupiers, told me:

I never saw anyone in patches. There was this report about Black Power members from Wellington and I showed it to Tari and she took me over to where they were staying and they were very positive about the fact that they were observing the protocol of the marae.

The following day the Chronicle reported the Iwi response to the police account under the headline "Police scare mongering, Moutoa occupiers claim". The report stated that the protesters had given a statement to the Chronicle which contended that there were fewer gang members at the marae than there had been earlier. The statement was quoted:

Iwi at Pakaitore are very concerned that the deliberate misinformation by Inspector Harry Hawthorn may well be an attempt to mislead the community in preparation for what the occupiers believe will be the forced removal of Iwi off
their land ... "Clearly it is an attempt to justify the possible use of violence by the police" (*Wanganui Chronicle* 10 May 1995: 1).
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Indeed, the following day the police did enter the marae. This was reported by the *Chronicle* under the large banner headline "DAWN RAID ON MOUTOA GARDENS" (*figure 13*). The lead story "Arrests made as police execute search warrants" explained that "Operation Trojan" resulted in 11 arrests and more were expected to be made (*Wanganui Chronicle* 11 May 1995: 1). Four of those arrested were "Black Power gang members or associates." The report detailed the operation from the perspective of police. The perspective of Iwi was represented by the headline "Angry reaction from protesters". Within this report a spokesperson claimed that the initiative was "invasive" and a demonstration of police power as a prelude to an eviction. This perspective was elaborated to me by informants from the marae:

I was really frightened. Most of us had never been in a situation that involved police. They threw kids down on the ground and held them down with their feet.
None of that was ever reported from the point of view of the people that were there.

Where in the world would you see police in full riot gear because of stolen property valued at two hundred dollars? ... it was really aggressive: they had surrounded the whare, our children were inside, our old people were outside, they had their batons drawn. It was the most horrifying thing I have ever seen and I was disgusted to think that the state would allow something like that to happen to our people. When they know that they took our land, they know they disenfranchised us, they know that they have put us in a position of defendants. And I believe that's why they sent them in there like that, to really show our people what they would be prepared to do to us if we dared to believe we could fight back, even if it was in a peaceful protest.

The raid on the Gardens was on the day before the High Court hearing commenced. Justice Heron made his ruling on May 16, and his decision was published in its entirety in the Chronicle on May 18. The decision was visualised with large images of police during the "dawn raid", one of which was captioned "A sight no one wants to see again - police line at Moutoa Gardens during a recent raid there. There are fears a major police presence may be needed if occupiers ignore the order to pack up and leave". This copy, accompanied by the photographs, signifies the power of the state and the intersecting authority of Crown, police and the press. A forced removal of Iwi is constituted as "necessary" if Iwi should act outside of the law and decide to stay. Alternatives to forced eviction, such as negotiations between Iwi and Crown as Treaty partners, are effaced. The press represents the consequences, and legitimacy of such consequences, should Iwi fail to heed the order of the Crown.

Justice Heron explained in his findings that "because of the absence of the defendants in these proceedings, or anyone to speak directly on their behalf, the Court is required to examine the claims to title and possession in the absence of a true contest" (Wanganui Chronicle 18 May 1995: 8). Indeed, the perspective of Iwi was that a "contest" was not appropriate in this
setting, as it is not fitting for a Pākehā authority to determine the legitimacy of whakapapa. However, for Council and Crown the occupation was narrowly a legal, rather than constitutional, issue. Justice Heron said in his decision that for Iwi "claims to earlier ownership or possession of the land or any justifications for occupation which history might throw up are probably secondary to an opportunity to make a political protest" (ibid). I am interested in the location from which he speaks. He at once renders "political" that which challenges his authority (as a constitutional issue) and imagines a neutrality of his own interests. Further, it challenges the "authenticity" of the claims of Iwi to whakapapa.

The historical evidence presented by the Council was that which was presented in the earlier legal opinions. It relied on historical photographs of the area and accounts in the diaries of settlers. It was this evidence which compelled the Judge's verdict. As I have noted elsewhere, the written and photographic record contains contradictions. The defence also raised the matter of records destroyed by fires. Justice Heron held however, "on the evidence I have seen and heard it seems as if Pakaitore Pa was never on the Moutoa Gardens site but of course we cannot be sure, and it may be that in earlier times, before 1839, it had fulfilled that role" (ibid). The Council was adjudged to be the owner of the site and as such, Iwi were trespassing.

What was not significant to the Judge was that living Iwi trace whakapapa to the land in question. While he was aware of this, it did not compel him in the manner the documentary evidence did. I was told by a (Pākehā) journalist:

The whole thing was a farce without the occupiers there. What they should have done is sing the waiata of the river and have them translate it and none of that happened because most of the evidence was on the side of the District Council. What happened at the end of the court case was that somebody said to me that the Judge said that Pakaitore did exist but they can't prove that Moutoa Gardens was Pakaitore, it may have overlapped, but Pakaitore did not take up all of Moutoa Gardens. But afterwards that seemed to be a farce, I was talking to someone, Ken
or Niko, on the river bank - "okay" he said, "let's try and imagine it, this is the way our folklore has it, over here we have our racks of eel drying, over here all our vegetable Gardens, there's the meeting house, the sleeping area, around that our paddocks" - Pakaitore was quite substantial as I saw it and for a judge to say "you can't prove that Moutoa Gardens is Pakaitore" seems a farce, as Pakaitore was big, and none of that evidence was presented.

One of my informants from Pakaitore told me of the kōrero within the marae, and the way in which it was not appropriate for this to be aired in the court:

One wonderful kaumatua, he came from between Pipiriki and Raetihi. He had wonderful stories to tell about various chiefs who wouldn't sign the so called sale of Wanganui - how can you sell Wanganui? He talked about his relations who didn't sign. There were lots of important stories that were told. I think the oral history is yet to be told and all that takes time and it can't be slotted into someone else's agenda. That was part of what was happening at Pakaitore.

A journalist I interviewed told me about "Operation Exodus", the police plan for the forced eviction from the site:

We were taken to a police press conference and told the police's plan - they were going to fly in one thousand front line police, most of them from the South Island, they were going to completely seal off the area two or three blocks back and put barbed wire around the whole area. Then they were going to give them all a last chance to leave and then they were going to send in a riot squad. And we were going to be put on top of a cattle truck and trailer and they were going to put a roof on the top of the trailer and it was going to be driven alongside the Gardens, we were all going to be there with out telephoto lenses watching the whole thing. There were only a certain number of designated reporters that were going to be there. None of that was ever reported because of course they walked off.
This is instructive as to the nature of news media and the relationship between mainstream news organisations and the police (as agents of the state). The news doesn't simply happen. In this case the police intended to create a situation in which "hard news" could be made. They planned elaborate means through which events could be represented which would demonstrate the police's power to restore order. The consequences of challenging the state would be explicitly represented under these conditions, and those people named as "news" would be subject to a disciplinary gaze. This anecdote also speaks to the distance, both physical and metaphorical, between those at Pakaitore and their experiences and the reporting of this as news.

Iwi walked off Pakaitore on May 18. Their decision to do so thwarted this hard news story. Their reasons for leaving were not "hard news" and were not covered in the Chronicle's report of the walk off. The report focused instead on the cost of police resources over the course of the protest and damage done to the Gardens. This angle once again legitimised the position of the Council and state. I was told by my respondents from the marae:

As we came to the end of our time a thousand policemen were in Wanganui, the army was on the stand by. Of course we weren't going to fight back. We could have called on our people to come back, but we knew that it would end up in a blood bath and we didn't want that. That's not what it was all about, it was to tell the Crown that they can't continue to do this to us. We can't continue to watch our kids go down the damn gurgler.

We were told later that they were ready to process 600 of us at Kaitoke. They had cleared out a whole wing of the prison out there. In a way we outsmarted them.

Mainstream press, with the exception of the Evening Standard, were unable to represent what happened at Pakaitore from the point of view of those who were there. The strengthening of the community at the marae was not intended for public exposure. Some of the issues at
Pakaitore that the media failed to represent were considered "too soft", such as stories of what day to day life was like at the marae, and stories of supporters from around the country and abroad who came to visit. But clearly this was not the only reason why perspectives of those at Pakaitore were not represented.

For those at Pakaitore issues of sovereignty, of the illegitimate sale of land, of living in a racist society, of bomb scares and threats on their lives were "hard news". But this news challenges the authority of the state and its agents: police, Council and arguably the media itself. As a result these perspectives were discredited. There was no space made in which to consider the context from which this initiative emerged. In this case, "hard news" is news that supports the authority of Council, Crown and of the news to "tell". The discourse produced by mainstream media about Pakaitore legitimised the use of force to end the occupation, had this been deemed "necessary".

While the Chronicle's editorial stance was firmly in line with that of the Council, and disproportionately aired the views of the political Right and police, this was not the case across all media. In the following chapter I examine coverage provided by television and news magazines, elucidating the mechanisms which constrain and authorise particular ways of telling in specific contexts.
I am sitting at the reporter's bench in the court room. We are opposite the dock. I am following a journalist on his rounds, he is anticipating hard news. The police superintendent is appearing on fraud charges. I am very embarrassed. He will see me. This is not my business. I know the defendant, I have interviewed him for this project. He stands at the dock and nods to me in greeting. This is not my business. We hear about his troubled family life and this is the reason why his name and occupation will be suppressed. I am relieved. I think this is a good thing. After court my reporter works on his story. He tells me he can get around the name suppression by telling his story in a way that will enable people to guess who it is about. This is his business.

My anxiety within this anecdote invokes politics of vision I engage throughout the remainder of this project. I did not want to be seen as positioned with, or represented by the reporter. I wish to imagine myself as doing something different from the reporter; a worthier look, trained on the way he looks at others. Of course I cannot escape being (seen as) positioned. It is the imperative for the visibility of our locations which underpins my project; yet we exercise limited control over the ways in which we are read. My telling also conjures the vulnerability of being looked at: my friend is recast as defendant and pity replaces my deference.

So the reporter and I both get our story.

My desire for reflexivity led to my attempts to prompt a television journalist I interviewed into seeing the predicaments I suppose we inhabit. Within the following account the disjuncture of our preoccupations is apparent, and I am reassured that my story is a good one:
Sue: In anthropology the process of getting information from other people has been rendered problematic, so I'm interested in this process in news. In anthropology much of the debate on the nature and politics of representation is pretty rarefied, and I am interested in how these things play out in the "real world". There are some similarities between representation within anthropology and news, and I had a bit of a dilemma the other day when someone I interviewed wouldn't tell me stuff or let me tape what she was saying. I was thinking "come on, give me your story, I'm going to do something worthwhile with it" and, as she put it, she did not want to "be the news". And what was for me a good story was her life. Do you have these crises of practice?

TV journalist: People may be reluctant because they worry that what they say is going to be misused or distorted. There are all sorts of issues behind why people won't talk to you or tell them things. I used to do crime and justice stories and police stories and there would always be people who wouldn't want issues publicised because television is seen as being so invasive - there you are in glorious living technicolour splashed all over the screen for everyone to see who you are, and we live in a very small community.

Sue: Are the issues about what it's like for people who are being made the news addressed in your training?

TV journalist: Our training is pretty much on the job and you learn very quickly about the sort of effects publicity will have on people. I talk to people about the effects going on television may have. A lot of the time I'll tell people it may not be as bad as you think. And there are times when the effects will be bad for people if they are publicised, in criminal cases for example, but the public's interest will sometimes override that. And judges and lawyers might say that part of the punishment is the publicity that will ensue. There are a whole lot of issues
here about the right to privacy and the public's right to know that we deal with on a daily basis and we do take those things into consideration.

This exchange indicates that the reporter is mindful, on some level, of the possible consequences for people who are the subject of news. However, for this to explicitly inform his praxis in the manner in which I framed the issue would lead to impossibilities. The medium is structured to accord with the "public's right to know". Of course, my project concerns that which news industries sanction as public knowledge, and the implications of this for the subjects of "hard" news. Thus, the conversation above did not satisfy me. I wanted the reporter to experience a dilemma too. I wanted him to acknowledge the politics of his location. Yet I have a particular investment in conjuring a distance between us.

This chapter considers what it means to look and tell under the specific circumstances of particular representational projects: how might we consider the way meanings are structured, yet also contested by the agents who inhabit them? I expand my focus from print media to consider the way news stories are crafted through the editing of pictures. In the following chapter I focus on seeing in both a literal and metaphorical sense; exploring Haraway's arguments regarding the imperative to acknowledge the embodiment of vision within representational practices.

My conversation with the journalist reveals his investment in the authority of the ways news practice is coded. As I have discussed, what counts as news is culturally rather than "naturally" determined. Journalists and editors pursue or select stories with recourse to the codes of news, whereby the best stories are "hard", the most credible sources are "official", the best subjects are famous or infamous. Chomsky (1988) argues that in the U.S. newsworthiness is determined by "filters" which privilege the interests of national and global capital. My preferred focus is the particular practices of news making and the ways these are discursively deployed by news workers. This is because I do not believe that news workers are either uniformly or consciously participating in a grand narrative which favours the interests of capital. In my comparison of the praxis of reporters from the *Chronicle* and the
Evening Standard I elucidated the different discursive resources they marshalled, and the particular institutional contexts within which each reporter was able to operate. This resulted in substantively different renderings of "news". News codes are experienced by many news workers as manifestly reasonable. Of course this obscures that these codes are embedded in politics of class, race and gender. Within this chapter I address the manner in which the "situatedness" of news values was described and critiqued by a Māori reporter, whose inability to inhabit his organisation resulted in his securing of alternate employment. This intensifies my analysis of the variety of practice engaged by newsworkers, and suggests the constraints which act to reproduce institutional orthodoxies.

**editing and authority**

Within news culture, editors have the authority to determine which stories will be covered and how. Throughout the course of my research several journalists told me of industry and public perceptions of the editorial stance of specific daily papers, which meant that their workers were tasked with pursuing particular angles or types of story. A journalist told me of the editorial stance of a Wellington daily:

> I've got every respect for [the reporter], he's got the ability to go in and get a fresh angle. But we're all aware of the position of the editor, and obviously that's who he's working for. Sometimes if you read their stories there is a certain direction to them, there wasn't too much on tino rangatiratanga. The editor's known to have a fairly staunch, white, middle class attitude towards Māori issues. So he's a very good reporter but it seemed that if he got a hard anti-Māori angle it would be given lots of prominence.

The editor of another paper told me: "there were a lot of bad guys down at the Gardens, and a lot of good guys too, lovely old people. All around the periphery were the warriors with clubs and spears and anyone who came near would certainly get it". These assumptions were partly formed through distance, and this was elaborated to me by an informant from the police:
[He] took upon himself a role as a commentator, both in electronic and print media - I didn't speak with him during Moutoa, definitely wasn't at any meetings, discussions, groups that my staff or I were involved in. I don't think he had a feel for the issues and I was surprised at the air time he got. [He] didn't have direct input but he made himself into a commentator, and I don't think particularly accurately, and he definitely didn't take it upon himself to be briefed by me in any form - he just made his opinion up from a distance.

The coverage produced by a particular newspaper is in part formed by the preoccupations of its editor. But this is only one factor which determines what counts as news. The editor's role is to direct the production of news within the codes and provisions of the medium.

Bell identifies four functions of the process of editing copy: "to cut, to clarify, to maximise news value, and to standardise language. Of these, maximising news value is the primary function, and much of the cutting and clarifying is done to serve a story's newsworthiness" (Bell 1991: 76). He elaborates: "Most copy editing is designed to maximise news value - to make the lead "harder" and more striking, the source's credentials more authoritative, the writing more crisp, the appeal to the audience more compelling" (ibid: 79). "Newsworthiness" relates to the news makers' perception of what will draw audiences or readers. As my project details, this means that the priority is to engage rather than inform a public.

The production of a "newsworthy" story also means one that it is possible to tell within the time or space available. Both press and television news are constrained by the requirement for brevity in the form of time slots or copy space. A television journalist also told me:

The newsworthiness of events is determined by the amount of news that is around on the day. If it is a quiet day then sometimes events that wouldn't make it on to the news on a busy news day would get in. The process is a wee bit arbitrary in
that respect. But there were some events at the Gardens that were so important that they were covered regardless. Those were executive editorial decisions, we make recommendations but the decision is theirs.

The role of editors in regulating what will go to air on the nightly six o'clock news was explained to me by journalists working for TVNZ. The process begins with an 8:45 am editorial meeting at which items are selected from a list of prospective stories. The editor assigns stories to reporters for which they then seek interviews. The next meeting is at 10:30 am. At this meeting the managing editor becomes involved and reporters explain their stories. The daily editor and managing editor make the decision as to whether the reporter will pursue the story. At 2:30 pm, a final meeting is held at which journalists report on how their stories have "panned out" and a final commitment is made by the editors as to whether each story will go to air. Reporters then write their scripts which are sub edited. Sub editors may change reporters' scripts to fit the stylistic standards of the program, which includes vocabulary and grammar but also the political angle taken by the reporter. In this process the power to identify events as newsworthy and to shape the way the event will be translated into a news story lies with the editorial staff.

qualitative analysis of a One Network News story

The structuring of the day's events into a television news clip (events which in themselves represent moments in the continuum of the lives and activities of participants) necessarily reduces that which participants are profoundly invested in (it is their work; their passion; their politics; their misfortune; their private life) to a carefully scripted and visualised story.

The lead story screened by One Network News on March 30, 1995 was the passing of the eviction deadline at the Gardens. My analysis of this clip examines the mechanisms through which this medium produces stories. If a photograph constitutes an arresting of meaning, do the events represented by the press photographs I have reproduced signify differently when viewed in animation?

1See appendix A for a shot analysis of this clip. The clip is also included on the video tape which accompanies the thesis.
Television news differs from the press in terms of the consistent centrality of the visual. Reporters from television are always mindful of how their stories will "look". While visual interest is also significant to the selection of press photographs, one might assume that the number of images which a news clip consists of might offer a range of perspectives. One of my informants told me that some of the aspects at Pakaitore were "ideally suited to television": the demonstrations and swaggering rangatahi made for good (hard) pictures. The story which screened on March 30 offers examples of this.

Richard Long's lead in to the story is presented in the studio. It assumes a familiarity with these events on the part of viewers. The "story" had been running for a month, and TVNZ had a news team living in Wanganui. Thus, there is no background given to the events, viewers are simply told that the deadline has passed and the stand off continues. As the story begins we are told, and see, Arana Taumata "live from the scene". In news practice, as in Geertz's rendering of anthropology, an authority to tell is drawn from "being there". This is supplemented by the presumption that reporters are trained to produce objective representations of events and people. Ostensibly, the stance taken by one who reports, is that of one outside of events. Those with stakes in events are interviewed, events are then impartially summarised and explained, relying on the reporter's expertise at "playing all sides". Thus authority is drawn from being on location, while simultaneously the partiality of position produced through locations of race, gender, class are eschewed. This is not to say that the reporter is not read by viewers as located: as I shall address he was read by one of my respondents from TVNZ as providing a "Māori perspective". Conversely, Iwi read his role as complicit with the structures of a Pākehā organisation.

Beginning in the present, "live from the scene", Arana Taumata tells us that the real news of the day is not the passing of the deadline; the mood at the Gardens is one of celebration: this

---

2 The literature regarding the role of proximity within broadcast news is summarised by Zelizer (1990). Zelizer observes that, in response to innovations in news production, such as the increasing reliance on new technologies allowing information to be rapidly transferred between diffuse spaces, proximity is transformed "from a value into a practice". This practice is "most centrally realised through spatial codes used in the presentation (not formation) of news" (Zelizer 1990: 46).
is in "stark contrast to scenes earlier this morning". The reporter's facial expression, intonation and slight shake of the head convey the gravity of this statement. The linguistic selection of "scenes" intimates that events happen the way we see them on the screen: as newsworthy "scenes" rather than longer sequences within time. It is the way things look that is privileged; the way things lend themselves to representation as television news.

In keeping with the primary news value of "negativity" the report is structured around the "hard" angles; the dramatic events of the day. Shots 6 to 8 depict Māori men standing on a road running alongside the Gardens. Shot 6 includes a sign which clearly does not belong here: "CONSTRUCTION ZONE. NO THROUGH ROAD. NO EXIT". Behind this sign stands a man holding a large tīnō rangatiratanga flag. Some of the men hold rākau, and one has his face concealed with a scarf. The men do not look legitimately authoritative; we might imagine in comparison the order; the uniforms, the signs of which a police road block would consist.

These images render the reason given for the roadblock, "they say for safety", dubious. I assume the perspective of Iwi would be that the driver's "refusal to cooperate" is a euphemism for posing danger to Iwi, but instead of elaborating this perspective the hard angle is pursued. The pictures accompanying the copy on the arrests made in relation to the car smashing include a long haired Māori man with a rākau gesturing at a cameraman. The daunted cameraman retreats. The threat posed by those at the Gardens is developed through reference to the closing of the court house. A panning shot shows the proximity of these two sites.

"Meanwhile Taranaki supporters marched into Wanganui." This phrase simplifies the process of the supporters arriving and being welcomed by local Iwi. The ceremony this involved might have been selected; a pōwhiri on the main street of Wanganui is certainly novel. But this does not have the same news value as the aspects of the march that were selected: it reveals accord between Taranaki and Whanganui Iwi, rather than conflict between Iwi and the Council. The mid shots selected to visualise the march foreground young Māori
men. Women, children, kuia and kaumātua, are peripheral to these shots. The "hardest" pictures are of the haka performed outside Poynter's book shop. Some of these images are repeated during Archie Taiaroa's comments.

Three "accessed" voices are used in the story. Hartley (1982) calls the voices of those representing the news organisation (in this case those of Long and Taumata), "institutional". This is distinct from the voices of those interviewed in the course of the program, the "accessed voices". Hartley draws an analogy between the spoken dialogue of characters in novels and the accessed voices within news: in both cases the dialogue belongs to the speaker, but it is produced by an author. Accessed voices are a narrative device which produce a "reality effect"; they authenticate the reporter's script (Hartley 1982: 109-111).

Archie Taiaroa is the first of the accessed voices. He is introduced as "prominent Whanganui River Leader" (and nominated by a caption "Tuwharetoa Trust Board"). While he has, that day, expressed his support for the occupation, he does not represent those at Pakaitore. His criticism of the tactics of rangatahi enables a perspective to be introduced "in terms that are denied to the 'impartial' professionals" (Hartley, 1982: 110). By comparison, Niko Tangaroa is a spokesman chosen by Iwi to speak for Pakaitore, but is nominated simply as "protester". The use of nominations (the captions and verbal introductions provided for interviewees) provides the audience with clues to the status and authority of speakers (ibid: 108). In this case we are clued to the relative authority of the speaker critical of some Iwi members.

Niko Tangaroa's remarks do not express the introduction provided by Taumata. The reporter states "protesters say the occupation has become a platform for all Māori grievances". Tangaroa is used to represent the protesters, but his comments refer to the support from other Iwi; not the reason for this: "The motu has responded to the call to come and support Whanganui. And that's what they've done. And we've been overwhelmed by support from all Iwi."
Prime Minister Jim Bolger is the accessed voice which runs between Taiaroa and Tangaroa. Bolger's comments are rendered as a "call for calm". More accurately, his statements negate any role for the Crown in these matters; posing "a challenge to Māori leadership to find a way, with the Wanganui City Council ... to find a solution to the problem."

Taumata's story ends with several shots of the Council who "will go to the High Court to seek a ruling on the occupation. So whilst the occupiers may still be on Moutoa Gardens their reprieve may be short lived, if in fact the Council go to the High Court". The coverage thus comes back to the present and Long, in the studio, asks Taumata about the police presence around the Gardens. This is a hard angle; the police, with reinforcements are "on stand by if or when the call does come from the Council". The final exchange between Long and Taumata affirms the latter's authority to tell about these events. Long tells Taumata (and the viewer) he has been "following the story closely" and is asked for his "judgement" rather than an opinion as to how long the protesters will stay.

In this news story, most of the "hard angles" run across the papers I have analysed were included. The pictures used for the story are neither as favourable as the Evening Standard, which chose not to run these "negative" angles, or as sensational as either the Chronicle (attention is not drawn to the presence of either Mike Smith or Tame Iti) or the Dominion (there are no pictures of the car being smashed).

Sontag suggests that: "Photographs may be more memorable than moving images, because they are a neat slice of time, not a flow. Television is a stream of under selected images, each of which cancels its predecessor" (Sontag 1977: 18). While the moving images of a news clip cannot be closely examined or consulted again with the ease of a photographic object, an edited segment of footage may be crafted around the "hard" picture. Within this flow, certain images will produce affect: they will arrest the viewer and, as I discuss in the following chapter, be remembered.
My reading of the process of the coding and location of television news production was rendered in a similar fashion by a television reporter I interviewed. He explained to me his frustrations with both the structure of the medium and the editorial process. The reporter and his cameraman had unrestricted access at the marae because they were Iwi whānau. But according to him:

The main focus was on events of conflict, sensational things, like clashes between protesters and police. If that happened it was the lead story for the day. When I look back at it those things were very rare. There were some amazing things happening at Pakaitore: Māori groups coming from throughout the country to support Pakaitore. That didn’t get any air time. It wasn’t deemed newsworthy. There were other things that touched me; the way they sheltered and fed themselves over such a long time. They never knew how many people were going to come each day but they always seemed able to accommodate them. But that didn’t grab my editors as being news. I felt a bit used actually. TVNZ knew I had the edge over other journalists, but in the wash up the end product wasn’t really any different from what other journalists were doing ...

A lot of editors were listening to what was being said on the radio, and that determined what the angle was and that was frustrating for me because I was right at the coalface and my judgement as to what was significant was left by the wayside ...

There was one example near the end of the occupation where it was imminent that they were going to be evicted by the police and the radio copy at that time was saying that there were major divisions among the occupiers as to whether they should dig their toes in or leave. And I basically canvassed the people at Pakaitore - "radio is saying there are divisions, what’s the story, are you going to stay or leave" and their line to me was, "no we’re not divided, we’re still strong and together, what’s being portrayed as divisions by radio is basically us
discussing what our options are”. And I told my editors about that but they were still adamant to construe it as major divisions existing among the occupiers ... A lot of the time we were looking for angles to discredit them, lower their credibility, it was mischief sometimes.

Sue: So did you feel uncomfortable about your positioning?

Television journalist: Shit yeah, because I got it the next day when they saw my reports "division at Pakaitore". It was all right for them in Auckland - they were sitting there in their ivory towers, catch their ferries back over to Devonport, they're sweet in their lovely little villas, but I was just across the road and I'd get it the next day, and they were giving me shit some of them ... Structurally there are major problems in terms of how news is conveyed, especially in an organisation like TVNZ because the editors there and the management are out of touch with reality, they spend too much time in the offices and make key judgements without being at the coal face themselves.

Sue: And they're not going to make decisions that will question the legitimacy of their positions, they won't make themselves the problem, so it's self protection as well.

Television journalist: I was upset with TVNZ, I remember one story I was calling Moutoa Gardens Pakaitore in my reports and that received a number of complaints from members of the public. That was actually followed up in the *Dominion* a number of days later in a satirical column, and the managing editor of TVNZ was contacted and said he was "a little upset with [the reporter], and from here on in he'd be using the correct name, Moutoa Gardens".

Sue: Surely there would be comments from the other side when it was referred to as Moutoa Gardens?
Television journalist: Exactly, and that's where I was coming from. When I was using Pakaitore I was basically talking from the perspective of the occupiers. An example is a time when there was a bomb scare there, and I think my voice over said "but the occupiers did leave Pakaitore last night" and I thought that was fine because to them Pakaitore was Pakaitore, it wasn't Moutoa Gardens. And when I was voicing over the Wanganui City Council's point of view I might have referred to it as Moutoa Gardens. I got very clear instructions from my editor after that time to refer to it as Moutoa Gardens and nothing else ...

I think every mainstream news editor should try and get on a marae - it quite surprised me, there were a number of news editors at TVNZ that had no direct interaction with Māori people, and a lot of the time I would feel their prejudice coming through. They've been conditioned by what they themselves are generating in the media - Māori being gang members, dole bludgers, solo parents, losers - and that's not the full story and I think if they had more interaction with Māori maybe their treatment would be different. I broached the subject with someone at Wellington Polytech about training in Māori issues - they have a cultural component, marae stays, tikanga - but I'm not sure how effective it is.

This series of comments raise a number of considerations regarding the positioning of journalists in relation to their editors. My informant refers to his organisation as "we" ("were looking for angles to discredit them"), which acknowledges his complicity while simultaneously enabling a critique of the way television news is structured. As I have mentioned, the other television reporter I interviewed largely accepted the mechanisms of the medium. This journalist identifies the politics of the representational process; that news is coded both by ethnicity and class. Further, he locates training as a space where interventions may be made. His doubts regarding the efficacy of training in Māori tikanga suggest the broader exclusions inscribed through schooling and the wider mediascape, which limit the discursive resources of news workers.
The way stories were told about Pakaitore by both the press and television news was determined both by the structural constraints of particular mediums and the assumptions of editors and news workers. The account by my second respondent from television suggests that the agenda of editors (to minimise flak from the public, maintain ratings, produce news which is "apolitical") constrain the ability of individual workers to produce stories which may challenge the authority represented by their employers. Thus, while this reporter was able to use a different process from other journalists in getting his stories, he told me:

> You can't sum up something as complicated as what Pakaitore was all about in a one minute twenty news item, it's just impossible really. And that was a constant source of frustration for me, not because of the criticism I was getting from the occupiers, I'm pretty thick skinned and can take constructive criticism, but in terms of my own satisfaction, that's the reason I got into this job, working with the media, as a Māori I would be able to bring a Māori perspective into these issues, but I found that because of the format it's impossible. And that's the main reason why I got out of news, I worked there for three and a half years and realised that its impossible to cover complicated, complex issues like this in a one minute twenty news item. I've gone back to Māori programs and I work on stories that are on average eight or nine minutes and I find that much more fulfilling in terms of getting information out, in terms of conveying different points of view, and I'm really happy now.

The television reporter I discussed at the beginning of the chapter read the presence of this journalist as representative of an Iwi perspective. In this context "representation" consists of a sign for a Māori perspective which stands in for voice and works to cover over that absence. This is elaborated by the commentary which follows, where the discourse produced in the interview with my first television reporter is challenged by the perspectives of Iwi:
Sue: Did you hear from people at the Gardens what sort of issues they had with the media?

TV journalist: A lot of it seemed to be just generalised hatred of the media, media bashing, you'll often find when you go out there that just because you're a journalist with a camera it causes people to say to you "bloody media, don't point that thing at me, don't bring that thing in here, I don't want to be filmed" and that seemed to be the general tenor of any sort of complaints. I think some people saw us as an agent of Pākehā oppression, portraying things the Pākehā way, which was ironic considering that the journalist at the centre of it all was a Māori, so were some of the camera operators there. We take these sorts of issues very seriously because at a very basic level people come down on us like a ton of bricks if we don't because we're so high profile, and also because they're important.

What is identified by this reporter as an "ironic" response by Iwi is viewed as a legitimate concern by the Māori reporter in question, as his earlier commentary conveys. One of my respondents from the marae told me of her reaction to the Māori reporter's coverage:

I cracked up to him because he is Māori and he belongs to the upper Wanganui but when I looked at the late news the odd time I groaned, he was sounding like all the others, and I suppose we presumed he might have a bit more feeling for what it was about. But he was no different. We then heard later that his script was changed.

I asked the Pākehā reporter about the way people felt about being filmed:

Sue: So do you generally find in the course of your job that people don't want to be filmed?
TV journalist: People get nervous about it, but as long as you treat them like human beings and accept the fact that they will be nervous when you stick a hundred thousand dollar camera in their face and ask them to act naturally; or shine bright lights in their eyes; or say "you've got twenty seconds to tell me about something that's controversial or disturbing or that you find uncomfortable talking about". But you can usually get around that, a good journalist will be able to film someone in a situation and make them feel comfortable, even enjoy it. It doesn't have to feel like an invasion.

This was not the experience of some of my respondents from Pakaitore. One told me: "they're so intrusive with their cameras. They stick it in front of you, there's nothing subtle about them. Generally there was an unease about the media all the time". I was also told of the insensitivity of media practice: "some media were quite rude and crude in the way they poked their cameras into tents and the dining hall - we had to put a stop to that, people didn't want their lives flashed across the TV or papers. Another of my respondents criticised the editing of interviews into sound bites: "on TV the time is so short - twenty seconds, a sharp little spurt and that's all, and they cut you up. I wanted a very low profile. I think they preferred Ken because he appeared to be more sensationalist and had things that they thought might sell".

These considerations illuminate both the culturally specific and political role of news. We cannot imagine that it is the prerogative of academics alone to identify this. My respondents from Pakaitore participate in a critique of the news process which is drawn from their experience of being subject to its practice. They reveal a knowledge of the editorial process and the profit imperative underpinning the "hard angle".

I was particularly interested in another aspect addressed by my Pākehā television reporter informant, not only because of the unsenscious ethnocentrism it conveys, but also because it reveals that as an insider he knows how news works, yet this did not prepare him for how this related to Pakaitore. That is, on one level he understands that news is crafted to
tell in particular ways, but on another he is surprised by his experience of what it does not
tell:

It was quite a revelation because it was a first hand experience of how intense the
feeling surrounding the issue of land and ownership are, and how intractable the
problem is, incredibly difficult to solve with any sense of fairness to both Pākehā
and Māori. You can intellectualise these things and think it's a really difficult
problem and people are really angry, but when you're actually there and in the
thick of something like that you really start to realise how deeply people feel
about some of these issues. That was something I wasn't prepared for, and I had
seen a lot of the coverage before hand.

I wanted to draw from my respondent if this may have led him to consider the problematics
of what counts as news. This is conveyed in the following exchange:

Sue: What some of the people I have interviewed from Pakaitore have stressed to
me was that it was a positive time for Iwi, of building relationships and educating
the young. And this wasn't "news"

TV journalist: That's something that television news and current affairs isn't really
tasked with covering, and I don't think it's appropriate entirely. It can, through
coverage of issues in a round about way, not intentionally, educate people.

Sue: So what should news be? What is its role?

TV journalist: It has a multiplicity of roles. Television news in particular has a
very important role in bringing a community together, and publicising issues,
making people aware of issues. An organisation like TVNZ news is a community
organisation, it shows a community to itself. We all know what significant public
figures look like, at a very basic level, purely because of television.
Sue: So people get these bits of information, and do you think it's the responsibility of other social organisations, like the education system, the family and so on, to provide people with a context in which to locate what they see and hear rather than the news provide that context?

TV journalist: Yes, and the public are media literate, the most average person that I'll meet and interview, one of the first things they'll say is "now you'll cut out the bad bits won't you". They know about the editing process they know that we shoot twenty minutes of tape and go back and cut it down to a minute twenty. They know that we pick and choose, that's the way the medium has evolved. So people can look at a particular story and say "okay I've seen that but I also know from what I've heard on the radio and read in the paper that there are other issues involved and other points of view". People are pretty media savvy. I think there's a high public awareness of how the news process works in a general sense.

At the risk of belabouring the point, "average" people may recognise that stories are shaped in a general sense, however I am unsure that this is recognised as political. I think this reporter is overly optimistic with regards the level of media literacy, particularly in light of his own experience of "revelation" at the Gardens. While how the news process works in a "general sense" may be understood this does not extend to the specifics of the medium. One of my respondents from Pakaitore explained to me how his awareness of the way television media worked developed over the eighty days he was a subject of news stories. What I am concerned to highlight here is that "the public" are never in a position to learn this. My respondent's understanding came about through his lengthy participation as a subject of news:

Some of the reporters were very responsive to where we were coming from, but in the editing they would pick out certain types of bit, and I've become a little more selective through experience, when someone's doing a camera shot I'll tell them to stop because I don't want that bit in. So when someone is interviewing
me and I don't like what I've said I'll try and stop it now, if they don't listen I will
walk away. I've done that several times and it's a habit I think I'll get into more
and more if I'm interviewed in the future. It's a bit sad when you have to do this
because of the unethical behaviour of some of the editors.

Sixty Minutes: A Thirteen Minute Frame

The lack of time to tell stories about Pakaitore was one of the frustrations identified by my
Māori respondent from TVNZ news. In light of this, I am interested in the way Sixty
Minutes, a national current affairs program, covered the occupation through their time slot of
thirteen minutes. The story, "Pa or Park" was filmed eighteen days into the occupation.

According to Abel "news is an account of events that have occurred in the immediate past
period, while current affairs attempts to provide analysis, background and debate" (Abel 216).
This "softer" material cannot be accommodated by news, due to the requirement of concision.
Bell suggests that "the boundary between current affairs and news is a grey one, particularly
for the audience" (Bell 1991: 15). My analysis of "Pa or Park" shows that while there is time
to include longer interviews with a wider range of people than a news story would allow,
little is offered in the way of analysis or background. In keeping with the codes of news, "Pa
or Park" is constructed through the editing of images and interviews, and the provision of
narration to present a story of conflict; of oppositions within the community.

"Pa or Park" is introduced in the studio by the reporter, Ross Stevens. This shot is
accompanied by a graphic of men performing a haka; an icon intended to draw the viewers'
interest. It is masculine; it is "Māori". We are told in this introduction "who knows" the
rights and wrongs of the land dispute; this is not the story that will be told here. Rather, this
story is about "race": "the fate of Moutoa Gardens, or Pakaitore, has become a symbol for all
those things that divide Māori and Pākehā in this society". The designation of these events as
symbolic of racial division masks the fact that this is not the meaning of Pakaitore, but a
meaning assigned by news media. Generalising these events in this way renders this story

---

3See appendix B for a shot analysis of this clip. The clip is also included on the video tape which accompanies
the thesis.
significant for all New Zealanders (rather than an issue specific to Wanganui). This angle is developed throughout the story.

The opening sequence of the program features a close up of Ken Mair, a familiar figure to audiences who have followed this news, who states that Iwi intend to stay at Pakaitore, and if evicted they will return. This sound bite is the only footage of Mair used in the program, and serves as a trope of protest. The story then cuts to a series of atmospheric shots of the Gardens at night with narration provided by the reporter. We are told, in language which clearly establishes this as a story, that "it was on just such a night ... that Don Kidston decided to exercise his rights as a citizen of Wanganui". Stevens' voice over is accompanied by pictures of Kidston walking down the main street in Wanganui with his wife. The staging of these shots of Kidston may be read as literally constituting him as the ordinary "man on the street". The visuals, accompanied by his comments, establish him as a family man; a rate payer; Pākehā. Kidston explains that (bolstered by alcohol) he decided to take a walk in the Gardens.

Elaborating the meaning of these events in a voice-over Stevens explains that Kidston knew the Gardens were "subject to something called the Whanganui Declaration of Nationhood". This qualifier signals this is an unusual concept; it is not stated as "fact" but is cast ambiguously. This is not an opportunity for the viewer to learn what this means, but rather to consider the "otherness" of this notion. Stevens continues that the Gardens "had been declared Māori land; subject to Māori control and Māori security, day and night". The repetition of the term "Māori" emphasises and reiterates that what is happening is racial, rather than the initiative of Whanganui Iwi. "Māori" (security) is visualised with a low angle close up of Leon Rerekura. This makes Rerekura look bigger than he actually is; it is surprising to see him in shot 17 with the reporter, who is considerably taller. This shot is selected to signify intimidation.

Kidston's description of his encounter with marae security is cut with responses from Leon Rerekura, the coordinator of security. This editing together of two interviews filmed at
different times, in different places, conveys two different perspectives of the incident. In Kidston's telling he was confronted by a Māori man with "dreadlocks and tattooing on his forehead, and that"; the archetypal "native" menace who needs no provocation to strike a white man. In the version provided by Rerekura, Kidston was abusive and threatening violence. He was "contained" by security. However, the version of events accepted as fact by Stevens is Kidston's: "what happened to Don Kidston is evidence of the tension that envelops Wanganui like a river mist as the race debate is played out daily on a city park". Kidston's participation is presented in the passive tense. This incident might have been evaluated as a deliberate provocation by Kidston⁴. Instead it seems that the protesters produced the situation simply because they are there. The narration provided by Stevens to shots 24-28 reiterates that this is not an issue specifically regarding Whanganui Iwi's claim to land. Rather, it constitutes the playing out of "the race debate"; the terms of which are never explained.

Stevens explains that he and his crew entered the marae according to protocol; "the polite route". This conveys good manners; reasonableness; a bicultural sensibility, and may function to produce identification with audience members who find Kidston's behaviour objectionable. While we see Stevens and his crew being respectful of protocol, the linguistic selection of "squatters", to refer to Iwi, counters this deference.

In the first clip of conversation between Stevens and Niko Tangaroa, Stevens' acceptance of the protocols is discussed and he asks: "am I being embraced by that [acceptance of protocol] or am I being threatened by that?" Stevens concedes he did not feel threatened, and Tangaroa contends that those who do feel threatened by the occupation have been misinformed. However, the representation of the marae in the following segment controverts this.

The presence of Tame Iti is highlighted, introduced as "one of the most infamous faces in Māoridom ... the man who spat at Waitangi". The spitting at Waitangi referred to occurred a month earlier at the Waitangi commemorations. Abel writes of this incident:

⁴I discuss other versions of this incident on pages 86-7.
During the pōwhiri the official party was vigorously challenged by Tame Iti from Tuhoe, who in the process spat on the ground four times ... Shots of Tame Iti in action appeared ten times in the television coverage. In addition to the incident itself, shots of Iti were used to symbolise the protest action at Waitangi and its extremism (Abel 1998: 181).

Abel explains that as an expression of insult this act may be read as acceptable in terms of Māori kawa. Rather than elaborate on the complexities of its signification, throughout media coverage "a strictly Pākehā interpretation of the issue prevailed" (ibid 184). This interpretation is reproduced by Stevens' description.

In his voice-over to shot 37, Stevens describes his host as "squatter kaumatua Niko Tangaroa". This linguistic device, whereby the "determiner is deleted from the first, descriptive noun phrase in apposition with a second, name noun phrase" has become popular within news in recent decades (Bell 1991: 195). Its effect is to confer "titleness" to the subject which "embodies a person's claim to news value" (ibid 196). In this case it reiterates the stance of the program that those at Pakaitore are there illegitimately.

Stevens' narration which accompanies a series of historic photographs states:

In 1848, by all accounts, this single acre of land was willingly sold by local Māori to the Crown as part of the 80 000 acre Wanganui purchase. The Wanganui chief at Mawae said at the time "let no one attempt to infringe upon the lands about to be sold to the Europeans. The chief's plea seems to have fallen on deaf ears ... 

The phrase "by all accounts" clearly excludes the perspective of nga Iwi; the commentary positions Iwi as not only acting outside of the law, but also as disrespectful of the wishes of their ancestors. An alternative approach to this issue could have pointed out the inconsistencies in the historical record, such as I have discussed. The reporter does not
attempt to solicit details of the Iwi's claim in the following discussion with Niko Tangaroa; rather he elaborates on the lawlessness of the occupation.

The reporter does not explain the content of the photographs. Their function is to provide a sign for documentary evidence of the sale of the Gardens. The piano music which accompanies this segment is, I suggest, intended to evoke a particular sensibility, whereby the violence and contestability of the colonial encounter is effaced through an aural aesthetic of nostalgic sentiment.

A series of shots of life on the marae follow. A shot of a sign prohibiting dogs is juxtaposed by one of a dog on the site; imaging the commentary that the "thriving squatter village" is subject to "its own laws". A drop in Stevens' tone signals the gravity of the marae's "own security" which is visualised by a trio of Māori men, one holding a rākau.

The following sequence of Stevens' interview with Tangaroa gives voice to the perspective of Iwi. Tangaroa points out that the sale of land is disputed by Iwi; "that's why we're here". The brief exchange does not convey Iwi's previous experience with the Waitangi Tribunal, effacing the recent history of their claim. Tangaroa replies to Stevens comment "you're saying hang Parliament, hang the Waitangi Tribunal, hang Pākehā process" that "it was the so called laws that put us into this particular situation that we're in now. We've lost our lands". Instead of using this as a point from which to elaborate the specifics of the Iwi's perspective there is a cut to an interview with One Law protesters.

The opening question to the Turners is not a query regarding the reasoning behind the counter protest or the nature of the One Law group, but about the Ballance statue. It is calculated to produce, and receives, an emotive response. Ian Turner's response "if I went onto a marae and did something like that, which I would never do, they would probably kill me..." constitutes Iwi as "other"; fearsome, and produces the toppling of the Ballance head as commensurate with desecration of a marae. Ballance's historical role in relation to Māori makes this comparison untenable. According to Ian Turner, the initiatives of Iwi must be
"nipped in the bud" or we'll have "the sort of problems they had in Ireland". Both of the analogies drawn by Turner suggest that he cannot make sense of these events in terms of their local specificity.

In a voice-over to shot 65, Stevens implies that the police are ineffectual; responding to the "confrontation" by placing out a row of traffic cones. Perhaps if this was a "confrontation" this would be an inappropriate response; as it is a peaceful demonstration police involvement is not required. Stevens then speaks to the camera, telling viewers that "race relations in New Zealand are walking a fine line". It is clear from his commentary that he believes the responsibility for this lies with Iwi, who "say they are subject to their own law, and they've taken that law into their own hands".

The story returns to the interview with the Turners, whose reactionary perspective gets played against the ostensibly liberal position of Stevens. The latter insists that New Zealand is made up of "two people, Māori and Pākehā" and urges conversation with Iwi. This would make a good angle for the story. The interview with the Turners is cut with the interview with Tangaroa. Stevens urges the One Law group to visit the marae. Stevens is told by Tangaroa the group would be welcome if they followed protocol. The One Law group make it clear they will not visit. What would make good footage will not occur, and Stevens compensates by proposing a "what if" scenario to Tangaroa: "If they chose not to [accept the protocols] and walk on anyway what would happen then? ... And what would happen if they refused to go?"

Yet Stevens tells us "this hardly seems a threatening place" in a link to an interview with the Secretary of One New Zealand. His first observation to her (which is contrary to what his story reveals) is that at the marae there are "old folks, kids. It's not just Ken Mair, it's not just Nik Tangaroa. There's obviously very considerable support for what's happening over there". The responses by the Secretary (Iwi want "something for nothing ... they're like spoilt children .. somehow or other they should be made to observe the law") augment Stevens' moderate and impartial position.
A brief interview with the police Superintendent follows, who states that Council must request police intervention for that to occur. The following interview with Mayor Poynter, introduced by Stevens as the man who "on behalf of his citizens, owns Moutoa Gardens", is conducted in the Mayoral office. Poynter dismisses suggestions he has received from the public on how to deal with Iwi, on the basis the suggestions are immoderate and unrepeatable. This, coupled with Poynter's attire, title, and the location where the interview is shot, work to legitimise his anger.

The final segment focuses once more on the presence of Tame Iti. Shot 98, a gratuitous close up of a hammer slung through the back of a man's black leather pants, is a "hard" image which we are supposed to read as weaponry, rather than a tool. The shot is used to visualise Tame Iti's "tribesmen [who] are also planning occupations in what they call their Tuhoe nation". Stevens asks Iti "do New Zealanders have anything to fear from you?" The final shot is a close up of Iti, who says "We only wanted to remind them that in the very near future we're going to be their new boss; and their new landlord".

Rather than provide background to the dispute, or elaborate the perspective of Iwi, "Pa or Park" focuses on "hard angles". The privileged voice belongs to the reporter, who composes his authority as "neutral" through mediating the voices of others. The camera's eye directs the viewers' gaze to aspects of Iwi presence which may be construed as threatening. A longer time slot makes little difference to the type of story that is told about Pakaitore. This would require the willingness to challenge the construction of the best news as "hard".

**reflexive practice**

The reporters who were responsive to Iwi understood that a particular process was required which demonstrated that Iwi were not simply "news stories". A press reporter told me of his process of getting stories:
I got to meet Joe Hawke because I got taken onto the marae, it was a big day and I got into the food tent there and I hung around and got a message to him, would he like to talk, and it's quite difficult in that scenario getting up to speed as a Pākehā because there are certain things that have to be done - the hongi, the protocol. And I found that was quite difficult for some Pākehā who had never experienced it in their lives before but I'd done a little bit of it before hand. Provided you go through that and show a guy like him respect then I found that it was quite easy to get him talking on subjects and to draw him out. Because of course he's been there, done that, his knowledge was amazing. He talked for ages and he gave me a really good perspective of the history of protest and where it was all coming from and that gave me an ideal background.

This process, coupled with an editor who was supportive of the stories he wanted to do, meant that this journalist's reports differed markedly from those in other daily papers. Iwi expressed their appreciation to me of this journalist's work and he also told me they had "gone on record" with their support. This recognition of the requirement of respect was explained to me from the perspective of Iwi:

There were some media that were better than others, and some that got better as time went on and we began to build relationships with them, they began to feel more of a responsibility in the way they treated us. I don't think they cared about us when they came there, they just wanted the news. But as they came to know us better, some of them, and they were the ones that were there the most, they began to be more careful and we noticed that. They were more careful in the way they spoke to us and that signalled to us that their attitude had changed towards us. And they began to ask us more about the issues rather than concentrating in on the personal stuff. But then again, even though the reporters did that then there's an editor who would sift through what's newsworthy and what's not, and that's what we found really difficult. You would build a trust in somebody but
there was always someone else a little bit higher up the chain who decided what
they thought was news worthy.

The most widely lauded account produced about the occupation was by Cate Brett, a
journalist for *North and South* magazine. Brett engaged a process of story making which a
number of my informants commended, including the police superintendent (who told me he
used it as a resource) and Iwi. A respondent from Pakaitore told me:

When we've talked amongst ourselves we've felt that the articles in magazines
were probably more truthful than others, and we thought that could have been
because those people did stay at the marae, like Cate Brett stayed for nearly a
week at the marae, plus she came with quite a different political analysis. She
had done quite a lot of structural analysis and she had also done Treaty training
and things like that, so she came with a different knowledge base, she had a
greater understanding of the causes and the history, so she was a lot easier to talk
to for that reason, she was very sensitive to the issues. The other thing too was
that she exposed herself to our people, she came and asked, which is not
something that anyone else did. She asked if she could be there and write the
story. And our people gave her quite a pounding because she came about the
third week we were there and we'd already had all the awful other stuff. She was
quite different, she used a different process to come in, and at the end of the day
our people appreciated and respected her for that. And she got her story in a
different way, she went and worked in the kitchen, she didn't just run around, hold
you up against the wall to talk to you, she built relationships before she talked to
people, because most media people don't do that, they don't have time, they have
to get a story.

In this sense I am inclined to argue that Brett's process was "ethnographic", in that she
became a participant rather than a producer of commentary from a distance. Her process of
telling begins with an assessment of her own assumptions, formed through media reports, of
what she expected to encounter at the marae. She proceeds to explain the way her experience there led her to identify a series of misrepresentations in this coverage. Notably, she identifies that at the marae:

Among these kuia are women in their 80s and 90s: women who in Pākehā culture would carry about as much clout as the family cat. Here they are formidable and inscrutable ... These are the women who ignited this particular fire (Brett, 1995: 46).
I would elaborate that it was both the time spent by Brett, the copy space she had as the author of a feature story, and her understanding of the Treaty and local kaupapa which enabled her to tell in this way. However, the cover of the issue of the magazine stressed the "hard angle" through both the image of a man with full face moko performing a haka and the headline "Wanganui: Beyond the Comfort Zone" (figure 14). Neither represent Brett's story.

Journalists can, if they are so inclined or equipped, problematise the structures which constitute their jobs. I am interested in why, and the extent to which, they may do so. In chapter three I identified the different sensibilities journalists from the Chronicle and Evening Standard engaged in their praxis, and the restrictions editors and readerships may place on what becomes news. Within this chapter I have detailed the way in which some newsworkers don't understand why questions, beyond allegations of "distortion" of the "facts", would be raised around their practice. Central to what is imagined as "value free" practice is the vaunting of concepts such as "journalistic integrity", "objectivity" and "impartiality". Criticism from the "outside": from Iwi and their supporters, which questions these fundamental principles may be rendered political, and therefore an inappropriate challenge to "apolitical" news practice.

My examination of the sites of newsmaking reveals the significance within the playing out of events around Pakaitore of personal (and political) agendas, which are informed by the cultural positionings of individual newsworkers. The reluctance to question editorial and cultural privilege, or to have one's practice rendered culturally insensitive, can be evaded through recourse to the codes of news and the rational imperative of news practice. However, around Pakaitore there was a general convergence between news that was named as "soft" and perspectives which challenged the legitimacy of the Council, Crown, police and news media.

As I have elucidated, several of my respondents from news organisations recognised the politics of news. Their testimony, coupled with the perspectives of Whanganui Iwi, signify that the local is embedded in wider discursive formations. This is explicit in the following
account, where one of my informants compares his experience in Māori controlled media
with his work in a mainstream news organisation:

I think there's a huge difference in terms of our people's perception of a Māori
production as against a mainstream production. When I was working with One
Network News, even though I had very good access to a lot of Māori people, key
Māori people that perhaps Pākehā journalists couldn't get to, there was always the
suspicion that the mainstream media treatment would portray Māori in a negative
light. Whereas working for a program like Marae I think that a lot of the people
that I interview are that much more at ease because they know I am going to be
handling the stories from a Māori perspective, I'm working for Māori producers,
so the agenda is slightly different. For that reason I get much better quality
information from them, much better interviews, and I think that makes the whole
process of what I'm trying to do, trying to inform and educate people, that much
easier. Plus I have much longer durations to work with, the average news story is
one minute, twenty seconds, on Marae its seven or eight minutes. So I can let
people talk longer, I don't offer sound bytes any more - if it takes someone fifty
seconds to say something that's really strong, relevant and meaningful then I let
them talk for fifty seconds, I could never let them do that on a news story, and I
think that's important because sound bytes can be really quite dangerous, in
longer grabs people get to qualify their statements that much better.

Within his account the reporter describes his agenda as a news worker as "trying to inform
and educate people". This contrasts with the role of news imagined by his Pākehā colleague,
for whom educating publics was not "entirely appropriate"; instead the roles of news include
"bring a community together"; "publicising issues"; "it shows a community to itself". Within
this comprehension news is a mirror for the viewership the reporter both represents and
inhabits: he has no particular investment in reformulating publics or institutions to
accommodate Māori preoccupations; news serves the status quo. The Māori journalist
expresses a desire to produce a quality of information beyond his colleague's rendering of
news, and values the way in which his practice at Marae is enabling, not because he is Māori, but because he is mindful of the politics of (post)colonial authority and the issues this raises for Māori. His comments highlight that perspectives beyond those privileged by Pākehā authorities are required in order to get closer to a "truth". The more perspectives that one has available, the closer one moves to "getting the facts right":

I think we need more Māori journalists in the media, not just Māori per se, people with brown skins, but rather who come from a cultural base, have te reo, have knowledge of tikanga, because you see things differently when you have those kinds of skills and qualities. If you have that perspective you’ll be closer to the truth, closer to the facts, and that's what journalism is about to me, getting your facts right. I think our people should come from the other side - try and use media more proactively, instead of reacting to stories or angles that are being generated by papers or radio, they should try and set mechanisms in place so we're not always on the receiving end.

Challenging authority does not mean disposing with it. It means subjecting it scrutiny. That this journalist left a Pākehā organisation to work in Māori media is significant in itself. For me it speaks to the reproduction of institutionalised authority through news. Rather than the structure of TVNZ news changing to accommodate "difference", "different" perspectives make a space "outside". While I think Māori controlled broadcasting is imperative, I am wary that this also serves to let mainstream news organisations "of the hook". Ethnocentrism within mainstream organisations becomes reinscribed; reconstituting "race" as a "Māori problem". Two of my respondents left their respective news organisations in response to their experiences of racism over the course of Pakaitore. One of them would not give me her story, in part because of the anguish this experience consisted of. I am mindful then, of a "danger" implicit in the challenging of authority.

In this chapter I have sought to demonstrate both the possibilities and impossibilities of reflexivity within news practice. Representational practice is never "innocent" but is
politically and historically constituted. In chapter one I advocated the used of semiotic methods to reveal the politics of representation. The caveat to this strategy of analysis is that this way of telling is not exclusive to the academy: these ways of telling are also revealed by those who are not authorised through news.

In the following chapter I broaden my focus in order to elaborate a theme I have thus far indicated rather than substantively addressed. I examine the manner in which the visual operates within mediascapes (and their contexts of production and reception) to constitute "selves" and "others". I frame my discussion of the images of Pakaitore which were circulated by news media within an elucidation of the nature of "visual authority" and the praxis of constituting "whiteness" through imaging "others".
I would like to insist on the embodied nature of all vision, and so reclaim the sensory system that has been used to signify a leap out of the marked body and into a conquering gaze from nowhere. This is the gaze that mythically inscribes all the marked bodies, that makes the unmarked category claim the power to see and not be seen, to represent while escaping representation. This gaze signifies the unmarked positions of Man and White ... (Haraway 1991: 188).

In this chapter I reflect on the role of images in the reproduction of Pākehā authority. The manner in which Pakaitore was visualised by news media legitimised existing sites of authority, and proved compelling in shaping some of my respondents' perceptions of the occupation. News must be considered as a set of practices which are informed by and constituting of a broader public imaginary. News is part of a continuum of representational practices, within which the selection of images by news organisations is embedded in a "racialised" gaze. I examine the way indigenous news images "fit" within a national mediascape comprised of local and imported images of "others". I frame these considerations in relation to the notion of "visual authority", by which I mean both that the visual is authoritative in our making of meaning, and that images, in a manner analogous to written texts, are authored. My objective here is to direct a gaze upon the positions from which "others" are visualised; arguing that this reveals more about the way in which "whiteness" operates than it does those framed through photographic practice1. I situate my discussion of

1Analogous arguments within anthropological theory claim that the concept of culture, which has structured the representations produced by anthropologists for much of our history, is a means for comprehending "others" in order to know the self (for example Abu Lughod 1991; Pasquinelli 1996). Young (1995) contends that "Culture has always marked cultural difference by producing the other; it has always been comparative, and racism has always been an integral part of it: the two are inextricably clustered together, feeding off and generating each other. Race has always been culturally constructed. Culture has always been racially constructed" (Young 1995: 54). Annette Hamilton's concept of "the National Imaginary" conceives of "the means by which contemporary social orders are able to produce not merely images of themselves but images of themselves against others. An image of the self implies at once an image of another, against which it can be distinguished. I suggest that under world conditions in the past two hundred years or so, and more so recently, the problem of distinguishing a national self has moved to the forefront precisely as it is challenged by social, economic and
press photography within the broader discursive formations encoding public photography and its comprehension within the academy. In conclusion, I compare video footage produced by a member of Whanganui Iwi with the photographic forms considered in previous chapters, in order to evince the role of location in the stories told by pictures. I contend that while feminist theory has made much of the gendered gaze, our "looks" are also fundamentally structured around our "raced" positionings.

**public vision**

Documentary photography, along with photojournalism and press photography, are "public" forms of the photograph; they function for the public, ostensibly to inform and educate:

The information that photographs can give starts to seem very important at that moment in our cultural history when everyone is thought to have a right to something called news. Photographs were seen as a way of giving information to people who did not take easily to reading. The *Daily News* still calls itself "New York's Picture Newspaper", its bid for populist identity. At the opposite end of the scale, *Le Monde*, a newspaper designed for skilled, well informed readers, runs no photographs at all. The presumption is that, for such readers, a photograph could only illustrate the analysis contained in an article (Sontag 1977: 22).

The distinctions I make between the documentary and the press photograph are in terms of the photographic process, the intended function, and the intended circulation of each genre. The press photographer may be supplementary to the reporter, whose role is to gather the news. As the above quote by Sontag suggests, the photographer may simply visualise the information the reporter gathers in a different (and subordinate) form. The documentary
photographer is seldom constrained by the temporal context in which news is produced; this
genre may be characterised as a quest for the visual image which takes us beyond our
everyday knowledges. According to Rosler (1993) the documentary photograph must be
located within a history of the fashioning of social conscience:

Documentary photography has come to represent the social conscience of liberal
sensibility presented in visual imagery (though its roots are somewhat more
diverse and include the "artless" control motive of police record keeping and
surveillance). Photo documentary as a public genre had its moment in the
ideological climate of developing state liberalism and the attendant reform
movements of early twentieth century Progressive era in the United States and
withered along with the New Deal consensus some time after the Second World
War (Rosler 1993: 303).

The sensibility underpinning these projects has been vigorously critiqued. Rosler contends:
"documentary photography has been much more comfortable in the company of moralism
than wedded to a program of revolutionary politics" (ibid: 304); and "documentary, as we
know it, carries (old) information about a group of powerless people to another group
addressed as socially powerful" (ibid: 306). Documentary photography circulates within a
milieu which posits sympathy expressed through charity as the solution to inequity. But there
are further considerations I wish to put in play here, in order to elaborate what press
photography is not.

For Clarke (1997) the term documentary "is limiting both in relation to the range of reference
and the approach to the subject" (Clarke 1997: 145). We must consider the political location
of the photographer, the context in which photographing takes place, and the selection from
available prints (ibid 165). Yet, because Clarke is aligned with a broader discourse attentive
to the "art" of the photograph, these considerations are not rendered in such a way as to
seriously challenge the entitlement to photograph "others".
For Rosler the practice of visualising others, motivated by a desire for social change, expresses paternalistic and misguided sentiment; while Clarke attends to the comparative radicalism of this genre:

'Document' means 'evidence', and may be traced to *documentum*, a medieval term for an official paper: in other words, evidence not to be questioned, a truthful account backed by the authority of the law. And documentary photography, as a genre, has invariably rested within this frame of authority and significance. It seems the most obvious of categories, and is used precisely as evidence of what has occurred, so that its historical significance is employed further to invest its status as a truthful and objective account (or representation) of what has happened. Equally, documentary photography shows the camera at its most potent and radical. The very subject-matter of the documentary photographer is an index of the contentious and problematic as well as of emotional and harrowing experiences: poverty, social and political injustice, war, crime, deprivation, disaster, and suffering are all difficult areas to photograph and all potentially problematic in the way a photographer will approach their meanings in terms of his own assumptions (ibid: 145).

Under the auspices of the documentary photograph we may include Jacob Riis' work on the New York poor; the Farm Securities Association photographs of rural poor in the U.S.; and the photojournalism, war photography and documentary photographs run in news magazines such as *Time*, *Life*, and *National Geographic*. While I don't wish to idealise the historical moment when documentary photography enjoyed its authority as a public genre, I do want to note a comparison with the present. This era was prior to the proliferation of images, before "we" (those privileged with access) might imagine there was nothing we have not seen. I imagine a public more readily affected than today's. Where is the radical (or reformist) role of photography for a contemporary public? The sustained plight of "others" is not "news", but the imagery of advertisements which entreat us to "sponsor" the world's poor and refugees of war.
Of the genres of public photography which feature in printed form, press photography is the most transient, it is circulated on newsprint; it is "news", its function is immediate. Yet the press photograph may be the raw material of the documentary photograph; by chance or design the photographer may capture a moment of import which endures as historical testimony. The best of these genres are exhibited, displayed in edited collections: they are to be received as monuments to events; the work of masters. It is in these sites that the identity of the photographer is rendered significant. As Rosler writes:

[T]he Right wishes to seize a segment of photographic practice, securing the primacy of authorship, and isolate it within the gallery-museum-art-market nexus, effectively differentiating elite understanding and its objects from common understanding. The result (which stands on the bedrock of financial gain) has been a general movement of legitimated photography discourse to the right - a trajectory that involves the aestheticisation (consequently, formalisation) of meaning and the denial of content, the denial of the existence of the political dimension. Thus instead of a dialectical understanding of the relationship between images and the living world ... - in particular, of the relation between images and ideology - the relation has simply been severed in thought (Rosler: 1993: 321).

The run of the mill press photograph is not of this ilk; but is subordinated within the medium of news making. And despite the interrogation of photographic "truth", and the theoretical scrutiny regarding the evidentiary role of the documentary photograph, there is a credulity which remains attached to photographs. There is an absence of an "author- function" (Foucault 1977) within a "public" understanding of press photography. An image appears natural; (author-less) if the viewer is able to inhabit its gaze. It is through the testimony of those who cannot inhabit the gaze of the photographer that the connection between images and ideology becomes visible.
The press photographer takes the camera to an event and returns with photographic evidence. It is this product, the photograph, that is bestowed with authority (in Foucault's rendering this authority passes to the author). This is because:

A photograph passes for incontrovertible proof that a given thing happened. The picture may distort; but there is always a presumption that something exists, or did exist, which is like what's in the picture. Whatever the limitation (through amateurism) or pretensions (through artistry) of the individual photographer, a photograph - any photograph - seems to have a more innocent, and therefore more accurate, relation to visible reality than do other mimetic objects (Sontag 1977: 6).

Within press photography it is the medium on which an authoritative status is conveyed, rather than the individual with the camera. We do not say a photograph is "more true" because it was taken by someone or other who produces "truer" photographs. A photographer can produce a "better" photograph than another. A good photographer may be skilled in composition; lighting; the capturing of a subject which produces affect; they may take risks for their shots; form good relationships with their subjects, "have a good eye". A photograph can be coded through technique to connote truth: it reveals candor; it is grainy (like a newsprinted image); or video footage appears amateur, unedited (and thus authentic) because we can see the movement of the private, unwieldy eye. But the terms of reference here are aesthetic; of quality and technique rather than location. What is significant when a press photograph is selected is rarely these qualities, but rather the way the picture visualises "news".

When photographs taken by the photographer employed by the Chronicle are used in the paper they are not credited to an individual. Similarly, when I was given permission to use the Chronicle's photos I was asked to credit the paper rather than specify the work of a particular photographer. It may be inferred from this that the photographs represent the perspective of the publication. They are imagined as objectively visualising people and
events; the photographer reveals, he does not craft. This serves to mask the presence of the individual with the camera as a politically located subject who creates (authors) an image. Photographic authority is a cultural production, rather than a natural truth.

**locating vision**

In my preceding chapters I have reproduced images rather than explain how the images look. I have provided versions of the originals so that you may see for yourself. I use the probative value of photographs to tell my story; my desire is to orchestrate how you see. It is my intention that this provision of images will convey authority to me; I want to persuade you to see how I see. Within this process it is the context provided for an image that effects its reading. What is at stake here is not the "truth" of the picture, but my ability as an author of its meaning.

In both their original contexts and my project the photographs of Pakaitore represent political and moral claims. In the context of news production, the threat of Māori protest to the stability of Pākehā society is rendered visibly. In the context of my story the coding of protest as threatening reveals the ethnocentrism of the photographic gaze. Seeing takes place through intimate connection with the way our imagination assigns meaning to what we see. While we share the gaze of the photographer in what is available to us within the photograph's frame, we do not look upon this "framing" or that which is framed, in the same way. I view the visualising practices of press photography as constituting both a process and technology similar to Rey Chow's rendering of the cinematic gaze:

In Mulvey's original argument, this language of the oppressed is conceived in visual terms, as part of the state of being-looked-at. This state of being-looked-at is built into the cinematic spectacle itself ... What this enables is an understanding of the cinematic image not simply as some pure "thing" to be perceived, but as what already constitutes the gaze (the act of gazing) that cannot be seen itself (Chow, 1991: 18).
By analogy the act of gazing is structured into the photographic spectacle, and this production is concealed by the immediacy of the image. Images of Pakaitore are documents for a particular "white" readership, for whom images of rangatahi will provoke anxiety.

**tropes of difference**

We can use visual signs to express what it is not acceptable to say in words: an image reduces a discourse to a sign which has a different status from a verbal or written description. The editor of the *Chronicle* cannot write publicly in his own voice that the Gardens is populated by "warriors with clubs and spears and anyone who came near would certainly get it"; but he can show a picture to convey this. This ability of images to express a "white" sensibility may be understood in relation to Barthes' work in *Mythologies*.

Chela Sandoval identifies Barthes, who wrote "Myth Today" in the 1950s, as "one of the first white Western critical theorists to develop an analytical apparatus for theorising white consciousness in a postempire world" (Sandoval 1997: 88). She explains:

> In finding the dominant social rhetoric that functions in the mode of a language, the poses for subjectivity available to dominating classes, Barthes hoped to undo the effects of being a citizen/subject in Euro-American Western culture; to undermine the subject positions of legitimate "bourgeois" citizens; to cite these poses and their languages as comfortable masquerades for identity. Barthes' horror was that the innocent usage, consumption, acceptance, or production of these rhetorical figures consigned citizen/subjects to generating and accepting a multilevel, profound alienation-in-consciousness as a natural state of being. Barthes' pain over the recognition of this profound alienation as it determined psychic and social life brought him face-to-face with the languages and idioms of survival spoken by colonised peoples, and into contact with the methodology of the oppressed, which he at once affirms and asserts while blinding himself to its ongoing practices and practitioners^2^ (Sandoval, 1997: 96).

---

^2^ Barthes did not develop the concerns he raises around whiteness in *Mythologies* through his subsequent scholarship; nor does he engage with the work of contemporaries such as Frantz Fanon.
Sandoval's analysis examines Barthes' series of seven rhetorical forms; "a set of fixed, regulated, insistent figures, according to which the varied forms of the mythical signifier arrange themselves" (Barthes, 1972: 150). I use the first three of Barthes' figures: "inoculation"; "the privation of history" and "identification" to frame my discussion of "white" practices of visualising "others".

In the following account one of my respondents (a Catholic nun) locates contemporary gestures of biculturalism within Wanganui's colonial history. In the present, icons of "Māori-ness" elide the role of (post)colonial institutions and businesses in reproducing Māori inequality:

You'd know about the history of Wanganui would you - its a colonial town, a military town, its not all that long ago we had the guns and stockades - and John Ballance was the MP for Wanganui and he belonged to three administrations. There are all manner of things here in his honour - that's all part of the scenario, of the history of Wanganui, so we would expect no different. We've lived here all our lives and (Poynter) is a racist, he only uses Māori people if there's some ceremony and he wants to make a show and uses Māori tikanga and Māori art to beautify places. It doesn't even beautify them - Trust Bank, I mean whakairo in a bank which isn't even very good to Māori people anyway. Places like the Labour Department have whakairo in the hope that it will make Māori people feel more at home and give this outward appearance of being oh so bicultural. And even in the Catholic church it used to have a carved altar and a carved Jesus over the main altar, now there are other Māori carvings. There's a lot of that - it might be a start but there are a lot of other deep issues. Wanganui is now calling on Māori tikanga to lift the tapu on Pākehā things, buildings, and that's happening throughout the country - even at the prison or the courthouse you'd be forgiven for thinking it was a marae.

3 Not in terms of tikanga however: At the request of a friend he was supporting in court, Ken Mair said a karakia at the opening of her case. Permission for the karakia had been granted, on the understanding that it
This safe aestheticised function masks the history and politics which position Iwi as colonial objects. Signs for "difference" stand in for the politics of inhabiting bodies rendered "different" through colonisation. This process of signs standing in for "genuine" engagements with Māori calls up Barthes' notion of "inoculation"; the figure whereby "[o]ne immunises the contents of the collective imagination by means of a small inoculation of acknowledged evil; one thus protects it against the risk of generalised subversion (ibid.). While the term "evil" does not adequately account for what is in play here (I would substitute "alterity"), Barthes' figure of the white imagination conveys the lack of substance to external trappings of inclusion.

Barthes' second rhetorical figure; "the privation of History" also describes the way in which "difference" may be consumed as an aesthetic which is imagined as located outside of the processes of history and politics. Analogous consequences are produced; the privation of history differs from inoculation in the motive Barthes assigns:

Myth deprives the object of which it speaks of all History. In it, history evaporates. It is a kind of ideal servant: it prepares all things, brings them, lays them out, the master arrives, it silently disappears: all that is left for one to do is enjoy this beautiful object without wondering where it comes from. Or even better: it can only come from eternity: since the beginning of time, it has been made for bourgeois man, the Spain of the Blue Guide has been made for the tourist, and 'primitives' have prepared their dances with a view to an exotic festivity. We can see all the disturbing things which this felicitous figure removes from sight: both determinism and freedom. Nothing is produced, nothing is chosen: all one has to do is to possess these new objects from which all soiling trace of origin or choice has been removed. This miraculous evaporation of

would be recited before the judge entered the court room. The prayer was said while the judge was present. Mair was charged with contempt and sentenced to 3 weeks in prison (Wanganui Chronicle 2 November 1995: 1; 6 December 1995: 2).
history is another form of a concept common to most bourgeois myths: the irresponsibility of man [my italics] (Barthes 1972: 151).

For me this figure of myth evokes the sense of entitlement which characterises colonial cultures, and which, in (post)colonial cultures continues to underpin representations of "others". Barthes' description of the privation of history suggests the very politics of photographing "others". Barthes' example of the Blue Guide is comparable to the preference, as described by Lutz and Collins (1993), of National Geographic photographers and editors for images of non-Westerners engaged in ritual. Rituals are portrayed as a spectacle for the viewing pleasure of the western reader, rather than a meaningful expression of sentiment, emotion or belief by their participants (Lutz and Collins, 1993: 90-91).

It is a sense of entitlement that I identify in Lisl Dennis' travel photography manual, as critiqued by O'Barr. The instructions and anecdotes Dennis offers reveal to O'Barr mechanisms of colonial appropriation. For example, Dennis describes an encounter between herself and a young boy in the West Indies. She enters the yard looking for the boy's mother to ask permission to photograph him, but the mother does not appear to be home. She gestures to the boy to indicate she wants to take his photograph and explains to the reader:

I knew from the start I wanted to get a close up of the boy's face, but I didn't yet know how close I could eventually get. My first shots were of the boy seated in the doorway. He was still posing unflinchingly after these, so I moved in closer for a head and shoulder portrait. Knowing the child felt perfectly comfortable with me, I took a few of the strips of plastic covering the doorway and rearranged them in his hands and around his face, immediately he got the message to hold onto them while I zeroed in with the macro lens about four inches from his nose (Dennis 1979, cited by O'Barr, 1993: 40-41).
O'Barr draws attention to issues of consent around this encounter, and views Dennis' practice as an example of "photographic colonialism", which he likens to economic and political colonialism:

We are instructed in this manual that the people who live in other parts of the world are the raw materials for our photographs. Since they are neither using their own images, nor seem to care or object, we may appropriate them. Back home, we turn them into souvenirs for display or even products that can be sold. Once the pictures are taken from the indigenous setting, we seem to have no further responsibility to those whose lives supplied the images for our photographs (O'Barr 1993: 41).

O'Barr's reading of the encounter accents the power inequity which underpins it. I would elaborate his reading by noting that the language the photographer uses reveals an awareness that her apparatus / presence may be coded in an other-than-benign fashion. She recounts her cautious advance, expecting that the child may be reluctant or threatened by her behaviour. She approaches with stealth; he remains "unflinching" and thus she is able to manipulate him into a beguiling pose.

The photographer travels to far lands to photograph people. These images make her reputation; this reputation positions her as an authority in this practice and thus she instructs others. Her privilege in relation to her subjects consists of her international mobility, and her ownership of photographic equipment, which enables her intrepid capturing of images of "others". These are "others" who will never experience an equivalence of privilege, and upon whom she imagines she is bestowing favours (Dennis explains that her subjects are flattered by her attentions; "it does something for their self esteem" (Dennis 1979, cited by O'Barr, 1993: 42). In keeping with her assumptions, she advises travellers not to tip for photographs, which she renders as "photo-extortionism" (ibid). Here value is assigned to the "other" only as an image. Within western commercial and aesthetic spaces the image can have value as an
object, but in Dennis' account an awareness of this on the part of her subjects (who request payment), disrupts her sense of entitlement.
In another context the biography of the photographed subject challenges the public function of documentary photography: the humanitarian intentions of FSA photographers to draw attention to poverty is incongruous with the "evaporation of history" necessary to the act of photographing and subsequent reception of the image *Migrant Mother* (figure 15).

In the photograph, taken in 1936 by Dorothea Lange, the children hide from the camera's gaze and the mother looks into the distance with a furrowed brow. For this image to work, this lack of engagement with the camera must refer to their powerlessness as *the poor*, it must speak to their socio-economic (and perhaps ethnic, as the woman is Cherokee) position, rather than the experience of being photographed. (Here we must imagine their plight robs them of the confidence to smile into the lens).

In a 1960 article for *Popular Photography* Lange discussed the situation in which she photographed this family. On her way home from an assignment she passed a family on the road and went back to photograph them (Clarke 1997: 151):

I saw and approached the hungry and desperate mother, as if drawn by a magnet. I do not remember how I explained my presence or my camera to her but I do remember she asked me no questions. I made five exposures, working closer and closer and closer from the same direction. I did not ask her name or her history (Lange 1980 cited by Clarke 1997: 151).

The administrator of the farm securities photography projects, Roy Stryker, said in 1972 in a book on this work "So many times I have asked myself, what is she thinking? She has all the suffering of mankind in her but all the perseverance too. You can see anything you want to in her, she is immortal" (Rosler 1993: 315). *(I see that to the subject the photographer represents a mobility and privilege the migrant family do not have; she passes them on the road; returns to capture on film. The mother's face registers this intrusion.)* Clarke writes:
Lange creates a highly charged emotional text dependent upon her use of children and the mother. The central position of the mother, the absence of the father, the direction of the mother's 'look', all add to the emotional and sentimental register through which the image works. The woman is viewed as a symbol larger than the actuality in which exists (Clarke 1997: 153).

Florence Thompson is woman in the photograph Migrant Mother. In 1978 she was living in a trailer park and was quoted by the L.A. Times: "that's my picture hanging all over the world, and I can't get a penny out of it". She has tried, unsuccessfully to get the photo suppressed (Rosler 1993: 315). Rosler notes that within this story Thompson "is of interest solely because she is an incongruity, a photograph that has aged; of interest solely because she is a postscript to an acknowledged work of art" (ibid). Rosler distinguishes between the two moments through which the documentary image is produced: "1) the "immediate", instrumental one, in which an image is caught or created ... 2) the conventional "aesthetic-historical" moment" where the image is appreciated by viewers:

This second moment is ahistorical in its refusal of a specific historical meaning yet "history minded" in its very awareness of the pastness of the time in which the image was made. This covert appreciation of images is dangerous insofar as it accepts not a dialectical relation between political and formal meaning, not their interpenetration, but a hazier, more refined relation, one in which topicality drops away as epochs fade, and the aesthetic aspect is, if anything, enhanced by the loss of specific reference (although there remains perhaps, a cushioning backdrop of vague social sentiments limiting the mysteriousness of the image). I would argue against the possibility of a nonideological aesthetic; any response to an image is inevitably rooted in social knowledge - specifically, in social understanding of cultural products (ibid 317).

In order to function as a mythical signifier, Thompson's history; her biography; her name must be leached from this story. The photographer's entitlement to take the image must be
given precedence in the first moment; and the viewer's entitlement to consume myth in the second.

The image of three men at the whakaroa was also reproduced (in the press) because of the story it tells about Pakaitore (figure 16). Once more the trope of rangatahi (here they are bare skinned), is used to mythologise the occupation as "about" the presence of men who look like this. Yet the picture can only be consumed as myth (where this means "other") from a particular location; from a distance which feigns "knowability". One of my informants, a spokeswoman for the occupation told me:

I just picked up a newspaper article the other day which was related to this whole drive for rangatiratanga amongst Māori, and they showed the same photo which I think appeared on the cover of the Dominion, where three of our young men were
standing at the gateway with no shirts on. If you didn't know them it means something quite different - I thought it was a really lovely photo when I was shown it. But I have a Pākehā friend who lives just out of Tauranga, when she saw it she wrote to me, she was scared, and I was amazed, she and I grew up together. And we had a long talk about it. After that she said to me that talking to me was really good because she knew then that you really couldn't believe what you were seeing and it was important for people to come down to [Pakaitore] and make their own judgements.

These comments reflect on the locations from which we look. For my informant the young men are a "lovely" image, an image of her colleagues. She knows that these bodies mean differently to Pākehā, even to a friend who she grew up with: the friend sees the "other" while my informant sees herself. Her friend's comment, "you couldn't really believe what you were seeing" testifies to a "de-mythologising" of vision: what is rendered suspect is the intended signification of rangatahi and the assignation of meaning to what one sees. Going to the marae to "see for oneself" means learning to see both that rangatahi were not representative of the range of people at the marae, and that rangatahi are more than signifiers of menace.

Perhaps a viewer of the images preferred by news media learns principally about themselves. Berger writes:

The contemporary public photograph usually presents an event, a seized set of appearances, which has nothing to do with us, its readers, or with the original meaning of the event. It offers information, but information severed from all lived experience. If the public photograph contributes to memory, it contributes to the memory of an unknowable and total stranger. The violence is expressed in that strangeness. It records an instant sight about which this stranger has shouted: Look!
Who is the stranger? One might answer: the photographer. Yet if one considers the entire use-system of photographed images, the answer of "the photographer" is clearly inadequate. Nor can one reply: those who use the photographs. It is because the photographs carry no meaning in themselves, because they are like images in the memory of a total stranger, that they lend themselves to any use (Berger 1980: 52-3).

Yet the entitlement to photograph within the genres of press and documentary photography is drawn from the assumption that the public have a right to know. For me the photograph of these three men does not reveal the nature of Iwi presence at the marae, rather it reveals the relationship of the photographer to the Iwi (figure 17). The photographer represents the Wanganui Chronicle, whose relationship to Iwi I have previously described. These rangatahi know this (at the very least the photographer is Pākehā and represents a "white" press). The
"fuck you" gesture may be read as the man’s objection to being represented by the *Chronicle*. Thus, the identity of the photographer is significant to the story the photograph tells. The intended reading requires the concealment of this relationship in order for the image to become the "impersonal" rendering of Māori presence.

For both the editor and photographer the selection of this image conveys their location. It must be read as visualising their experience of the occupation. They were not allowed onto the marae; they were positioned through the history of their relationship with Iwi as representatives of a structure which will never "authorise" Iwi.

The print from which the image in the paper was "cut" included a woman (figure 18). I read this cutting as an iconoclastic act; a violence to the image (and presence) of Māori women at Pakaitore. On one level the excising of the woman with the video camera alters the meaning of who is representative of the occupiers and actively masculinises the protest. The "hard angle" favours angry rangatahi, while the proximity of the woman to the men may connote they are not as fearful as this requires. Further, the woman is filming what is happening
outside the marae from within its parameters, in a sense conveying that there is also a story from this perspective. What does her eye see? Her presence is complicating on a another level: "Māori woman" with the technology to represent is not the "Māori woman" of the public imagination. The editing of the image to exclude the presence of "woman" serves as an allegory for the Chronicle's coverage throughout the 80 days.

As the woman is cut from this image the men become her. A number of my informants were women, who acknowledged that the images of men selected by newsmakers were simultaneously a representation and negation of female presence at Pakaitore. For these women the images of rangatahi which stood in for her were at whānau, but were chosen by news makers for the way they encoded the protest as masculine.

This excision of woman from the photograph illustrates Barthes' third figure of white consciousness; "identification": "The petit bourgeois is a man unable to imagine the Other. If he comes face to face with him, he blinds himself, ignores and denies him, or else transforms him into himself" (Barthes 1972: 151). Unable to imagine the presence of women, "we" are blinded; she is ignored, denied. The men are, at best, treated with the latter option, as "analouges who have gone astray" (ibid 152). As Ian Turner certified in the 60 Minutes story, Māori do not have to act in this fashion; his family have "Māori in them". Barthes offers another alternative:

Sometimes - rarely - the Other is revealed as irreducible: not because of a sudden scruple, but because common sense rebels: a man does not have white skin, but a black one, another drinks pear juice, not Pernod. How can one assimilate the

---

4By way of comparison, Ginsburg writes: "What is the fascination that prompts popular magazines such as New Society in the United Kingdom (Miller 1986) or Rolling Stone in the United States (McGregor 1988) to run articles on Aboriginal television, or international Time magazine to run a feature story, "Letting in the World: Subversion by Video" (Beyer 1989), with a cover photo of a Kayapo man in full Amazonian regalia holding a video camera to his eye? Even in this postmodern era of the ironic pastiche, there seem to be a moment of pure modernist shock for many westerners at the seemingly incongruous combination of two different modes of life. Such images contrast with those of natives presented in traditional settings (the noble but exoticised savage) or as victims (the vanishing race) that are now problematic for Euro-Australian (and other) consumers who are increasingly aware of and uncomfortable with their own implication in the lives and historical circumstances of these "Others". Conversely, I would argue, there is a pleasure for these consumers in regarding the image of the indigenous photographer as a kind of bush cosmopolitan, at ease with both tradition and western technology; such an image evokes a kind of futuristic nostalgia, even as it masks inequality and responsibility" (Ginsburg 1993: 562).
Negro, the Russian? There is here a figure for emergencies: exoticism. The Other becomes a pure object, a spectacle, a clown. Relegated to the confines of humanity, he no longer threatens the security of the home (Barthes 1972: 152).

The extraction of woman, which removes the complexity of the image, enables the men to become the spectacle of "Other".
This inability to imagine the "other" underpins the discursive production of "the photograph" within Clarke's (1997) book of that title. On the cover of Clarke's The Photograph, from the "Oxford History of Art" series, is an image of the back of a black man's head. It is one of Mapplethorpe's photographs; Ken Moody, 1984 (Figure 19). This photograph is used as a sign for "art"; which for me drew attention to the absence within the text of any discussion regarding the particularities of photographing people of colour. Dyer (1997) and Winston (1996), for example, write of the racial coding implicit within photographic apparatus itself; of the development of film stock and lighting techniques for photographing white skin and the difficulties this has posed for photographing black skin.

There is one photograph of a person of colour prior to chapter eight. John Henry, A Well Remembered Servant (1865) is the work of Matthew Brady. Clarke's commentary explains that in contrast to another of Brady's images, of General Potter and his staff, the image of Henry "draws attention to the position of the black figure within the Union army" (Clarke 1997: 35). It reveals the "critical and self conscious use of the medium" by Brady (ibid). The image is:

an inversion of the 'official' portrait. This is literally, the underside of the formal advertising and reveals the Potter image as both propagandist and mythologised. The single figure is isolated, at the margins of the world depicted and at the bottom of the hierarchy. Most obviously he is black, and just as his presence was missing from the white world of Potter's image, so here he is restrained within a domestic context. He is named as a servant, passive, and surrounded by rubbish. His uniform confirms his condition [my italics] (ibid 36).

Thus Clarke speaks of an historical absence of blackness, and conveys this by visualising a peripheralised black presence. The absence Clarke writes of is reproduced in his own story; a black presence is "missing from the white world" of The Photograph. Images of people of colour are absent from the chapters "The Portrait in Photography" and the "Body in Photography". The latter chapter contains reference to Mapplethorpe's work:
Criticised for both his images of children and a series of images involving sadomasochism, Mapplethorpe's photographs raise questions about the relationship between image and viewer, and the assumptions we bring to them. In particular, his photographs of black male models and of male genitalia further complicate the question of the body in terms of racial as well as sexual identity and the mythology associated with them (ibid: 139).

The terms through which the body may be complicated by "race" receives no further attention; nor does the notion that photographic practice may be complicated by "race" (aside from the comment that "Japan not only produces some of the most sophisticated cameras and makes the photograph central to its culture, it has even named cameras after its traditional gods, such is photography's status in Japanese society"[my italics] (ibid: 218)). The "body in photography" is discussed in relation to the following topics (as listed in the index): action / motion; brothel photography; female body; female passivity; gender ideology; homoerotic photography; male body; male gaze; nudes; photographer / subject relationship; pictorialism; pornography; power; scopophilia; sexual difference and identity; sexual fantasy and desire; stereotyping of female identity; voyeurism / fetishism" (Clarke 1997: 241). It is not specified that all the text and images cited refer to, and image, white bodies; nor that the discussion of "power" refers exclusively to gender.

On one level perhaps my critique is misplaced; Clarke may not have had editorial control over the cover photograph, the selection of which would suggest an engagement within the text with the "question of the body in terms of racial ... identity". Clarke's story may (simply?) reflect broader exclusions; the bodies of "others" have been disproportionately

---

5Authors who have engaged with the politics of racialised looking and black bodies include Mercer (1997), whose account of his shifting readings of Mapplethorpe's black nudes elucidates the changing stakes which bear on the meanings we make of raced images. Feldman (1994) interrogates the layering of violence acted upon black bodies within a range of mass mediated sites. He compares media representations of the Gulf War, characterized by an absence of "other" bodies through the primacy afforded weapons technology, with the centrality of Rodney King's bodily alterity in court proceedings and media coverage. With regards the latter he contends that "The conversion of King from the terminus to the source of aggression was enabled by a series of iconic displacements that embodied him in tandem with the disembodiment of police violence. Blackness, bestiality, narcosis, and anesthesa created both the specularization and the racial density of King's body. King, once invested with these mythemes, functioned like a neocolonial mirror that radiated an autonomous racial miasma that prejudiced state violence" (Feldman 1994: 413). See also, Pieterse (1992) hooks (1995).
documented rather than snapped by family members (a costly exercise), rarely subject to portraiture (unless for ethnographic purposes), and seldom celebrated as aesthetic form (unless controversially so) (Figure 20). If we imagine that Clarke's exclusions reflect a politics he does not wish to engage (because it is the domain of "cultural studies" / "black studies" / "media studies" rather than "art history" / "visual culture" as framed up by "The Oxford History of Art Series") it nevertheless reflects a lack of engagement with discourses authorised within, for example, (visual) anthropology which might mitigate his exclusions.

Aside from the Brady photograph, people of colour appear in chapter eight, "Documentary Photography" and chapter eleven, "The Cabinet of Infinite Curiosities". Within the former chapter, only three of ten photographs containing visible faces are white. Documented are the fleeing and terrified Vietnamese (Hung Cong Ut's Accidental Napalm Attack (1972); Robert Haeberle's People About to be Shot (1969) (Clarke 1977: 160-1); and the piled bodies of dead Jews in George Rodger's Bergen-Belsen Concentration Camp (1945) (ibid: 158). In these contexts the photograph attests to the horrors visited upon the bodies of those "othered". But this is not the context for moral fervour; indeed the "quality" of these images stems from their appearance of documenting rather than interpreting.

Margaret Bourke White's Sharecropper's Home (Figure 21), featuring a poor black child, may be distinguished from the former photographs on this basis. She uses "an obvious visual discourse and does so in terms of an emotional and political plotting characteristic of much interior photography of the period" (Clarke 1997: 149). Yet for Clarke while the image is in many ways a blatant presentation of a cliched subject ... it retains its significance and impact. The use of a black child and his dog is an obvious sentimental ploy. The surrounding newsprint (full of adverts from a consumer culture) confirms the polemical approach of the photographer (ibid 150).

---

6A sample of work which attends to the positions from which we view / image others includes Haraway (1989), Lutz and Collins (1993), Taylor (1994) Devereaux and Hillman (1995), and the journals Public Culture, Visual Anthropology Review, Third Text.
Clarke elaborates: "this is a photograph not just about poverty, but also about injustice and the inequalities of a political system. The photograph is constructed to make us question that very system in relation to the example before us" (Clarke 1997:149). In a parallel to Clarke's
reading of the photograph, the selection of this image as the visualisation of black masculinity within the chapter raises questions regarding the "system" he constructs for our comprehension. Bourke-White's image works as "sentimental ploy" through the implicit distinction that children bear innocence which (male) adults cannot signify (in this way resembling the infantilised "Third World" featured in the ads requesting the viewer's charity). In his discussion of *Migrant Mother* Clarke attests that "the woman is used purely as a subject. She is appropriated within a symbolic framework of significance as declared and determined by Lange" (ibid: 153). The photograph *People About to be Shot* is used to illustrate the complicity of the photographer: "Guys were about to shoot these people. I yelled "Hold it" and I shot my pictures" (ibid 160). Yet his critique of photographic practice does not extend to *Sharecropper's Home*, which literally has no subject to be spoken of.

This use of black subjects to illustrate photographic artistry rather than problematise processes of the representation of "others" is reproduced in the chapter "The Cabinet of Infinite Curiosities". Peter Marlow's *Rhodesian Refugees in a Camp, Zambia* (Figure 20) is captioned: "[a]n image which celebrates as it insists on the democratic nature of the photographic image. It is the very opposite of the stilled and stilted daguerreotypes of the nineteen century" (ibid 218). The analysis in the text is confined to a mention: "Like Peter Marlow's image, [the photograph] celebrates multiplicity" (ibid: 221).

My critique of Clarke's work reveals the invisibility of "whiteness", and the reproduction of tropes identified by Barthes' theorising of "myth". These characteristics are entrenched within the representational practices of photography and are reproduced through discourse about photography. Edwards' (1991) assessment of the "new" public photography takes place within a comprehensive critique of documentary photography and photojournalism. As representing the former, she praises the work of Sebastio Salgado for its commitment to *reflexivity*. Edwards draws a parallel with the new school of ethnographers: a critique of traditional practice within both disciplines frames the desire to produce representations which emerge out of an exchange and reciprocity between representer and represented (Edwards, 1991: 165). She renders Salgado's practice in the following manner:
Sebastio Salgado has allowed himself to become vulnerable and to be represented by those he photographs. Living with the people, Salgado subjects himself to the grind of everyday life among the poor. The images he removes from them are images filled with the symbolism, pride and hope which gets these people through each day despite their disadvantaged conditions. Acting as a sort of ethnographer, Salgado attempts an understanding of the full range of life within different cultures - everyday encounters, relationships, rituals, celebrations and struggles - as opposed to other photojournalists ... who just run in, snap and leave. In this encounter with the people he photographs, Salgado is inevitably characterised by his hosts. He tells of a group of Ecuadorian Indians who "thought I was an emissary of the divinities, sent to their village to photograph" [my italics] (ibid: 170).

Edwards' "heroic" characterisation of Salgado suggests the "trials" and "quest" of Rosaldo's "Lone Ethnographer" (Rosaldo 1993: 30). Edwards' agenda is to elucidate Salgado's rendering of a common humanity, and reveal his vulnerability. Yet the inclusion of the statement regarding his characterisation by his Ecuadorian hosts testifies to an explicit hierarchy within this encounter.

Edwards explains that because "Salgado's images confront us with a complex humanity, perhaps too painful to be realised on a global scale" his work only appears in "museums and plush books" (ibid: 172). Salgado's approach does diverge from those who "run in, snap and leave", but there are wider issues at work here. In both the moments in which he photographs and the moments in which his work is received "representation" is constituted by and reproducing of other inequities. Salgado returns from the field. From a safe distance the audience can look.

Who gets to look, and the qualities of "our" looks is central to my analysis of representations of Pakaitore. One of my informants who worked in the news room at the Chronicle, and was
opposed to the occupation, told me about the haka performed outside Poynter's bookshop on the day of the proposed eviction. Her version of the event indicates a layered interplay of gazes and imaginations which recall the forms of "identification" theorised by Barthes:

As the Moutoa residents marched up the Avenue and came across Poynter's bookshop they went berserk, it was almost as if something clicked and they realised 'hey - this is Poynter's - if we can't get him lets get his shop'. Its a very open shop and they all came forward with a very threatening haka, and the police were all trying to reason with the ones in the front saying "hey calm it down". And our photographer was there along with photographers from other papers, they were all in town, they knew something was going to happen, the TV cameras were there too, and our young photographer has only been here for 12 months. They said "hey you're from the Chronicle aren't you" and he said "no, no I work for the Palmerston paper" and because he had done some work for them in the past he was able to quote the name of the editor and so they backed off. But he was very shaken when he came back to the office, he said if he had admitted he worked for the Chronicle he would have been in fear of his life - "they would have beaten me I could see it in their eyes". And how they controlled them I just don't know, if you saw it on the tele it was really quite overwhelming. I couldn't see how they were going to stop these fellows, they all had big tattoos all over the place. And as far as I understand they actually were from one of the gangs over on the East Coast. In subsequent articles and reports we have found that the crime rate went up fifty percent for the eighty day occupation and Wanganui people were very pleased, very relieved to see them go.

This incident was the "hard angle" not only for the press, but also for my respondent. It was told to me by way of an explanation of the degree to which the occupation upset the town due to its illegal and fearsome aspects. In news parlance the exaggeration of "the facts" is called "beating up" a story and a dismal view is taken toward this practice by mainstream news workers. But it would be unfair to characterise my informant's rendering of this incident as
such. Her version is not simply to impress or titillate her audience: I have no doubt that this
is how she imagines the incident took place, or that her colleague was frightened by the
encounter she describes. Rather, her account reveals her positioning (and that of the
photographer) in relation to the incident. It does not convey what the incident "objectively"
looks like. I saw no tattoos in the photographs and video footage, and I know the performers
were Iwi whānau. The way my informant recalls this event has been informed by several
sources. First, the incident was recounted to her by the photographer who took this
photograph. In her narrative the photographer is cast as an ingenue, unprepared for the
physicality of the hypermasculine "other". His innocence is significant to her narrative: the
challenging of his right to take photographs of the protesters is not acknowledged as part of
Iwi's ongoing desire to control their representation in the local paper, rather it is the action of
"berserk" gang members whose eyes reveal their propensity for physical violence. The
photographer's presence is not problematised, but 'natural'; 'legitimate' (it is his job, the public
have a right to see what he fears). This contrasts with the menacing gaze of the "other".

The photographer's rendering of the event is confirmed by what my informant saw on
television. When I have watched these events on both news footage and video made by Iwi I
see a performance of anger, which I distinguish from an act of violence: it is not an act upon a
body or property, but a display of sentiment. While her story is ostensibly about Māori, it is
also about her position in relation to Māori. She can inhabit what she imagines as the
"innocent" gaze of the photographer.

looking back

For the photographer this means thinking of her or himself not so much as a
reporter to the rest of the world but, rather, as a recorder for those involved in the
events photographed. The distinction is crucial. (Berger, 1980: 58)

The video footage from which the news clip I discussed in the previous chapter was edited
offers insights into the locations from which we look. Here the camera cannot be constituted
as an unseen and all-seeing eye. It is a mechanical eye operated by a man. The man behind the camera is a TVNZ cameraman, and he is Māori. According to the reporter he worked with on stories for TVNZ, the cameraman "has links to the river. [He] had a very good rapport, probably better than me, with the people at Pakaitore and that basically guaranteed us access to the marae that other members of the media probably didn't enjoy".

The footage is not intended for public consumption; it will be edited down to less than a minute. It was filmed as a means to capture newsworthy images for the evening broadcast. In a double sense the film is not for "us": as a stream of images it is not "news", and it was given by the cameraman to Iwi, for whom it fits within memories of being present. The pictures are of selves, friends, supporters. I take some of these pleasures, I see some of my respondents of whom I am fond. What compels me in this footage are the images of white folks who watch. Which of the gazes represented: the cameraman's, the white spectators', the participants (who offer a range of looks in response to the camera), can we inhabit?

What marks this footage as extraordinary is its "un-edited-ness". In a sense this provides a realism which, despite engagements with notions of reflexivity, documentary lacks. When shaped into "news" these events will be narrated; like the expository mode of documentary making (Nicholls, 1992). The images will be used to illustrate the objective account provided by the reporter (we will see the haka at Poynter's store front and some mid shots of Taranaki Iwi). In the unedited form, instead of post-dubbed narration, the sound is synchronous. The narration will create the particular distance of objectification through translation: rather than search for clues to meaning we can receive the expert's interpretation.

Responses to the camera are not registered through the camera's explicit engagement of subjects (as in the interactive mode of documentary production), but as by-products of the attempt to unobtrusively record events. Thus, as viewers of this footage we cannot forget that the camera's presence is not naturalised; we can see it interrupt and intrude. We can see it filming people who do not know they are being filmed, and we can see it being assiduously ignored by people aware of its presence. The camera (and the man who operates it) receive a
range of reactions. In this sense the camera eye is not detached, omniscient, concealed to convey an "objective" reality, but is located by its subjects. And of course there is a translation taking place; of a reality into an image, through the lens of a man doubly positioned as newsworker and Iwi whānau.

As the footage begins the man with the camera is within the circle of singers. He pans across the singers and rests on a woman with a baby. Her face registers surprise as she becomes aware she is being filmed. She ducks her head behind her baby, out of the camera's gaze. Why does he continue to film her when she clearly does not want this? Does there need to be a reason why she does not want to be filmed? The camera zooms back and we see her walking away from the singing. She has been intruded upon. Her response tells us the camera intrudes. Her participation in these activities has been disrupted.

Conches sound. The camera pans the crowd assembled for te wero. The camera is ignored; it is excluded from the meaning of these events. Taranaki manuhiri respond to the karanga with a haka. Women hold the banner leading the approach, in the shot selected as news they will be obscured by men. The haka performed by Whanganui Iwi will be repeated at Poynter's. In the latter context it will be rendered by newsmakers as an act of aggression rather than a display of unity and identity.

The camera (man) stands to the side of the road as marchers pass. No one looks at the camera. He cuts to a close up of the store front of a real estate office. Two men walk into the shop, one is laughing (a response to the procession?). A third man is watching the march, he sees the camera, his face drops and he shrinks behind the door frame (he is chagrined at being caught looking? He doesn't want to be seen by this eye?). An elderly man in a bicycle helmet stares as the procession passes. He sees the camera and a slight smile crosses his face (politeness? A comprehension of how he must appear?).

How do I read the shots of Pākehā spectators? There are many within this footage: Pākehā stand at the side of the street in clusters, at the front of their workplaces, or lean on their cars.
Their mouths are straight lines or their brows furrowed. Perhaps the motivation for their inclusion was to visualise the "sides" in Wanganui for the news clip. None were selected for the evening broadcast. These images may also be read as a "looking back" from within the ranks of Iwi. They represent Pākehā, who from a distance consume this spectacle. I do not see their gaze being returned by Iwi, yet the camera does this, rendering visible a particular whiteness which sees but is rarely seen.

The camera(man) trains his eye on Tame Iti pushing a child in a stroller. The child stares into the lens, as the camera pulls away the child grins. I read this as a pleasurable engagement. The film cuts to a lingering shot of a man in bowling whites using a pay phone (what a white man he is). Iwi walk past the camera(man). Some cast sidelong glances at him, or frown, but most remain focused ahead.

A boy on a skateboard responds to the camera by dangling a red (Mongrel Mob) scarf in front of the lens. The camera cuts to a close up of a man leaning against a wall, watching. He offers a slight tilt of the chin in acknowledgment. A child sitting on top of car stares into lens. You are allowed to stare into a camera at this age.

A Māori man sees the camera, and as he approaches he crouches and gestures in a wero. Is this challenge directed at the camera(man)? Or to Pākehā viewers of his footage? This clip was included in the evening broadcast. Another marcher gives the finger to the camera, his friend waggles his tongue. I read these gestures as opposition to the camera’s presence: perhaps the cameraman is read as a representative of an organisation which is not good to Māori. That he is Māori does not automatically render him entitled to film.

In the following sequence some marchers smile at the camera. Mike Smith is speaking through a megaphone. He looks into the camera, and says "watch out mate", the camera is turned off. Smith’s warning, and the address "mate", represent an affability which may be compared to the challenges posed by other men.
The camera scans the cars banked at the intersection, and focuses on the car of supporters, who wave their hands in gestures of peace out the car window.

A middle aged white woman strides into street towards Smith, yelling at the passing marchers "we are one". She is directed back to the footpath by a policeman. This is the only vocalisation by spectators recorded by the camera. I imagine that this woman would make a good "hard angle": "Angry white woman restrained by police". Following this incident is the only footage of a marcher engaging with the spectators. In a friendly manner she refers to their looking: "and its all for free, you don't have to pay".

The cameraman stops to frame up a shot of Mayor Poynter's bookstore. As the haka is performed TV cameras jostle with police to get between the store front and the rangatahi. Flash bulbs go off in the doorway. The footage of the march ends. I wonder why it ends here. The marchers have several blocks to go before they reach Pakaitore. Perhaps the cameraman knows that these images of the haka are the ones which will be "news".

The second clip is the footage from which the news story of April 25, 1995 was edited. That day the One Law group staged a march protesting the occupation. Filming begins on the marae; there are no other news media visible and those within the shot ignore the camera. Ken Mair briefs Iwi on the morning's activities.

The following sequence is filmed from inside the fence on the perimeter of the marae. The One Law marchers round the corner. A woman calls to Dave, the man who took this footage, I cannot understand what she says. A child greets him, "Hello". He replies "Kia Ora". That the man behind the camera is known to Iwi is made explicit in this footage; he is responded to not as a camera, but as a friend.

A cameraman from another news crew approaches the fence to get some close ups of Iwi. It is from a distance that Dave films the procession which passes. He goes to the gateway and zooms up on the passers by. They are singing "God Defend New Zealand". He zooms on the
(news') obligatory face of a Māori man with tattoos. A photo of this man ran in several publications. The shot dwells on his face, then swings around to the marchers. This sequence asks me to look; not at the rangatahi, but at what he is seeing. An ugly whiteness: signifying intolerance, misunderstanding, and power.

At the end of this clip some children, who are listening to the band, respond to the camera. The first plays some air guitar: he knows he is being filmed, the cameraman kneels in front of him. The second child drags his friend in front of his face, ducking behind his body, frantic in his attempt to hide from the camera. To his left another child gestures: arms crossed, forefingers raised, signifying the Mongrel Mob. Two of these children perform for the camera; and so doing locate it as a friend and conduit for their fantasies. The third is terrified.

Paying attention to the variety of ways in which this camera(man) is responded to unsettles the entitlement which is necessary to both photographing and our consumption of photographs. The disparity of responses allow us glimpses into the biographies of those on whom the camera-eye is trained.

There is no singular "Māori gaze" which responds to the camera, or which looks through a camera. Dave is inside the marae, but produces footage for an organisation which requires him to capture images which accord with the perspective of outsiders: the editors and audiences who want the "hard angle". That these kinds of shots make up very little of his footage (indeed they are exceptions to Iwi presence at Pakaitore) means that his film can have meaning for participants, who can see themselves, their whānau, their manuhiri, and the way the marching white folks looked from an Iwi perspective.
conclusions

Within this project I have charted the role of news within a community which formed around a particular initiative; where the news; the praxis of newsworkers and their reports of the occupation, were both integral to and analogous with more diffuse sites where the politics of representation may be contested. Within the boundaries I have set for this project several themes instruct the comprehension of the cultures of media, the role of media within cultures, and the raced locations from which representations are produced.

I began my inquiry with a particular query in mind: what resources do particular cultures have through which to represent themselves publicly; to constitute themselves through representation? By summoning Whanganui Iwi's lack of power, I assumed a liberal anthropological desire for subaltern perspectives; the narratives of Māori "othered" by representation would detail the offences and exclusions of Pākehā culture. And indeed, this is part of the story I have presented, and as I shall recapitulate, one which requires telling in specific terms.

But the accessibility of this story; its obviousness from the locations of those who imagine they can, in Haraway's words, "see from below", may conjure another set of displacements. Dominguez (1994) suggests a moment of "hyperprivileging" "diversity" and minority scholars in U.S. contexts, which may reproduce the very racialization it purports to remedy; Starn (1994) alerts us that "danger lies in presuming righteousness without adequate consideration of the contribution of our labours to struggles for justice and equality beyond the walls of the academy" (Starn, 1994: 14), and in a range of contexts I am struck by the assumption that because "we" know this story it must be time to tell a new one. With these points in mind, and attentive to the fact there is no position untainted by politics, my conclusions revisit the contributions my project makes to anthropology and broader disciplinary areas, paying particular attention to the multi-sited politics of "race".

1 As I signalled in my introduction, I am under no illusion that academic representation disrupts the dynamics my respondents from Pakeitore critique.
It has been suggested that I might invigorate my story of the exclusions enacted through Pākehā culture with an analysis of Whanganui Iwi which engages with potential criticisms of my advocacy of the perspectives of Iwi whānau. My position may be rendered as patronising; lacking nuance; failing to identify the inconsistencies and political machinations of contemporary indigenous politics. As Harris comments on Starn’s (1994) recommendations for a politically constructive anthropology of the Andes:

One of the reasons anthropology today does not make the sort of interventions into public debate that Boas, Mead, and Benedict did is surely our refusal to simplify and our commitment to the complexity of lived reality. We have discovered that the oppressed too are riven by factionalism and that the criteria for a "better world" may be hotly disputed at the local level (Harris 1994: 27).

I certainly acknowledge that we will find differing agendas within any community; that no position is "innocent" and that, as Starn (1994) describes, our political projects may have unforeseen and problematic consequences, yet this cannot act as an alibi for those who may be discomforted, excluded, or who may have their intellectual authority unsettled because "we" can no longer study "them" in ways which might advance "our" discipline. While an analysis of my own positioning within a local context might scrutinise the circumvention of scholarship on Iwi Māori, which, according to Webster, within anthropology and Māori Studies has largely privileged "ahistorical reification of culture in idealist terms" (1998: 174),2 scholarly productions of Māori must be implicated in contemporary struggles for self determination. The challenge is to find ways to decolonise "our" methodologies (Tuhiwai Smith, 1999). This does not preclude contributions to projects of cultural retrieval (if mandated by Iwi); yet such projects might attend to the articulation of Māori "cultures" within historical and contemporary struggles for resources and representation.3

---

2See Webster’s overview of the conceptualising of Māori culture within Māori Studies, chapter six in Patrons of Māori Culture, 1998.
3See Webster (1998) for his account of the ways in which political economy intersects with "culture"; and Tuhiwai Smith (1999) for accounts of indigenous research agendas, and the responsibilities and roles here for non-indigenous researchers.
Iwi's initiative at Pakaitore enacted a critique of localised marginality consisting of the reproduction of colonial relationships within the rohe and the alienation of resources. This common ground, so to speak, united Iwi across the political and socio-economic spectrum. Recourse was made to the status of Iwi as specified by the Treaty of Waitangi, and alleged breaches to this contract were specified. This articulated with a celebration of Whanganuitanga.

I am mindful of the prerogatives of Iwi to define and discharge their own interests, thus my questions about the operations of culture and the constitution of publics must be more accurately directed towards Pākehā cultures than a means to romance subaltern perspectives. Rather than reproduce the fiction that I can represent "them", and thus make amends for a discipline which has largely privileged the stasis of "authentic" cultures, (or more recently critiqued Māori elites on the basis of their class allegiance (Webster, 1998)), I have critiqued the positions from which Pākehā organisations have produced representations about Māori. My eye, not on those made into news, but on how that news was made from particular spatial and discursive locations; the way in which these locations bear the sensibilities of "selves"; arguing in my final chapter for an interrogation, not of those who are imaged, but on the looks which frame "them". Thus I recommend a reflexive anthropology, and the potential value of such reflexivity for other sites of representational praxis.

While wary of the enthusiasm for reflexivity and positioning in some quarters⁴, Starn (1994) contends that "the pursuit of greater self-awareness" is necessary to vigorous scholarship and projects of politically responsive (and responsible) anthropology. He writes of the Andean context:

⁴Starn points out that reflexivity does not guarantee liberal or radical politics (1994:18); and, I would add, is high on the agenda of the "clubby" contexts he identifies within Cultural Studies (ibid: 14). Yet it seems to me that while, under the rubric of Cultural Studies, there may be a "hyperprivileging" of "others" (Dominguez 1994), this fashion has passed within "mainstream" anthropology (if indeed it really ever ascended to this status). Reflexivity within anthropology has been vehemently disputed, as a "perpetuation of "Western bourgeois individualistic ideology"; the "ultimate argument for armchair anthropology"; "navel gazing" (James et al 1997: 1). The department in which I have studied has never employed a Māori Social Anthropologist (this is not an argument for "racial quotas" in hiring), and offers no curricula content attentive to Treaty implications or "Māori perspectives". Indeed, I have attended undergraduate lectures where the publicising of Māori political imperatives isrencered as opportunism which conceals the fact that Māori welcomed the material and intellectual tools of the coloniser.
Still assuming the postcultural invisibility of our own class of urban professionals, anthropologists of the Andes have done almost no work on bankers, TV producers, judges, lawyers, accountants, doctors, generals, politicians, bishops, bureaucrats, or professors. In the heat of the Viet Nam war years, Nader issued one of the first calls to anthropologists to think more about the "study of the colonisers rather than the colonised, the culture of power rather than the culture of the powerless, the culture of affluence rather than the culture of poverty" (Starn 1994: 23).

I have detailed the raced locations of the "projects of the powerful" within Wanganui and their rendering as news (Starn, 1994: 23). The news can be imagined as "unraced" by workers because of its claims to objective praxis:

I might go into situations that I feel very strongly about personally, but professionally you're entirely objective, you always must be. I know of journalists in our organisation who politically hold very strong views and yet there is no way they would let those views influence their coverage of political stories. Being objective is a really strong ethical principle that journalists adhere to. There are all those issues of conflict of interest that lawyers and other professionals have that arise for journalists as well. If I ever felt, and I never have yet, that I couldn't be objective about a story I'd ask to be taken off it, because again you get yourself into too much trouble if you try and influence or distort something to coincide with your own ethical or political views on an issue. Its just not worth the hassle, and its just wrong. If you're not objective and principled you get a reputation.

As I have elucidated throughout this project, this recourse to "objectivity" confounds that the preference for hard angles, and the political constraints set through editorial agendas manifest in partial accounts. This was explicit in the Chronicle's reports of Pakaitore; but the partiality
of news need not rely on the active construction of "negative" accounts of Māori. In rendering the "self" as legitimate, and acting representatively for Pākehā publics, the pathologising of "others" may be a by-product of normalising one's own location.

Yet the codes of news are neither uniformly deployed or compulsory. I have described the experiences and practices of two news workers which unsettle the assumptions of their colleagues. The reporter for the *Evening Standard* was able, through the support of his editor and the interpolation of discursive frameworks which disturbed the opacity of "whiteness", to produce accounts lauded by Iwi.

This coverage was self-consciously produced: a worker from the *Evening Standard* phoned me regarding a request I had made for the photograph of the celebrating crowd on the proposed eviction day. I was told that neither the negative or print of this shot could be found. Would I like another image of the crowd instead? The photograph was described to me as foregrounding "a tattooed man holding up a banner". I declined. I wanted to use the image of the celebrating crowd in order to provide a contrast to the *Chronicle's* selection. This conversation reveals that while the image of the man with the moko could have been selected (it was the type of image preferred by many publications) a decision was made to depict the large crowd in celebration: to tell a different story.

TVNZ's primary journalist at Pakaitore was compelled by some of the prerogatives at Pakaitore, and described the manner in which his organisation sought to discredit them. He accounted for this in terms of his employers' figurative and literal locations of class and ethnicity ("sitting there in their ivory towers, catch their ferries back over to Devonport, they're sweet in their lovely little villas"), which prohibited their comprehension of the meanings available from unprivileged locations. His imagining of different praxis prompted his move to Māori controlled broadcasting.

The positionings of these journalists were not produced by "race", but racialised sensibilities which do not neatly correspond with "Māori" or "Pākehā" "world views", but rather reflect
the preparedness or opportunity to engage with broader discursive possibilities than the codes of news proscribe.

My interrogation of the mechanisms through which Pākehā selves may be legitimated publicly is not about identifying individuals as "racist". The focus must be on the raced locations from which news is produced, locations which are specified within a broader (post)colonial milieu. Barthes' poses of white consciousness account for the persistence of truncated frameworks for comprehending difference, which rely on distant vision and a preoccupation with the authority of self. Here, rather than imagine this corresponds with a malformed version of the bourgeois self (as Barthes intimates), such tropes constitute the self in ways which, as Dominguez writes of another context, "is equally an issue for those who do not feel implicated - but always are" (Dominguez 1994: 338).

I cannot offer any pat "solutions" to the impossibilities of representational practice. There is some fluidity to the contexts we inhabit; which is not to imply the ease, but potential, of movement. As one of my informants from Pakaitore explained, a news worker’s looks upon Iwi changed as he allowed himself to be informed by their perspectives:

When he first came he was saying silly things on the radio about "warriors", and I said "hey, I have a bone to pick with you - how many people have you seen with tats, it would be no more than a handful". And he wouldn’t understand how to see that, he would just see gangs out of the prisons. But I was surprised, as time went on his messages actually changed a bit, at one stage I said "you have improved a little". He said "you won’t let me forget that first week".

I have explored the relationships within a community; their mediation as "news"; and the meanings assigned to news from a range of locations. I recommend that moments of reception (whether as textual analysis within academic contexts, or at sites of "mass"

5This recalls the self-presentation of the Sixty Minutes reporter, where the reactionary perspectives of One Law could be played against the liberal and objective poses of the journalist, to reveal his impartiality, and I suggest, a "pre-bourgeois" whiteness. As Sandoval (1997) contends, this applies to Barthes himself, who failed to engage with the scholarship of his raced contemporaries.
consumption), must be located within "culture". Thus, the nuanced sites of differentially inhabited positions, and the discursive frameworks they constitute and are constituted by, may be revealed. My multi-sited/sighted approach to media attests that while news texts are polysemic, (for newswriters, publics, scholars), within my research context readings which contest dominant poses do not correspond with "power", but rather a lack thereof in the world beyond the text. This must be a caution to audience researchers. The appropriation of "ethnographic" methods in studies of popular culture and media reception must heed the genealogy of these methods within anthropology, thus attending to the manner in which specified locales articulate with broader dynamics. Thus while our grasp of the "complex whole" may be circumscribed, our intention to explore the complexity of "culture" may be signalled.  

---

6For overviews of the contestability of the concept of "culture" see Pasquinelli, 1996; Abu Lughod; 1993.
glossary of Māori terms

aroha: love
awa: river
haka: rhythmic dance, usually performed by males
hapū: sub-tribe
hongi: to press noses (in greeting)
hui: meeting
ihi: inner strength
Iwi: tribe
kai: food
kaimanaaki: person who relieves guards
kaitiaki: guard
kaiwhakahaere: administrator
karakia: prayer
karanga: call of welcome
kawa: protocol
kaumātua: elder (male)
kaupapa: procedure
kāwanatanga: governance
kia kaha koutou !: You have strength !
kia kaha wāhine mā !: have strength women!
kiato: assembled
koha: gift
kōhanga reo: language nest; Māori pre-school
kōrero: talk
kuia: elder (female)
mana: integrity, prestige
manuhiri: visitor
marae: meeting area of village and its buildings
moko: tattoo
mokopuna: grandchildren; young children
motu: island
paepae: threshold; place on marae where main speakers sit
Pākehā: non-Māori
pōwhiri: welcome
rākau: tree, wooden stick
rangatahi: youth
rangatiratanga: sovereignty; chieftainship
reo: language
rohe: district
tangata whenua: people of the land; local people
taonga: treasures
tapu: sacred	
tikanga: custom
tino rangatiratanga: unqualified exercise of chieftainship
tipua: foreigner, devil
tūpuna: ancestors
waiata: song; song which tells a story
wero: challenge
whakairo: carving
Whakapapa: genealogy
whakaroa: gateway
whakaruruha: shelter
whakawhitiwhiti: conversation across parties
whānau: family; extended family
Whanganuitanga: the mana and tino rangatiratanga of Whanganui Iwi
whare: house
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One Network News, 30 March 1995

One hour ago the deadline passed at Wanganui. The standoff between Māori protesters and the local council continues. Our Māori Affairs reporter Arana Taumata joins us live from the scene. Arana, what's the latest?

Well the eviction deadline passed without any major incidents.

As you can see behind me there's a huge crowd of both Māori and non-Māori still occupying Moutoa Gardens. You can probably hear the music playing too. So the mood down there really is one of celebration.

But that's in stark contrast to scenes earlier this morning.

Just after seven, protesters were trying to enforce traffic control measures they say for safety.

But when one driver refused to cooperate his car was set upon.

Three protesters were arrested in connection with the incident.

But the Wanganui District Court is right next to the protest site and officials decided to close it.

Those arrested were taken to Marton for processing.

Meanwhile Taranaki supporters marched into Wanganui.

Sixty were expected
there was closer to 600.

Central city book shop belonging to Mayor Chas Poynter became a focus for protesters.

Prominent Whanganui River leader Archie Taiaroa came out in support of the occupation today, but voiced concern about the aggressiveness of some of the young protesters:

Archie: "I'm very much concerned about the method and the aggression that our rangatahi are using and there needs to be dialogue between those with various authorities"

The ripples from Moutoa even reached Chicago, where the Prime Minister was also calling for calm.

Bolger: "This is also a challenge to Māori leadership to find a way, with the Wanganui City Council, the city fathers of Wanganui, if you like, to find a solution to the problem"

Arana: From a small camp site protesters say that the occupation at Moutoa Gardens has become a platform for all Māori grievances.

Niko: "The motu has responded to the call to come and support Whanganui. And that's what they've done, and we've been overwhelmed by support from all iwi"

Ara: But still concerns their stay here's under threat

Voice of Tariana Turia, who cannot be seen: "they will move on us tomorrow morning at dawn"

Arana: That difficult decision rested with the Wanganui District Council. This afternoon they met to consider their next move. It's understood that they will go to the High Court to seek a ruling on the occupation. So whilst the occupiers may still be on Moutoa Gardens their reprieve may be short lived, if in fact the Council does go to the High Court.
38. Split screen; Richard in studio; MS Arana Taumata at Moutoa Gardens

39. MCU Arana beside Gardens

40. Split screen; Richard in studio; MS Arana Taumata at Moutoa Gardens

41. MCU Arana beside Gardens

42. MCU: Richard Long in studio

Abbreviations:
AS: Ariel Shot
ELS: Extreme Long Shot
HA: High Angle shot
LS: Long Shot
MCU: Medium Close Up
MS: Medium / Mid Shot
OC: Off Camera
PD: Post Dubbed

Richard: Arana, the police surrounding the Gardens, are they there as part of a normal response, or did the Council invite them in?
Arana: Well no, they certainly have been here all day and there has been a heavy police presence but earlier this afternoon more reinforcements did roll in from both Palmerston North and Wellington. So it seems they're on stand by if or when the call does come from the council.

Richard: Arana, you've been following the story closely, in your judgement how long are these protesters prepared to stay there?
Arana: Well they told me as long as it takes to celebrate their Whanganuitanga, their special status as an iwi nation, which is essentially the same line that they gave me on day one of the occupation four weeks ago. But with the council now going to the jurisdiction of the High Court it seems that the pressure is really on for the occupation to end in days rather than weeks.

Richard: Arana Taumata in Wanganui. And we'll cross back live with any developments
The citizens of Wanganui have been arguing about it for a long time, and now it's coming to a head. On one group, the local council, say the land they call Moutoa Gardens was sold to them over a century and a half ago. The other group, the Whanganui River Māori, say the land is called Pakaitore, and it's theirs, it always has been and it always will be. And to prove the point they've physically occupied the site and built a marae. Who's right? Who's wrong? Who knows? The only thing that is certain is that the fate of Moutoa Gardens, or Pakaitore, has become a symbol for all those things that divide Māori and Pākehā in this society.

Ken Mair: The situation is quite clear, this is our land and we'll stay here and if we're removed or evicted from our own land, we'll continue to return.

Ross Stevens (OC): So if they evict you you'll be back.

Ken Mair: You're dead right. We'll return, return, continue to return.

Ross Stevens (PD): It was on just such a night at Moutoa Gardens, just by the river in Wanganui, that Don Kidston decided to exercise his rights as a citizen of Wanganui.

Don Kidston: I'd been out to a mate's place, we'd had a flagon and a couple of beers.

Ross Stevens (PD): he wanted to go for a late night walk in Moutoa Gardens.

Don Kidston: Well I'd been thinking about it for some time, just to see what would happen if a chap, you know, a white man, walks through our Gardens, which our rate payers had been paying for the last hundred years or so.
Ross Stevens: Don Kidston knew full well that the Gardens are now subject to something called the Whanganui Declaration of Nationhood; that they'd been declared Māori land; subject to Māori control and Māori security, day and night. Nevertheless he apparently insisted on his right to enter ...

Don Kidston: Next thing I was confronted by these Māoris, and one in particular right in front of me, with long dreadlocks and tattooing on his forehead and that, and he just said to me "You're not coming in here you Pākeha bastard" and that was it. And I said "I'm exercising my right as a rate payer of Wanganui to come on our Gardens". And with that he just actually planted me fair in the mouth with his fist.

Leon Rerekura: He became abusive and he had actually taken a rākau similar to this one off one of our security people and started swinging it around.

Ross Stevens (PD): School teacher Leon Rerekura is the coordinator of security at Moutoa Gardens, now under Māori sovereignty renamed Pakaitore ...

Leon Rerekura: He left no other course for our security that was on at the time to deal with the situation.

Don Kidston: I actually took one of the sticks off the guys and went back at him with it.

Ross Stevens (OC): Did in fact anybody hit him, strike him.

Leon Rerekura: They contained him.

Don Kidston: Well he actually planted me twice in the mouth, yeah.

Leon Rerekura: Under the circumstances I think it was well handled by our security people that were on at the time.

Ross Stevens (PD): What happened to Don Kidston is evidence of the tension that envelops Wanganui like a river mist as the race debate plays out daily on a city park.
Don Kidston chose the provocative way to enter the Gardens.

We chose the polite route. We came onto the marae according to the protocol established by the protesters, the squatters, something called Whanganuitanga, the rule of the people of the River.

Ross Stevens: And being on the marae am I now subject to Whanganuitanga?

Niko Tangaroa: Yes you are

Ross Stevens (PD): Niko Tangaroa speaks for the occupation

Niko Tangaroa: Well you came on under our protocol

Ross Stevens: And I accepted that protocol

Niko Tangaroa: And you accepted it by entering through the whakaroa

Ross Stevens: Am I being embraced by that, or am I being threatened by that?

Niko Tangaroa: Well it depends on how you see it. Were you threatened by it when you came onto our marae?

Ross Stevens: I wasn't but a lot of New Zealanders see what you're doing here as threatening

Niko Tangaroa: That's because they haven't come to us to find out really what's the real story

Ross Stevens (PD): As we went on to Pakaitore marae the dawn came up, cold and clear on the eighteenth day of the occupation. We came on in the company of one of the most infamous faces in Māoridom, Tame Iti, the man who spat at Waitangi.

Then to press the flesh, to hongi, and to be embraced by the people of this marae.

And so to kai,

with Ken Mair, squatter kaumātua Niko Tangaroa and

Tame Iti, in Pakaitore, a place they now call home.
But few agree on their right to do so.

In 1848, by all accounts, this single acre of land was willingly and freely sold by local Māori to the Crown as part of the 80,000 acre Wanganui purchase. Indeed, the deed of sale was signed at Moutoa, the Wanganui chief Mawaʻe said at the time “let no one attempt to infringe upon the lands about to be sold to the Europeans”.

The chief’s plea seems to have fallen on deaf ears. The land he sold is now a thriving squatter village, with its own laws, its own cleaning department, its own security.

Ross Stevens: As far as I can tell, it’s beyond dispute that this land was willingly sold by your ancestors.

Niko Tangaroa: Well we dispute that, that’s why we’re here.

Ross Stevens: So if you have a valid claim, why not take it to the Waitangi Tribunal?

Niko Tangaroa: If we’re sure the land is ours there is no need for us to go before any tribunal or any other body.

Ross Stevens: In fact you’re saying hang parliament, hang the Waitangi Tribunal, hang Pākehā process.

Niko Tangaroa: It was the so-called laws that put us into this particular situation that we’re in now. We’ve lost our lands.

Ross Stevens (OC): What did you think of the beheading of John Ballance?

Voices of Turner: disgusting.

Ross Stevens (OC): He has a pumpkin on his head now.

Ian Turner: That’s even worse. If I went onto a marae and did something like that, which I would never do, they would probably kill me if they could get their hands on me.

Ross Stevens (PD): Ian Turner is a farm hand and father of eight from near Wanganui, who believes in one New Zealand, one law,
and joined a protest yesterday, positioned at a safe distance from Pakaitore, to say so.

Ian Turner: they should have been moved off the first night

Ross Stevens: He's convinced that the police should have been called in right from the start, not in a peace keeping role, but to evict trespassers

Ross Stevens (OC): You're talking confrontation

Ian Turner: So what?"
there's my daughter over there, she's got Māori in her, my wife's got Māori in her, all my children have got Māori in them, half of them are ashamed of it now because of the way these people behave

Ross Stevens (OC): What would you say to those people over the road there, the people who say one country, one law.

Niko Tangaroa: they need to go and inform themselves first before they start parading around with their placards

Ross Stevens: Because it's very similar to what you say isn't it, you say one country, one law, Whanganuitanga

Niko Tangaroa: we're concerned about our own well being

Ross Stevens: Your law for you

Niko Tangaroa: That's right; and that other people should recognise that

Ross Stevens: Are you intending yourselves to go over and have a conversation?

Ian Turner: No. No engagement, none whatsoever

Ross Stevens (OC): Why not?

Brian Turner: Because we don't believe that we could walk on there in safety

Ross Stevens (PD): Ian Turner's brother, builder Brian organised the demo

Brian Turner: Well not exactly safety, but we're not here for confrontation we're here to make a point

Ross Stevens (OC): Conversation wouldn't be a bad idea though would it

Ross Stevens: What if the demonstrators over the road appeared at the gate and asked to be welcomed on? Would they be welcome
77. CU Niko Tangaroa
Niko Tangaroa: We have no problem with that provided that they follow the tikanga of the marae

78. MS Niko Tangaroa and Ross Stevens on bench. Stevens faces camera
Ross Stevens: Which means they must accept the embrace of your welcome

79. I.S; zoom in on kids rapping on stage of tent at Gardens
Ross Stevens: If they chose not to do that but to walk on anyway, what would happen then

80. MS rear view of rappers in foreground, view of Gardens from inside tent in background
Niko Tangaroa: Well we'll wait and see, but if they do not follow the protocols then they will be told to leave

81. MCU Men playing touch rugby
Ross Stevens: And what would happen if they refused to go

82. MCU Men playing touch rugby
Niko Tangaroa: Well we'll have to wait until that occurs

83. MCU Tracking shot of One Law protesters along roadside
Ross Stevens (PD): This hardly seems a threatening place.

84. CU One New Zealand Secretary
By midday the kids are into some L.A. style rap

85. MCU zoom back to include Ross Stevens in shot
And the boys play a little touch

Meanwhile the demo over the road has been joined by the secretary of the One New Zealand group, a right wing, largely pensioner based group who have been vocal about special privileges for Māori

Ross Stevens (OC): See what we've got now, we've got 200 people over there, old folks, kids. It's not just Ken Mair, it's not just Nik Tangaroa.

There's obviously very considerable support for what's happening over there

One NZ Secretary: Oh granted, if you could get something for nothing you'd be in like (inaudible)
They feel that if they protest enough they'll be given it, they're like spoilt children, the more you give them, the more they want.

Ross Stevens (OC): So how do you deal with spoilt children

One NZ Secretary: I know how I dealt with mine but I'm afraid that's not considered legal these days, Wallop them.

Ross Stevens: It didn't work either did it

It did with mine. I didn't do it often

Ross Stevens: So you're suggesting bring the wallopers in, bring the police in and get them off.

Well, no I wouldn't go as strongly as that, but I do think somehow or other they should be made to observe the law

Ross Stevens (PD): The law; represented in Wanganui by a much politic and polished policeman

Alec Waugh: As of today there's been no request for formal police involvement

Ross Stevens (PD): Superintendent Alec Waugh ...

Alec Waugh: It's a Council problem, the Council has to negotiate with Iwi to resolve it before they come to us with any request

Ross Stevens (PD): So the police wait for advice from this man; Wanganui mayor Chas Poynter, the man who, on behalf of his citizens, owns Moutoa Gardens

Chas Poynter: Some of them have suggested using helicopters with monsoon buckets of water, etcetera, and other things like that, and things a lot worse than that, that I wouldn't even repeat

Ross Stevens (PD): he's been getting plenty of free advice
on what to do about his unwelcome guests

Chas Poynter: We're getting to a stage now where tolerance is coming to an end

Ross Stevens: You're angry about this aren't you

Chas Poynter: I am indeed

Niko Tangaroa: I wasn't aware that he was angry. We will work through it. We have indicated to the Mayor and District Council. They've presented us with their options, we'll work through that, we'll give a response

Ross Stevens (PD): The day goes on. More guests are welcomed onto the marae.

A traditional koauau echoes around the site and we check something we heard earlier during our own powhiri.

Tame Iti has told his hosts he and his tribesmen are also planning occupations in what they call their Tuhoe nation in the Bay of Plenty

Tame Iti: I think its inevitable for occupations happening all around the place

Ross Stevens (PD): Tame Iti says he plans evictions, not only of the District Council from land, but of private farmers as well

Ross Stevens: So does that in fact mean that private contracts, private land deals are no longer secure

Tame Iti: They never have been and they never will be.

Ross Stevens: Do New Zealanders have anything to fear from you?

Tame Iti: Fear? Fear of what?

We only
wanted to remind them that in the very near future we're going to be their new boss; and their new landlord.

Abbreviations:
AS: Ariel Shot
ELS: Extreme Long Shot
HA: High Angle shot
LS: Long Shot
MCU: Medium Close Up
MS: Medium / Mid Shot
OC: Off Camera
PD: Post Dubbed