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Like everything in my life, this thesis is dedicated to my mother, whose name I carry, and who inspires me to be all that I am.

— Thanks, Mum.

Kāore tātai whakapapa ki Tūhoe, engari kei te noho au i raro i te maru, i te aroha o Tūhoe. Ko te korero e whai ake nei i puta mai i raro i tērā korowai aroha.

— While my heritage lies beyond the heartland of Tūhoe, I have had the honoured privilege of being sheltered by the love and generosity of Tūhoe. Out of that love and generosity, this thesis was born.
I have found the phrase, ‘I acknowledge the traditional owners of the land…’ too often recited without deeper reflection of its existential implications, said quickly at the commencement of activities as a tick of the proverbial box. For me, as someone who does not belong in Australia, recognising the customary owners of the land means critically understanding that my tenure at university, my doctoral scholarship, and the opportunities bestowed on me therein, were made possible only through the dispossession of Aboriginal peoples, the negation of their sovereignties, and the establishment of a white supremacist state atop their ways of life.

Nō reira, te tuatahi o aku mihi ka tukua ki te tangata whenua o Ahitereiria, o te tangata o te ao moemoē, nō rātou te mana, nō rātou hoki te whenua. Tēnā rawa atu koutou ngā īwi taketake o reira, o ngā īwi Ngunnawal, Ngambri hoki. Waimārie au i te noho i tō koutou aroha. I thus extend my first acknowledgement and greeting to the multitudinous Indigenous sovereign nations of Australia, upon whose dispossessed and stolen lands white settler Australia was founded. To the Ngunnawal and Ngambri peoples whose ancestors existed in what is now known as the Australian Capital Territory, I thank you for your hosting of me in your own lands as I journeyed through doctoral study. As an Indigenous person whose home is across the ocean’s expanse, I grapple with the many contradictions of my life: for I am undertaking research about a sovereign people who are not my own, in a land whose people are likewise not own. I am a privileged guest in both spaces, and once more, I beckon a gesture of thanks and respect to the most senior, the most preeminent of ancestors older than time itself. Tēnā rawa atu koutou katoa.

Turning now to my own ancestral landscapes, I offer the wisdom of my tūpuna: ‘Ehara taku toa i te toa takitahi, he toa takitini kē’; my success is not that of mine alone, but a reflection of the many who have sacrificed therein. My thesis is the result of many sacrifices, and I have many, many people to whom I am indebted. The greatest of those is my mother, who has ceaselessly provided inspiration, support, and guidance throughout my life. You are my biggest role model in life, Mum, and forever will be. I beckon also to the innumerable ancestors of mine who are reflected in me, and especially to my Grandma and Granddad, and my Nan and Pop, and my dear Aunty Maureen who passed not long after I started my PhD. To my younger sister, Maya, who has put up with my chaotic self for many a year, thank you for all that you are.

E ngā rangatira mā o te Whārua o Ruatoki, o Ngāi Tūhoe rā, tēnā rawa atu koutou katoa. Waimārie au i ō koutou aroha, ō koutou manaaki, ō koutou mea atu rā. Ko koutou te whakatinanatanga o te whakataukī, ‘Tūhoe moumou kai!’ To Waitangi, as a dear friend from which this thesis arose, I am continually inspired by your strength and determination of will. To your Mum and Dad, your boys Te Wanea Ngakurukuru and Whareauahi, and your sister Te Hemanawa, who taught me so much about the world, ngā mihi nui rawa ki a koutou katoa. I am forever indebted to you. To Des, Whare, and your tamariki, your kindness and generosity of spirit has so humbled me throughout my work. To Aunty Waicy, Tarn, and Angie, you were
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1 Cover photograph by Tatsiana Chypsanava, of the forests upon Te Tāhū o Haokitaha. Ruatoki, 2016.
the embodiment of manaaki tangata in your incredible support of me, throughout my many kōrero with you over freshly baked paraoa koroua, for shuttling me to and from the Valley to undertake my work, and for humbling me by offering a place to work in Te Kaokao a Takapau. As an outsider to your world, I am honoured by your gestures of manaaki. May I reciprocate in kind in the future. To Whaea Kēkē Awhi, Uncle Smokey, and your whānau, I was privileged to sit with you and discuss an incredibly tapu topic. You humbled me both with your manaaki, and the kōrero you shared with me. I hope that my thesis has done justice to that kōrero. To Uncle Peho, who opened his home to me as we chatted over pikopiko and honey fresh from the land, tēnā rawa atu koe. To Juanita and Pete, whose kind and generous hearts provided so much during our kōrero about life in the city and life in the Valley, tēnei te mihi mahana ki a kōrua, tō whānau hoki. To Koro Bill and Nan Barbara, ōku mihi maioha ki a kōrua mō te manaaki, te kaha, te kai, te aroha i tukua mai. E kore te aroha e mutu i a kōrua. To Reverend Wayne Te Kaawa, tēnā koe e te minita, ngā mihi nui rawa ki a koe mō tō awhi mai ki ahau. I am also indebted to professional photographer Tatsiana Chypsanava, whose photographs of Ruatoki bring life to my thesis.
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* * *
This thesis examines the relationship between Indigenous sovereignty and state violence in the Aotearoa New Zealand context. To do so, I explore the following argument. The settler colonial state is founded upon the perpetual negation of Indigenous sovereignties, their peoples, and ways of life. This process is necessarily on-going: despite significant efforts at extermination, Indigenous peoples have survived – albeit on terms dictated by the state. Ngāi Tūhoe, the illustrious ‘people of the mist’ of Te Urewera, in New Zealand’s Eastern Bay of Plenty, are bearers of a superior, adamantine sovereign claim over their homelands. As I demonstrate, however, this prerogative is irreconcilable with settler sovereignty. Unable to completely eradicate Tūhoe in the initial stages of British colonisation, the contemporary New Zealand settler colonial state periodically reasserts its existential legitimacy, predominantly through repeated shows of force upon Tūhoe communities. In the last ten years, this has manifested in four major paramilitary police operations targeting Ngāi Tūhoe, violently raiding whānau (family) homes with reckless abandon. The overwhelming force used by the police in instances such as these, demonstrates that Tūhoe exist within what Giorgio Agamben has described as the ‘state of exception’ (2005). Drawing on the thinking of Michel Foucault (2003), I suggest that Tūhoe are rendered biopolitical ‘contaminants’ that threaten the health and wellbeing of the social body, and must be expelled by any means necessary. This distinctly colonial project is most ardently manifest upon the frontier – the threshold between ‘civilisation’ and ‘savagery’ – to which the state deploys its most violent machines of war in the circumscription of Indigenous existence. Central to this has been the colonial depiction of Tūhoe as savage, primitive, inferior, and simple beings, a system of representation that continues to inform the manner in which the state interacts with Tūhoe today. In this matrix, Tūhoe are ‘known’ by the state through an exclusively violent and hostile lens, but in this thesis I urge that manifold alternative portrayals of Tūhoe exist, untethered to these colonial convictions. To this end, I use ethnography and photographs of the dailiness of Tūhoe life to rupture such colonial stereotypes, in giving voice and sight to alternate ways of ‘knowing’ – and hopefully, interacting with – Ngāi Tūhoe.
Before opening my thesis, I would like to clarify a few technical issues. Formal ethical approval to conduct my research was granted by the Human Research Ethics Committee of the Australian National University in December 2015. I spoke with a number of people in Ruatoki, predominantly those of the Teepa and Harawira whānau (who are directly related to one another). This includes my close friend Waitangi (who is of the Teepa whānau), her Mum and Dad, her Aunties and Uncles, including Aunty Waicy, Uncle Peho, Whaea Kēkē (Aunty) Awhi, Uncle Smokey, her sister, Juanita, her brother, Whare, her sister-in-law, Des, and her cousin, Angie. Most conversations were held within the Ruatoki Valley, or the nearby Tūhoe township of Tāneatua. I have also included reflections from the Reverend Wayne Te Kaawa, who honoured me with his time and manaaki (spirit of generosity and hospitality) in exploring my thesis project, and an important Tūhoe kaumātua in my life, Koro Bill. While I was in Ruatoki, at Waitangi’s direction, I referred to each of these whānau by their names as they are presented here – thus her parents were ‘Mum’ and ‘Dad’ – which is in line with the culturally-appropriate forms of address for someone in my position, that is, on the same genealogical level as Waitangi. My mentioning of whānau in this thesis follows this approach; however, I first sought permission from each person to do so, with the alternative of a pseudonym should they prefer. All indicated a preference for their own names to be used. While I spoke with Des and Whare at length, their appearance in my thesis is mainly through the photographs and diary entries interwoven throughout my thesis.

My use of te reo Māori (the Māori language) befits its status as an Indigenous and official language of New Zealand. As such, Māori words will not be italicised or underlined, and

---

definitions of singular Māori words or phrases appear in italicised bracketed form (like this) at the first instance of their use, or will be otherwise defined in-sentence. A complete glossary of Māori words I have used in this thesis precedes the Introduction. Many of my kōrero (conversations; discussions) with whānau were conducted in Māori, and throughout this thesis I often reproduce large tracts of quotation. Where this is the case, the full translation will be provided as a footnote. While I have a conversational command of te reo, I am unable to communicate at the level of erudition required in the analyses and discussions of this thesis. As such, English remains the principal language of use.

Further – and I must insist upon this – the word ‘Ruatoki’ does not have any macrons, despite its invariable printing as ‘Rūātoki’, ‘Ruātoki’, or some other declension thereof. Incorrect spellings of Ruatoki were often a point of frustration for many whānau I spoke with, and a brief etymological excavation into the word reveals why. In my first conversation with Aunty Waicy, she shared the following story:

I reira, i Uta rā, i reira te hārōto. We had a lagoon there. He repo. And that lagoon was where [te ariki] Te Tai o Ruamano … [, i reira ia i] hide his adze[s], his war weapons, [e rua, he toki pounamu]. So he would put them [i roto i te repo] … [K]a haramai ngā whoever, kua hunaia e te koroua rā ngā toki ki roto i te wai. Koira i ki ai a ‘rua toki’ – ko te rua toki a Te Tai o Ruamano. Ko te ariki ko te Tai o Ruamano. Ko te repo e hunaia ana [ngā] toki. Koira te ‘rua’. Koirā te ingoa o Ruatoki. Te Ruatoki a Te Tai o Ruamano.

‘Ruatoki’ is thus the appropriate spelling of the name (see Figure 6), and as Waitangi remarked to me during one of our kōrero, “I hope you have a big fat status in the front [of your thesis]

---

3 Diacritical markers above the vowel (āēīōū) that indicate spoken stress.
4 Kōrero with Aunty Waicy, 6 June 2017.
5 ‘There was once a lagoon at Uta [(a village at the head of the Ruatoki Valley)], and that lagoon was where the great chief Te Tai o Ruamano hid his two treasured toki [(adzes) of pounamu [(greenstone; jade)]. He would put them in the marsh to conceal them, and in the event a foe were to arrive, the adzes would be hidden by the swamp. That is why it is said ‘rua toki’ [(‘rua’ being the Māori word for ‘two’)], referring to Te Tai a Ruamano’s two pounamu adzes he hid in the lagoon. That is the ‘rua’ [(‘two’)] [part of the name]. Hence the name ‘Ruatoki’: Ruatoki of Te Tai o Ruamano.’ Translation mine.
that says, ‘No goddam bloody macrons!’”\(^6\) Similarly, I refer to the Ruatoki Valley as ‘Ruatoki’, ‘the Valley’, and ‘the Whārua’ (valley) interchangeably, reflective of the everyday usage of these terms. Finally, on occasion I refer to people with the suffix ‘matua’ (male elder), ‘kuia’, or ‘whaea’ (female elder), in respect thereof.

A number of images are interwoven throughout my thesis. I am grateful to the Whakatāne Beacon, Auckland Libraries, the Crown Research Institute for Geological and Nuclear Science (GNS Science), the Alexander Turnbull Library, Radio New Zealand, the Department of Anthropology and Archaeology at the University of Otago, and CartoGIS at the Australian National University, for permission to reproduce their images. I am also indebted to professional photographer Tatsiana Chypsanava, who has allowed me to incorporate her rich and compelling photographs of Ruatoki into my theoretical meditations. Her work brings this thesis to life. Other photographs I have used are either my own, or were sourced from the public domain. Due acknowledgement accompanies every image.

I have attempted to write this thesis in the most accessible way possible, because my primary audience are the whānau of Ruatoki, and, respectfully, not the academy. As such, some explanations are slightly longer than others, at times providing examples through metaphor to simplify complex theoretical concepts. I also believe it is incumbent upon myself, as the privileged recipient of knowledge, to communicate in a way that is understandable to those outside of academic settings. University is accurately described as an ‘ivory tower’, and to write in a dense, incomprehensible manner (like far too many philosophers)\(^7\) not only accentuates this truism, but, for me, reinforces boundaries of class. While I realise that my discussions are often technical and require a lot of explanation, I have strived to compose this thesis in a way

---

\(^6\) Kōrero with Waitangi, 6 October 2017.

\(^7\) Foucault!
that acknowledges the mana (integrity, dignity, prestige) of all who might read it – whānau and academics alike (many of whom are both!). Similarly, the actual length of individual chapters varies greatly, in part because I have taken the liberty of careful exposition, but also because, where possible, I have left the telling of the Tūhoe experiences of state violence to whānau themselves. Thus, nearly a third of Chapter VI is made up of lengthy quotations from whānau, as this is their story to tell, not mine. It is my hope, that by the end of this thesis, the reader will have entered into a different relationship with Tūhoe not characterised by colonial discourses of violence and savagery.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TERM/PHRASE</th>
<th>INTERPRETATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aroha</td>
<td>Love; compassion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aukati</td>
<td>Enforced boundary (<em>see also</em> ‘kati’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haka</td>
<td>Posture dance performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hāngī</td>
<td>Food cooked in an earth oven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hapū</td>
<td>Clan; to be pregnant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hau kāinga</td>
<td>Ancestral home; literally translated as ‘the winds of home’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘He iti nā tūhoe e kata te pō!’</td>
<td>‘One by Tūhoe makes Hades laugh!’; A Tūhoe proverb highlighting the strength and determination commanded by few that prevails over insurmountable odds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hikoi</td>
<td>March; walk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiona</td>
<td>Zion; Rua Kēnana’s circularly-constructed meeting house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoaririri</td>
<td>Enemy; literally ‘angry friend’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hōhā</td>
<td>Annoyed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hui</td>
<td>Gathering; meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iwi</td>
<td>Bones; people; nation; tribe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kai</td>
<td>Food; sustenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaihāna wāhine</td>
<td>Female cousin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāinga</td>
<td>Home; village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaitakawaenga Māori</td>
<td>Māori liaison officers of the New Zealand Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapa haka</td>
<td>Performing arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karakia</td>
<td>Recitation of prayer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kati</td>
<td>Stoppage; to close or obstruct (<em>see also</em> ‘aukati’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaumātua</td>
<td>Elder; elderly man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaupapa</td>
<td>Purpose; topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāwanatanga Māori</td>
<td>Chief allied with the Crown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingitanganga</td>
<td>A Waikato-based political movement that emerged in the mid-nineteenth century to arrest the sale of Māori land, politically unify Māori, and create a representative body on par with the British monarchy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koha</td>
<td>Gift; form of reciprocity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori Term</td>
<td>English Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kōhanga Reo</td>
<td>Māori immersion preschool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kōkiri</td>
<td>War party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kōrero</td>
<td>Conversation; discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koro</td>
<td>Grandfather; elder; term of respect for an elderly man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koroua</td>
<td>Male elder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kōtiro</td>
<td>Girl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuia</td>
<td>Grandmother; elder; term of respect for an elderly woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kūmara</td>
<td>Sweet potato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kura</td>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurawaka</td>
<td>Measles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mamae</td>
<td>Pain; suffering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mana</td>
<td>Prestige; dignity; integrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mana motuhake</td>
<td>Sovereignty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mana wāhine</td>
<td>Womanly dignity and integrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mana whenua</td>
<td>Ancestral jurisdiction over land; exercise of authority over land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manaaki</td>
<td>Hospitality; generosity; sacrifices made in the exercise thereof (see also ‘manaaki tangata’; ‘manaakitanga’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manaaki tangata</td>
<td>‘Be kind and generous to people’ (see also ‘manaaki’; ‘manaakitanga’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manaakitanga</td>
<td>Hospitality; generosity; sacrifices made in the exercise thereof (see also ‘manaaki tangata’; ‘manaaki’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manu</td>
<td>Bird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marae</td>
<td>Community meeting plaza of ancestral significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mārama</td>
<td>To be clear (see also ‘māramatanga’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māramatanga</td>
<td>Enlightenment (see also ‘mārama’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mataatua</td>
<td>One of the several ancestral canoe that brought the Polynesian ancestors of Māori to Aotearoa New Zealand; an aphorism for Te Urewera (see also ‘waka’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matemate-ā-one</td>
<td>‘Death born of earth’; a uniquely Tūhoe philosophy centred on the imbrication of people with place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matua</td>
<td>Uncle; term of respect for a male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moko</td>
<td>Grandchild (see also ‘mokopuna’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mokopuna</td>
<td>Grandchild <em>(see also ‘moko’)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motu</td>
<td>Island; land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pā</td>
<td>Fortified village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pākehā</td>
<td>New Zealander of British European descent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakeke</td>
<td>Adult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papa-tūā-nuku</td>
<td>Earth Mother; primal ancestor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pikopiko</td>
<td>Fern shoots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pōtae</td>
<td>Top hat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pounamu</td>
<td>Greenstone; jade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pū</td>
<td>Gun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rākau kuia</td>
<td>Elderly tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rama</td>
<td>To fish by torchlight <em>(see also ‘whakarama tuna’)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangatahi tāne</td>
<td>Male youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangatira</td>
<td>Ennobled chieftains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raupatu</td>
<td>Land confiscation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rēkohu</td>
<td>Chatham Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewharewha</td>
<td>Influenza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rohe</td>
<td>Region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rua</td>
<td>Two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rūnanga</td>
<td>Self-governing Māori councils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamariki</td>
<td>Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tā moko</td>
<td>Traditional Māori tattooing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tāne</td>
<td>Man; male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tāngata</td>
<td>Human beings; people <em>(see also ‘Tāngata Māori’; ‘tangata whenua’)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tāngata Māori</td>
<td>Normal person <em>(see also ‘tāngata’; ‘tangata whenua’)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangata whenua</td>
<td>People of the land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangi</td>
<td>Ritual of farewell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taonga</td>
<td>Treasure of great worth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te ao Māori</td>
<td>The Māori world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Hokowhitu</td>
<td>The Union of Mataatua <em>(see also ‘Te Whitu Tekau’)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Ika a Maui</td>
<td>The North Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teina</td>
<td>Younger sibling of the same gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Kāhui o Matariki</td>
<td>A constellation of stars known also as Makali’i, Pleiades, the Seven Sisters, Mutsuraboshi, Subaru, and Messier 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Maunga</td>
<td>The (great) Mountain, Maungapōhatu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te reo Māori</td>
<td>The Māori language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Rohe Pōtae o Tūhoe</td>
<td>The Encircled Boundaries of Tūhoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Whitu Tekau</td>
<td>The Union of Mataatua (see also ‘Te Hokowhitu’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tikanga</td>
<td>Protocol/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tohunga</td>
<td>Expert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toki</td>
<td>Adze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Tōmairangi o Te Aroha’</td>
<td>‘The heavenly dews of love’; name bestowed by Ngāi Tūhoe upon Judith Binney for her commitment to the Tūhoe world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuakana</td>
<td>Older sibling of the same gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Tūhoe moumou kai’</td>
<td>‘Tūhoe wasters of food’; proverbial saying denoting the significant sacrifices made in the exercise of manaaki tangata (see also ‘manaaki tangata’; ‘manaaki’; ‘manaakitanga’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuna</td>
<td>Eel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tūpuna</td>
<td>Ancestor/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiata</td>
<td>Song</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waka</td>
<td>Canoe; vessel; vehicle (see also ‘Mataatua’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wānanga</td>
<td>Esoteric knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wero</td>
<td>Ritual of challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whaea</td>
<td>Aunty; term of respect for a woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whaea Kēkē</td>
<td>Aunty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whakamomori</td>
<td>Profound grief; suicide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whakapapa</td>
<td>Layers of ancestry; genealogy; lineage; genealogical ordering of the universe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whakarama tuna</td>
<td>Hunting for tuna (eels) by torchlight (see also ‘rama’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whakatauki</td>
<td>Proverb; proverbial saying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whānau</td>
<td>Family; family member; to give birth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whanaunga</td>
<td>Relation; cousin; kin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whanaungatanga</td>
<td>Relationship <em>(see also ‘whakawhanaungatanga’)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whakawhanaungatanga</td>
<td>Ethic of relationship building centred on the value of family <em>(see also ‘whanaungatanga’)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wharekai</td>
<td>Dining hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whārua</td>
<td>Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whenua</td>
<td>Land; placenta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

— RUATOKI, APRIL 2014.

The night outside was dark. Inside, a whānau prepared to rest from their day’s activities, the tamariki (*children*) asleep in bed, their parents and grandparents soon thereafter. As the moon begins its skyward ascent, the land and homestead drift off into halcyon slumber. A blanket of quiet gradually shrouds the valley, as the evening stills to a silence. As the hours pass beyond nightfall’s meridian, kuia’s sharp intake of breath stirs the whānau awake. A series of small, phosphorescent red dots appear, performing an oddly-choreographed dance across the walls and ceilings. Hushed silhouettes of movement encircle the homestead in military posture. Rotor blades shatter the silence, as night is abruptly set ablaze by the floodlights of a helicopter overhead. A legion of paramilitary figures emerge suddenly from the darkness, each enveloped beneath exteriors of black and grey. With the authority of automatic weaponry (the iridescent red piercing out from the many rifle scopes), the Armed Offenders Squad interrogate the whānau, aggressively demanding information from them. At gunpoint, the homestead is transformed into the object of state violence. Yet, as quickly as the raid invaded the home, so too the unit departed. ‘Wrong car, wrong house’ they said; wrong address,
wrong place. Upon bungled intelligence the raid was carried out; its eventual futility matched only by the violence of its execution. ‘Matakū ōku mokopuna, ōku tamariki’, expressed koro (grandfather). As quickly as they arrived, the figures then vanished into the night.

A FUNDAMENTAL VIOLATION OF JUSTICE

On a brisk autumn Otago morning in early 2014, as I prepared for my day at Polytechnic, I received an unexpected call from a close friend of mine. Her voice was tense and uneasy. I sat down next to the telephone, and held the receiver close to my ear. “What’s happened Wai?”, I asked. She paused, gathering her thoughts. “We were raided last night,” she explained, “the police were here with all their guns and raided us.” Perplexed, I listened on, as she detailed a severely violent police raid conducted upon her whānau homestead, in the Ruatoki Valley of New Zealand’s Eastern Bay of Plenty. I sat in horror as Waitangi (my friend) described how the Armed Offenders Squad (AOS) descended upon her home, bellowing orders at her parents from behind the barrels of their semi-automatic weaponry. “But they had the wrong place!”, she exasperatedly exclaimed, explaining that, in the end, the AOS had inadvertently targeted the physically wrong address. “And all they said was, ‘wrong car, wrong house,’” and without any offer of remorse, left into the night. My dismay quickly escalated into indignation. I was both outraged and bewildered, baffled by how this could have happened in ‘the New Zealand that I knew’, and infuriated that Waitangi’s whānau had been subject to such violent police tactics.

---

8 ‘My children and grandchildren were terrified.’ Translation mine.
9 The New Zealand term for technical college.
10 ‘AOS’, the paramilitary wing of the New Zealand Police.
Figure 2: Map of Te Urewera’s location in Te Ika a Maui. CartoGIS Services, College of Asia and the Pacific, Australian National University, 2018.
Figure 3: An elevated view of the northern edge of Te Urewera, in which the Ruatoki Valley is located. CartoGIS Services, College of Asia and the Pacific, Australian National University, 2018.
In the summer prior to the raid, I was humbled by Waitangi’s invitation to accompany her home to Ruatoki for the Christmas break, and being very much an urbanised Māori myself, I was excited to explore her ancestral landscapes of home. I was overcome with the manaaki she and her whānau extended to me during my stay, and lamented having to eventually bid farewell and return to my studies. That the raid was conducted so soon after my departure made its impacts particularly acute for me, and deeply characterised my anger at the whole affair. *How could this have happened in the New Zealand I grew up in?*, I continually asked of myself, for this kind of unchecked violence did not fit into the ‘narrative of New Zealand’ I had become familiar with. Yet, as my thesis will demonstrate, this is *precisely* the New Zealand I grew up in, a realisation that dawned rather late upon me. With the phone still in my hand, amidst a flurry of colourful adjectives on my behalf, I fiercely proclaimed, ‘Something has to be done about this! So I’m going to write a book or do a PhD!’ At the very essence of my being, I felt that the raid upon Waitangi’s whānau homestead was a fundamental violation of justice. Such a defilement could not go unanswered, and impassioned by this cause, at that very moment in my Dunedin flat some five years ago, I decided to embark upon doctoral study. My introductory reflection above was written soon after my kōrero with Waitangi, composed at a time when I continued to grapple with the ramifications of the raid. And thus, my thesis was born.

**MATEMATE-Ā-ONE: AN AUTOCHTHONOUS EXISTENCE**

What follows is my attempt to make sense of the raid upon Waitangi’s home, in unravelling a complex web of convergent and interconnected threads to reveal a much broader tapestry, in which the 2014 raid is but a small – yet by no means insignificant – fibre. In essence, then, this thesis is about the integral and hallowed relationship between land and Indigenous existence, and the way in which this collides with settler colonial sovereignty. Ruatoki is one of several
ancestral descendant communities of the Ngāi Tūhoe nation, a sovereign people whose ancient forebears lived and defended within the mountainous expanse of Te Urewera. Unlike most other Māori creation narratives, whose provenance is found in the ancestral, oceanic homeland of Hawaiki (Royal, 2005), Tūhoe’s principal strands of whakapapa (genealogy; lineage; layers of ancestry) are interwoven within the very earth itself. Ngāi Tūhoe are known as ‘Ngā Tamariki o te Kohu’, the ‘Children’ or ‘People of the Mist’, which denotes their birth of the union between Te Maunga, the great mountain Maungapōhatu, and Hinepūkohurangi, the illustrious ancestress of the mist. Tūhoe’s whakapapa is therefore autochthonous – that is, their origin is born of the earth.

A unique and somewhat uncommon term, ‘autochthonous’ is derived of the Ancient Greek words αὐτός (autós), or ‘self’, and χθόν (khthón), meaning ‘earth’. In Greek mythology, ‘autochthones’ were “…the first human beings who appeared in the world … believed to have sprung from the earth itself” (Encyclopaedia Britannica 1875: 141), and who were the “original inhabitants of a country as opposed to settlers” (Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1911, my emphasis). The Athenians of Ancient Greece, for example, would adorn their hair with golden grasshoppers as a “…token that they were born from the soil and had always lived in Attica” (Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1911). As a people whose ancestors ‘sprung forth’ from the soils and rocks of Te Urewera before time itself, Tūhoe existence is therefore an autochthonous one. Within the pantheon of Tūhoe knowledge, this autochthony is articulated through the philosophy of matemate-ā-one – literally, ‘death born of earth’ – “death that makes life precious and interconnected” (Liu and Temara, 1998: 138). I later dedicate an entire chapter to reflecting upon matemate-ā-one, but for now, the phrase signals a “craving for a particular place: a
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11 I use the terms ‘Ngāi Tūhoe’ and ‘Tūhoe’ interchangeably throughout; the former is slightly more formal prose, the prefix ‘Ngā’ translating to ‘descendant of’.

12 The geographic region of Ancient Greece within which Athens was located.
relationship with one’s forebears, and a sense of timeless belonging, of blood within the earth, across the waves, and in the skies” (ibid. 142). This points unambiguously to the indissoluble bond between Te Urewera and its countless descendants, and it is this imbrication of people and place that forms the bedrock of my thesis. Matemate-ā-one denotes the nurturing of this particular connection, and as a lived philosophy of life, equally extends to the strengthening of relationships between and amongst people. This is emblematic of the friendship I have with Waitangi, and it is by virtue of matemate-ā-one that this whole thesis arose.

Central to autochthony is origin from within the earth, in distinct contrast to those who settle – having come from afar – but who do not necessarily belong to that particular place. Let me be clear. My intention here is not to unsettle the claims of Māori whose ancestors migrated from Hawaiki in aeons long past (such as my own), but rather to situate Tūhoe’s origin in contrast to their colonial counterparts. Thus, in the wake of merchant Abel Tasman’s voyage to the Pacific in the seventeenth century, Dutch cartographers baptised a collection of islands he stumbled upon as (Nieuw) Zeeland, after a province in their homeland of the same name (Wilson, 2005). James Cook later anglicised the title to ‘New Zealand’, and the combined efforts of these European travellers heralded the arrival of tens of thousands of settlers to these lands. Thus arose the New Zealand settler colonial state, that is, a state founded upon the violent displacement of Indigenous sovereignties, under the auspices of Empire and Dominion. Colonial expansion pushed into the non-European world with a rapacious hunger for land and resources, and Tūhoe’s recent history (relatively speaking) is defined by this logic.
Figure 4: The great and exalted ancestor of Tūhoe, Te Maunga (The Mountain), Maungapōhatu. Maungapōhatu stands in the heart of Tūhoe’s homeland, Te Urewera. 1986. © Dougal Townsend, GNS Science, 2828.
Figure 5: Part of Tūhoe’s ancestral estate: Korokoro Falls, in Te Urewera. 1995. © Dougal Townsend, GNS Science, 2692.
In this thesis, I advance the following argument. The settler colonial state is founded upon the perpetual negation of Indigenous sovereignties, their peoples, and ways of life. This process is necessarily on-going: despite significant efforts at extermination, Indigenous peoples have survived – albeit on terms dictated by the state. Ngāi Tūhoe are bearers of a superior, adamantine sovereign claim over their homelands, but this prerogative is irreconcilable with settler sovereignty. Unable to completely eradicate Tūhoe in the initial stages of British colonisation, the contemporary settler state periodically reasserts its existential legitimacy, predominantly through repeated shows of force upon Tūhoe communities. Tūhoe, therefore, remain an existential threat to the New Zealand settler colonial state.

This ‘colonial project’ is most ardently manifest upon the frontier – the threshold between ‘civilisation’ and ‘savagery’ – to which the state deploys its most violent machines of war in the circumscription of Indigenous existence. Central to this has been the colonial depiction of Tūhoe as savage, primitive, inferior, and simple beings, a system of representation that continues to inform the manner in which the state interacts with Tūhoe today. In this matrix, Tūhoe are ‘known’ by the state through an exclusively violent and hostile lens. However, just as the same constellation of stars will be viewed differently from separate global vantagepoints, manifold alternative portrayals of Tūhoe exist, untethered to these colonial convictions. Giving voice and sight to these alternate possibilities of representation is essential in puncturing these stereotypes, and is a central political objective of my work. Place and representation are, therefore, the two fundamental threads woven throughout my thesis.

TERRA IN OUR MIST

Theoretical orientations

To explore and develop this argument, this discussion is divided into six substantive chapters. Chapter II sets out the theoretical foundations of my inquiry, beginning with a careful
examination of poststructuralist, postmodernist, and social constructionist approaches to research. These theories together share a scepticism about ‘universal truth’, and reject the notion that there is only ‘one truth’ to the world (Anderson, 2008; Burr, 2015a). To continue my earlier metaphor, while there are various earth-bound angles from which to gaze upon a given star cluster, none of them are ‘truer’ perspectives than any other – for we are all observing the same celestial phenomenon. In other words, there are always multiple ways of interpreting and understanding the world, and no one version can claim to be the exclusive bearer of truth. The problem, however, is that society emphasises one account as ‘the way’ of viewing the heavenly bodies, precisely the case with how Tūhoe are ‘known’ only through discourses of savagery and primitivism.

‘Discourses’, for French poststructuralist philosopher Michel Foucault, are systems of representation that frame how we think and speak about any given topic or issue (Anderson, 2008: 52). The way we speak about things has direct consequences in lived material reality – the more a child is told they are ‘less than’, the more they will come to believe that. When this is the case, that is, when discourses gain ‘authority’ about those whom they speak, a ‘discursive formation’ is said to have been created (Foucault 1982b: 44-5). This is characteristic of the operation of power, in which “people become both constrained and enabled to think in particular ways” (Anderson 2008: 52). For Foucault, power and knowledge are imbrications of one another (the phrase is often written as power/knowledge), because what we ‘say’ impacts upon how we ‘do’; discourse influences how material practice unfolds. Further, Foucault insisted we avoid thinking of power as something that is possessed or dispossessed, but rather understand it as a medium of force exercised between individuals (1978: 92-4; Halperin, 1995: 16). The relations of force between parents and children, for example, are distinct from those between employers and workers. Here, people become subject to force relations through
Discourses create recognisable ‘subject positions’ (‘parent’, ‘child’, ‘worker’, ‘employer’), all of which imply a certain configuration of power dynamics. This, for Foucault, is subjectification: subjectivities (or subject positions) are produced when one is subject to power (1984: 7-11).

The linchpin for Foucault, however, is that every instance of power brings with it the possibility for resistance, for power and resistance are two sides of the same coin. Understanding this crucial point – of the power/resistance duality – presents us with opportunities for challenging the colonially-influenced stereotypes of Tūhoe that continue to hold authority today. At this juncture, I then turn to focus upon Foucault’s methodological approaches, known as archaeology and genealogy. The archaeological method is the process of uncovering and identifying the boundaries of what can be said about a given topic, in identifying the ‘shape’ of a discursive formation. For my project, this entails a careful examination of the way Tūhoe have been described in early and recent literature, because this has informed the manner in which the state has interacted with them over the last two hundred years (these are the foci of Chapters V and VI). By contrast, the genealogical method highlights alternative ways of ‘knowing’ a person, topic or thing – “discontinuous, disqualified, or nonlegitimized knowledges”, as Foucault describes (2003: 9). For my research, these ‘nonlegitimised’ knowledges are the alternate ways of knowing Tūhoe that break free from colonial typecasts. Such ‘disqualified’ knowledges of Tūhoe form the basis of Chapters VI and VII (I outline these shortly). The principal political objective of my project, then, is about debunking and interrupting the colonial stereotypes and imaginings of Tūhoe that have dominated over the last two hundred years. I have composed my thesis as an overarching counter-narrative to these prevailing discourses.
I then turn to a discussion of semiotics, or the study of signs, to demonstrate the communication of discourse through visual means. This has been a particularly powerful medium through which stereotypes of Tūhoe have been perpetuated, and at this point I enter into conversation with Swiss linguist Ferdinand de Saussure, and French philosopher Roland Barthes. However, as I discuss, visual tools can similarly be used to counter these stereotypes, by offering different representations to be put into discursive circulation. To this end, the latter half of Chapter VII is presented as a photographic essay of elements of everyday Ruatoki life, a life detached from colonial tropes of ‘savagery’ and ‘violence’. The last section of Chapter II details the visual ethnographic methods I adopted to realise this, drawing principally from the work of Sarah Pink (2013), and also comments on the manner in which I approached research, through working with Waitangi along my thesis journey.

**Born of earth and sky**

If the colonial discourses of Tūhoe have produced a particular ‘archive’ or ‘archaeology’ of representation, the remainder of my thesis is organised as a counter-narrative to these ‘imaginings’. This begins with a close investigation of Tūhoe histories, from the epoch of genesis in the heart of Te Urewera, until the early twentieth century. Centred on the theme of place, Chapter III explores the deeply spiritual relationship Tūhoe have with the land, as a people ‘born of earth and sky’. The intentions of this chapter are twofold. Firstly, it emphasises Tūhoe’s autochthonous ancestral emergence from within Te Urewera, reflecting the fusion that exists between land and people: Tūhoe are the land inasmuch as the land is Tūhoe (Te Awekotuku and Nikora, 2003). Secondly, it interrupts the discursive framing of Tūhoe as ‘savage’ and ‘isolated’ beings, by giving nuance to their historical interactions with the Crown. As I establish, early Tūhoe histories are defined by movement, communication, openness to new people and ideas, and of seeking out new horizons and opportunities. This chapter
highlights the violence of the settler colonial project in Te Urewera, and is fundamental in drawing the contextual picture within which the April 2014 raid (and other paramilitary incursions into Tūhoe communities) are situated. This context is central to the argument that settler colonial sovereignty is maintained through periodic flashes of violence against Indigenous peoples (Moreton-Robinson, 2015b; Watson, 2009).

**Competing sovereignties**

Chapter IV continues with the theme of place, adjusting our focus to concentrate upon the Crown’s violent inscription of sovereignty over Te Urewera, as control of Tūhoe’s most sacred and treasured inheritance – land – was wrested from their control. At this intersection, I introduce the thinking of the late scholar on settler colonialism, Patrick Wolfe. For Wolfe, “[t]erritoriality, the fusion of people and land, is settler colonialism’s specific, irreducible element”, (2016: *In Whole and In Part*, 2006: 388), a reflection that epitomises early Crown-Tūhoe interactions. Here we have another fusion – albeit premised on the logic of property and state sovereignty. “[C]ontests for land can be – indeed, often are – contests for life”, Wolfe explains (2006: 387), and for Tūhoe, this has meant the confiscation of land, invasion, infrastructural decimation, and duplicitous legal ploys, all engineered by the Crown to gain a foothold in Te Urewera and liquidate its attachment to its wealth. Wolfe describes this as the ‘logic of elimination’; the means by which settler colonial societies are established upon the destruction of Indigenous peoples (2006: 388). What unfolds in Te Urewera during the nineteenth century, then, is a competition of sovereignties, with the Crown’s monopoly on force eventually outmanoeuvring Tūhoe’s ability to defend themselves. Colonisation and invasion are not one-time events, but structural, on-going processes (Wolfe, 2006: 388; 2016: *In Whole and In Part*).
Professor Irene Watson, of the Tanganekald, Meintangk Boandik First Nations Peoples, of the Coorong and the southeast of South Australia,\(^\text{13}\) describes this as ‘re-enactments of originary violence’, a violence foundational to the settler colonial state (2009: 45-6). Settler colonialism is thus a perpetual war over land and resources, captured in the etymological relationship between ‘*terra*’ (land, earth) and ‘*terror*’ (*terrêre*, to frighten). Mark Neocleous, in his meditations upon cartographic violence, summarises this integral connection (2003: 412):

The notion of ‘territory’ is derived from a complex of terms: from *terra* (of earth, and thus a domain) and *territorium*, referring to a place from which people are warned off, but [it] also has links with *terrêre*, meaning to frighten. And the notion of region derives from the Latin *regere* (to rule) with its connotations of military power. Territory is land occupied and maintained through terror; a region is space ruled through force. The secret of territoriality is thus violence: the force necessary for the production of space and the terror crucial to the creation of boundaries. It is not just that sovereignty implies space, then, but that ‘it implies a space against which violence, whether latent or overt, is directed – a space established and constituted by violence’ (Lefebvre, 1974: 280) … A founding violence, and continuous creation by violent means, are the hallmarks of the state.

The originary violence this heralds must be continuously reinforced for the state to maintain its existential legitimacy (Neocleous, 2003; Watson, 2009), a concept I build from in exploring how this typifies the operation of the New Zealand settler colonial state *vis-à-vis* Ngāi Tūhoe. *Terra* thus conveys the state’s necessarily violent (and ‘terrifying’) control over land, a story true for Tūhoe’s early and recent encounters with the Crown. In this way, Tūhoe’s dispossessed ancestral lands are maintained through *terra*\(^\text{terror}\), a reality that Tūhoe – as a people descendant of Hinepūkohurangi – exist within. Influenced by this, and the similarly titled *Terror in our Midst? Searching for Terrorism in Aotearoa New Zealand* (Keenan, 2008a; see also Jackson 2008; Temara 2008; Hill 2008; Crawford 2008; Abel 2008; Hokowhitu 2008; Higgins 2008), and

\(^{13}\) Biography uplifted from University of South Australia, 2018.
particularly Maria Bargh’s chapter therein, *Wars of Terra* (2008), my thesis title emerged. Thus: *Terra in our Mist*. As Wolfe suggests, “Territoriality is settler colonialism’s specific, irreducible element … Whatever settlers may say – and they generally have a lot to say – the primary motive for elimination is not race (or religion, ethnicity, grade of civilization, etc.) but access to territory” (2006: 388). As I explore at length, the colonial politics of place, encapsulated within the notion of *terra*, accurately describes Tūhoe encounters with the Crown throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Chapter IV charts the histories of Crown violence in Te Urewera from the late nineteenth century, up until the 1916 police raid on Tūhoe’s famous prophet and visionary, Rua Kēnana (Binney, Chaplin and Wallace, 1996). As I explain, these events are reflective of the originary violence that contributed to the rise of the New Zealand settler colonial state, and further contextualises the more recent moments of state violence such as the 2014 raid.

*The invention of Tūhoe*

In the last decade, as my research has revealed, Tūhoe have been subject to numerous paramilitary raids comparable to that upon Waitangi’s whānau homestead in April 2014. The notion of ‘terror’ finds more palpable expression in the most widely known of those in recent memory – the ‘anti-terror’ raids of October 2007, codenamed ‘Operation Eight’. The police alleged that there were ‘terror training camps’ in Te Urewera, specifically in the Ruatoki Valley, and to this end deployed a full-scale raid with all manner of quasi-military and police technologies (Devadas, 2008; Keenan, 2008a; Sluka, 2010). Turning to the theme of representation, Chapter V casts our gaze beyond the 2007 raids to examine the colonial depictions of Tūhoe as ‘primitive’ and ‘savage’ beings, the discursive context within which the
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14 *Terror in our Midst?* is a collection of reflections upon the 2007 national ‘anti-terrorism’ operation which severely impacted Ngāi Tūhoe. This is a central focus of my thesis.
October and April raids occurred. This chapter is thus a critical examination of the ‘invention of Tūhoe’ within colonial discourses, which proclaim themselves as the ‘true’ way of knowing and understanding Tūhoe.

This necessitates a careful study of the discourse of ‘race’, as a destructive – and ontologically unstable – system of representation that valorised European peoples above the rest of the peopled, non-European world (Mills, 2011). Employing Foucault’s archaeological method, I undertake a close examination of the way in which Tūhoe are repeatedly described as ‘savage’ and ‘primitive’ throughout early and recent literature. This entails a close analysis of diary entries, travelogues, books, letters, newspaper articles, opinion pieces, and television and radio newscasts, in piecing together the ‘archive’ of colonial imaginings of Tūhoe. I also explore the continuation of this through television and print media broadcasts of ‘Tūhoe terrorism’ from 2007 onwards. This involves a detailed semiotic analysis of the myth of ‘Tūhoe terrorists’ produced by media broadcasters, through a careful examination of the signifiers that were employed to denote both a predisposition for violence, and ostensibly justify the claims of ‘terrorism’ alleged by the police. In this manner, I demonstrate how the earlier colonial discourse of ‘Tūhoe the savage’ was the discursive foundation from which it could be claimed that terrorism was afoot in ‘Tūhoe country’. Such an allegation could only have been made possible, I suggest, by the regimes of truth espoused by these discourses.

*Subjects of state violence*

Chapter VI continues the theme of representation through invoking Foucault’s genealogical approach. Here, I retell the experiences of four major paramilitary raids upon Tūhoe within the last ten years, including the 2007 and 2014 raids, as well as police operations in 2012 and 2016. In 2016 and 2017, I was privileged to live in Ruatoki, hosted by Waitangi’s whānau. While there,
I conducted multiple in-depth ethnographic interviews about these raids. Using these insights in conjunction with other documentary evidence, this chapter presents Tūhoe experiences of state violence, as ‘subjugated’ and ‘delegitimised’ knowledges that remain eclipsed by colonial depictions of Tūhoe. In essence, this is about giving Tūhoe the ability to tell their own stories, and produce their own systems of representation.

Chapter VI has two key purposes. It first provides a counter-narrative to the discourses of ‘Tūhoe the savage’, by using ethnography as a tool to disrupt this discursive formation. In other words, the state-perpetuated discourses of Tūhoe, and the media narrative around Operation Eight, sought to depict Tūhoe through a lens of savagery and unbridled violence. Kōrero from Tūhoe whānau themselves disrupt these stereotypes by giving volume and priority to their experiences, away from the representations propagated by the state. Secondly, this chapter expands upon the central theoretical contribution of my research. I assert that, in the New Zealand context, the settler colonial state periodically reinforces its sovereign right of existence through the negation of Indigenous sovereignty, a process most obvious at the frontier.

To do so, I draw on Foucault’s comprehensive analysis of power within Western liberal democracies, in what he terms ‘biopower’. In such a matrix of power, not all are deserving of the right to live and exist, and in the interests of the health and wellbeing of the wider population, those ‘undeserving’ are ‘let to die’ in various ways (Foucault, 2003a). This exemplifies the operation of the New Zealand settler colonial state, in which Tūhoe are considered an unassailable threat to settler sovereignty, and must be circumscribed through any means whatsoever. The recent raids upon Tūhoe communities are direct manifestations of this process, as ‘re-enactments’ of originary violence as per Watson’s thesis. At this juncture, I bring Wolfe into conversation with Italian philosopher Giorgio Agamben, whose meditations
upon the ‘state of exception’ (2005) – the abeyance of civil rights and the interregnum of the law itself that has become definitional to Western liberal democracies – offer an illuminating analysis of Tūhoe experiences of state violence.

*Matemate-ā-one*

Chapter VII returns us to Tūhoe philosophy through a dedicated meditation upon matemate-ā-one, and the sacred imbrication of people and place. Matemate-ā-one is the articulation of Tūhoe’s superior claim to sovereign legitimacy, and, as I go on to assert, this is what the settler colonial state finds so threatening about Tūhoe existence. Put simply: Tūhoe’s sovereign claim surpasses that of the Crown, despite the latter’s wholesale efforts at ‘eliminating’ their autochthonous counterpart. This discussion emphasises the particularly violent way in which the Crown has interacted with Tūhoe over the past two hundred years, which has necessitated a degree of aggression beyond that of the state’s dealings with other Māori sovereignties.

In this final chapter, I compare matemate-ā-one with European notions of land and sovereignty, the former of which derives its claim through autochthonous emergence from Te Urewera. To illustrate how land is definitional to Tūhoe existence, I once again draw upon Foucauldian thought by offering an alternative reading of ‘somatechnics’, a theoretical framework highlighting the essential role technology plays in shaping life (Pugliese and Stryker, 2009). For Tūhoe, I suggest that the land is the *techné*, or technology, that gives rise to life, as embodied through matemate-ā-one. This chapter includes a reflection upon how manaaki, as an everyday social practice, provides a critical counterpoint to Foucault’s understanding of biopower. Through perspectives from whānau of the Ruatoki Valley, I then examine how the police might better develop rapport and relationships with Tūhoe in the future.
Chapter VII closes this thesis by returning us to the theme of representation, through presenting the photographic essay of Ruatoki I spoke of earlier. “If power is everywhere, according to Foucault, and if freedom – along with the possibilities for resisting power – is contained within power itself”, as Halperin explains, then our focus should be on “locat[ing] the pressure points, the fault lines, the most advantageous sites within [discourses to do so]” (1995: 48). Therefore, as the physical body is the principal object of the discursive formations of Tūhoe, the body itself presents us with these ‘fault lines’ and ‘pressure points’ to produce what Halperin has described as “discursive counterpractices” (ibid. 48). “Suddenly,” as Foucault describes, “what had made power strong becomes used to attack it. Power, after investing itself in the body, finds itself exposed to a counterattack in that same body” (1980: 56). The Tūhoe body is thus itself the means through which to resist, “…by revealing capacities and capabilities hitherto unforeseen by strategies of power” (Randell-Moon and Tippet, 2016a: 209).

The photographs interwoven throughout this thesis (and Chapter VII specifically) exemplify this discussion, by offering an alternate optic of representation that instead focuses on Ruatoki whānau going about their everyday lives, as mokopuna, parents, grandparents, Aunties and Uncles. This is what is so emancipatory about Foucault’s conceptualisation of power: there are always other representations of reality, and through the strategic use of knowledge, we ourselves can disrupt the prevailing discourses of Tūhoe. The point, then, is to short-circuit the power-knowledge duality that frames Tūhoe in reference to violence and savagery, contesting these racialised regimes of representation. For, as Stuart Hall insists, “meaning can never be [full and] finally fixed’ (1997b: 269-70, his emphasis). Lastly, I have incorporated a series of vignettes from my fieldwork throughout the chapters that follow, principally drawn from my fieldnotes and journal entries. They are snippets of my experiences while I was in and around
Ruatoki, and are intermittently presented to ‘ground’ the heavier discussions this thesis presents. As ethnographic ‘moments’, they too contribute to disrupting these broader regimes of representation.

KO WAI AU?15 POSITIONALITY AND REFLEXIVITY

The last section of this Introduction is an autoethnographic reflection upon my positionality within this research project. This is particularly important for me because I have often struggled with the ethical question of my right to be involved in this research at all – and it is quite possible that I do not have any right to deliberate upon this topic. Tūhoe, and Tūhoe alone speak for themselves, and it is not for anyone else to do so. I am but a vehicle through which specific Tūhoe experiences of state violence might be expressed, in addressing what I saw to be an extraordinary injustice suffered by Waitangi and her whānau. Moreover, while I have Māori ancestry, I am not of Tūhoe descent – and to assume that shared Indigeneity would enable me to undertake this project is not only seriously misguided, but broaches upon essentialist ways of thinking (we are not all the same!).

I have attempted to approach this project in the most respectful way possible, and right from my conversation with Waitangi in 2014, explored with her what my research might look like, and again – more crucially – if I have a right to do any of this in the first place. Throughout my preparatory thesis stages, through to fieldwork and writing, I periodically got in touch with Waitangi to seek her advice, or clarify issues of importance. I would often send her excerpts of my writing, to ensure both that I was accurately conveying information, and that my writing style was understandable (given that academic prose is not always celebrated for its clarity).16

15 The translation, ‘Who am I?’, is layered with the added meaning of, ‘What right do I have to be here?’
16 Again, Foucault!
This thesis is a manifestation of matemate-ā-one, of the relationship between myself and Waitangi, and I have endeavoured towards accessibility for this very reason.

The autoethnography that follows traces the journey of my life, in bringing forth the ‘uniqueness of self’ that positions where I stand in relation to this research. Reflexivity, the critical reflection of self in the process of ethnographic research, is central to this. This is to recognise and acknowledge that our emotions, subjectivities, and positionalities – determined by factors such as race, class and gender – intimately shape and influence the research we do and the ethnographic representations we produce (Pink, 2013: 36). In Indigenous research, Linda Tuhiwai Smith insists on the “constant need for reflexivity” in recognising the dynamic nature of relationships in research (2003: 137), and, more broadly, feminist Donna Haraway urges us to be “relentlessly visible” and open to critique from the onset and throughout (Haraway, 1997: 36). In other words, reflexivity is the awareness of one’s position within research, appreciating that our ‘uniqueness of self’ will impact upon how research unfolds. In recognising the imbalance of force relations (per Foucault) that exist from moment to moment, remaining continuously reflexive in research helps recognise the effects of this in day-to-day practice.

In particular, reflexive practice helps to shed light on the points at which, during my fieldwork, these impacts became exceptionally manifest. As I detail, class and formal education were the most salient axes of difference that notably shaped my everyday interactions with whānau in Ruatoki. I think it naïve to suggest such force relations can ever be neutralised, but I do feel it is important to attempt to mitigate their effects. In folding my autoethnography within my overall methodological approach, the following reflection is a narrative of the subjectivities I have taken up throughout my life, with particular reference to the subject positions whānau in
Ruатoki saw me as fulfilling. This is principally informed by the influences of ‘race’, class, gender, and education, and my discussion charts the watershed moments of my life up until the present. It is a deeply personal first-person reflection of my life, and introduces the reader to who I am.

Islands of difference

Like many Māori of the 1980s who crossed the Tasman Sea in search of better prospects in Australia, Mum met my biological father while working in the comparatively cosmopolitan metropolis of Melbourne. Mum had grown up in the far South Island during the 1950s and 1960s, after Grandma (Tainui, Ngāti Maniapoto) had moved away from her hau kāinga (ancestral home, ‘the winds of home’) in the central Waikato. There were many reasons for this – familiar to all who have shared the desire to ‘get away’ from home – and when Grandma met Granddad (Pākehā (New Zealander of British European descent) of Scottish heritage) in the early 1950s, their adventures took them well beyond the reaches of home territory, and eventually to the then-fledgling township of Queenstown. When Mum recounts her upbringing to me, she mentions how hers was one of only three Māori whānau in the roughly thousand-person alpine community, where “everyone thought we were suntanned or Italian, but not Māori.” In our family (and here, I am speaking of my maternal whānau, around whom I grew up), Grandma, Mum and I are the only ones with brown skin; a trait (thus far) shared only by the eldest of the eldest. Mum’s earliest experience of race – that is, what it meant to ‘be Māori’ in post-war New Zealand – came when she was visiting our northern relatives in the early 1960s, at the age of about five. As she lined up for an ice-cream at a local dairy, the proprietor told her to “get to the back of the line”, because she was Māori. Upset and confused

17 These are tribal affiliations.
by both the instruction and the implication, Mum began to cry. “That was the first time I
experienced racism”, she told me. Such ‘disorientation’ – if I may adopt such a diplomatic tenor
– is an all too familiar experience for many Māori, Pasifika and other peoples of colour growing
up in New Zealand, as it was for me in the South Island during the early 2000s.

I was born in Melbourne in early 1990, to parents with both whakapapa Māori and whakapapa
Pākehā. I therefore descend from the dynasties of Ngāti Maniapoto, Tainui (both of the central
Waikato region), Ngāti Awa, Ngāi Te Rangi (of the Bay of Plenty), and Ngāi Kōtirana
(Scotland). While my Ngāti Awa ancestors neighboured Ngāi Tūhoe, I am not of Tūhoe
descent. I am privileged, however, to have been sheltered in Te Rohe Pōtē o Tūhoe (The
Encircled Boundaries of Tūhoe) on many occasions, out of which this thesis project has
emerged. Much of my early youth was spent with my paternal grandparents, Aunties, Uncles
and cousins, and us cousins would often stay together at our Nan and Pop’s cork-floored flat
in South Auckland, with mattresses or beds lined up side by side in the garage. On other
occasions, we would stay with our wealthier Aunty and Uncle in central Auckland, who would
regularly host extravagant dinner parties with all manner of celebrities in attendance. Our Nan
was not someone to be trifled with. She ruled with an iron mouth (and sometimes fist), and
you never wanted to get on her wrong side. Poppa, on the other hand, was not one for shouting.
His voice was reserved for more important endeavours, such as singing to his grandchildren –
a favourite song of his being Jim Reeves’ He’ll Have to Go.

But down south was really home for me. Grandma and Granddad lived in South Canterbury,
and after I was born, Mum took me home to live with them. Grandma and Granddad were
kind and gentle, both of whom indulged me beyond the limits of their means. We arrived in
the autumn, and I often found that a fitting reflection of the aged gifts of wisdom and patience
they so freely gave away. Granddad used to take me hunting for pine cones in the garden, and
built me my first toy aeroplane. I thought, given that I had been given a creature of flight, that
it would take to the sky after my launching it. It nosedived to the ground and was quickly
returned for urgent repairs. Soon thereafter, we moved to Gisborne, where my younger sister
was born, and Mum helped establish a retirement home for the Nannies and Poppas of the East
Coast. There I attended Kōhanga Reo (Māori-immersion preschool), and all of my initial
instruction in arithmetic and literacy was conducted in Māori. Changing to mainstream
English-speaking schools proved difficult, and once we moved to Auckland, I had major
reading problems at school. I grappled with understanding words, and would pronounce them
in my head as if I were speaking Māori. Although I was put into Reading Recovery, understanding English was a constant struggle. To teachers unfamiliar with my Kōhanga Reo
background (nearly all of them), I was often cast aside as ‘just another troublesome Māori boy’.
I was always in trouble with two of my primary school teachers, in Auckland and Christchurch
respectively (to where we later moved). One’s temper was constantly being set off by any
number of things I did. The other made jokes about my name (it apparently being too
effeminate for a boy), and both insinuated I would never get anywhere because of who – and
what – I was: a young Māori boy. Although I was young, I remained acutely aware of how
differently both of these Pākehā women treated me in comparison to my Pākehā classmates.

Yet it was my primary schooling in the South Island where I first realised what it meant to ‘be
Māori’, or rather, what it meant to be a brown-skinned boy in a white world. Granddad died in
1996, and I went to live with Grandma in the South Island, as a way to keep her mind occupied
by looking after her young mokopuna (grandchild). None of my maternal cousins had brown
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18 Reading Recovery is “…an effective early literacy intervention designed to significantly reduce the number of children with literacy difficulties in schools” (National Reading Recovery, 2018).
skin, and nor did anyone in my class at primary school. The norm of whiteness was so powerful in this community, and my skin so obviously different from everyone else’s, that one night I dreamed it as possible to change the colour of my skin through the consumption of orange or mandarin peel. I ate a lot of citrus peel that week, convincing myself that the terribly bitter taste was a test of my resolve to determine my worthiness to receive the gift of white skin. While I don’t remember many specific examples of the obviousness of my difference, the dream I had was so vivid, and its message so resoundingly clear, its overt gesture towards norms of whiteness remains unmistakable. Like Fanon lamented in *Black Skin White Masks* (1986), I felt my brownness imprisoned me, as people constantly pointed out my inescapable epidermal existence.

When we moved to Auckland, Mum constantly worked night shifts to make sure my younger sister and I had all we needed. We shifted from place to place across the vast reaches of the city, staying in spare rooms or garages of whānau and family friends. When times were particularly tough, I might go and live with a relative elsewhere, as the case with my move to live with Grandma. We would create our own little worlds in the garage we were then living in. We never went without, even though we had so little. Mum sacrificed everything, just as her parents did for her. Being a young Māori woman, however, did not stand in Mum’s favour: she was told, in no uncertain terms by her careers advisor in the 1970s, that her only options were to become either a nurse, secretary, or teacher – dashing her adolescent hopes of becoming an archaeologist.

When I was about 10, we moved to Christchurch, and I was quickly drafted into one of my school’s rugby teams. I enjoyed the game itself, but loathed its culture. “Rugby men don’t knit!”, berated my coach upon once seeing me knitting a scarf. The same sentiment was attached to
my love of reading, the insinuation – from other male influences in my life – that ‘real men’ and ‘real boys’ find enjoyment in the outdoors, and not in literature. On one occasion, I was punished for reading under the covers by torchlight after my bedtime, which reinforced for me that to read was taboo – or at least outside the expectations of appropriate masculinity. Such norms assumed new gravity as we moved south to Timaru, where I completed my intermediate and high schooling.

Although I flourished in my intermediate education – at a low decile school with a particularly committed set of teachers – my Roman Catholic secondary schooling was an entirely different scenario. Conservative values of the broader community were reified (and deified!) in this environment, demarcating the ambit of proper masculine behaviour – and policed therein by pupils and teachers alike. This template of masculine expression was framed in terms of emotional stoicism, unquestioningly heterosexual attitudes and behaviour (with an overt willingness to castigate those who were perceived to exist exterior from this norm), regular social interaction outside of school premised on considerable consumption of alcohol, certainly not interested in art as a school subject (as I was), and certainly not eloquent in speech (as I also was). To add to this, being visibly Māori – that is, having obvious ‘epidermal difference’ – precipitated a further series of expectations bound up in notions of race: athletic prowess, and a strict preference for physicality rather than intellectuality. This ‘difference’ is crucial to note: my sister, who was born with fair skin and dusty brown hair, was not read as ‘Māori’ in the same way I was, and, by the same token, such discourses of race were not attached to her body as they were mine.

Although Mum was earning a bit more, money was still tight. She continued to sacrifice so that we had access to opportunities, in sports, music, a school trip to Australia, school camps, and
new school uniforms for my sister and I when we started high school. We lived in a rural farming community about half an hour’s drive from the town; we occupied part of bourgeois society, but were not fully constituent members of it. That, however, did not immunise me from recognising patterns of bourgeois behaviour: I quickly learned the codes of what was ‘acceptable’ bourgeois costume, appropriate consumer choice (even though we were Pak’n'Save patriots, not of the New World elite), and norms of whiteness vis-à-vis Māori. In the latter, for example, at high school I actively partook in propagating racist slurs and jokes about my own whakapapa and ancestry. On another occasion, in the aftermath of the heavily mediated and racialised representation of the October 2007 raids, I uncritically consumed the images and implications of what local and national media were circulating, believing them to be conveying the truth of ‘Tūhoe terrorists’. The interpretation of this by my classmates, however, suggested instead that all Māori were terrorists (a heterogeneous view of Māoridom being foreign to them), and, by following this logic, so must I be.

My modulation of self-expression to conform to the norms of whiteness extended also to my pronunciation of Māori words. Despite having been raised in Kōhanga Reo, I purposely mispronounced Māori words throughout the majority of my primary and secondary schooling, in conforming to local orthodoxy. Such conditioning meant also that my voice (and accent) differed from how my northern whānau spoke. On the few occasions we visited relatives in the North Island, while I was still at primary school, this was consistently a point of irritation for my cousins (and some Aunties and Uncles) who said that I sounded and acted ‘too Pākehā’. During my Koro Rangi’s tangi (ritual of farewell) in the 1960s, Mum experienced precisely this sort of prejudice, albeit two generations before. During my visit, however, we were in the
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wharenui of our marae (community meeting plaza of ancestral significance) listening to our kaumātua (elder) orate, and I sat enthralled by his kōrero. Some of my kaihara wāhine (female cousins) were in the wharenui, but I was the only rangatahi tāne (male youth), and so the orating kaumātua instructed me to leave because I should be outside with ‘the men’. Out on the driveway, an older cousin of mine (who played premier rugby) lined us up and told us that as ‘real tāne’ (men), we had to learn our whānau haka (posture dance performance), and boisterously perform it with great vociferousness to underscore the mana of our hapū (clan). Failing to do so – or rather, failing to assume this subjectivity without question – implied you were not a ‘real Māori’. Needless to say, no mana was added to our hapū that day on my behalf!

As I later explain, there is no ‘right’ or ‘wrong’ way to be Māori, and to suggest otherwise is precisely the kind of thinking that perpetuates racism in the first place. I wanted to learn how to prepare the wharekai (dining hall) for hosting, and cook in the kitchen, but this did not conform to the gender roles instilled in the crucible of the marae. In the eyes of many of my relations, therefore, I did not fit into subject positions determined by gender, and this, coupled with my preference for intellectual curiosity over overt displays of haka-qualified masculinity, led some of our kaumātua to label me an isolationist recluse. Elsewhere, in my later life, when I returned to various of my marae in the Waikato and Bay of Plenty, some Aunties would point and say, ‘Who’s that Pākehā boy over there?’, denoting my comparatively lighter complexion. While the statement itself may appear innocuous, it accentuates my on-going contradictory reality of being too white in a brown world, and too brown in a white world. Once familiar with who I was, however, the same Aunties insisted I sit in the front of the car when driving around the motu (land; island; region), “because men sit in the front.”
I moved to university in the southern city of Dunedin after completing secondary schooling, and felt liberated from the matrices of conservatism and racism I had previously been subject to. It was here that I felt my intellectual curiosity was rewarded, and I could ‘think’ without having to qualify or hide it. Yet it was also where lines of what it meant to be a ‘real Māori’ continued to be patrolled, and I was again faced with the allegation, amongst Māori peers, that I was ‘too Pākeha’ in both the way I acted and spoke, and the endeavours I pursued. In this context, I often felt like my intellectuality, as a Māori male, did not fully qualify me to be a ‘real Māori’, and in one situation some of my peers lambasted me for “actually doing the readings [for a paper]” and critically engaging with the course content and materials. Indeed, I have often felt that a “persistent spectre of inauthenticity”, as distinguished anthropologist Margaret Jolly has fittingly described it (1992: 49), has loomed large throughout my life. Later, on a trip with one of my Pākehā flatmates to visit her cousin employed as an itinerant worker on a farm in North Otago, we were hosted by the family who owned the farm. Over our final dinner there, the (white, male) farmer (whom I had never previously met) pointed to me and said, “When you first arrived, I thought you were the dumb one, and you [(pointing to my Pākehā flatmate)] were the smart one. But after hearing you [(me)] talk, I think you’re the dumb one [(pointing to my Pākehā flatmate)] and you [(pointing to me)] are the smart one.” The confidence of his proclamation, despite having no prior information about who I was, can only be explained by the discourses of race attached to my body as a young Māori male.

I continued on with my tertiary education in Dunedin to complete an Honours degree in Māori Studies, a Master’s degree in Anthropology, both at the University of Otago, and an Automotive Engineering qualification from the Otago Polytechnic (when the realisation finally dawned on me that I was useless in any technical or practical endeavour). Today, my university education continues through working towards a doctorate in Pacific Studies from the Australian National
University, the product of this thesis. The privilege bestowed upon me to undertake this level of education is humbling, from the financial and moral support from my parents and grandparents, to the several considerable university scholarships and stipends I have received. Over time, this privilege has afforded me significant class entitlement. This includes, but is by no means limited to: upward class mobility; lucrative employment opportunities; immunisation from WINZ\(^\text{20}\) (having never had to apply for emergency accommodation, a government benefit, a ‘WINZ approved’ firewood request, or a food grant); the ability to afford a comfortable standard of living; confidence in the knowledge that my references for rental accommodation will more than suffice; and other opportunities such as considerable overseas travel, and internationally representing New Zealand as part of a youth leadership delegation to Japan in 2015.

The point I have been implicitly suggesting throughout this discussion is not to shy away from this constellation of privilege – and to suggest differently, I feel, would be disingenuous. It would trample on the mana of all of those who sacrificed for my benefit. Rather, it is important to recognise that the intersecting axes of class, race, gender, sexuality and so forth revolve differently in different situations, affording us entitlement in some spaces while denying them to us in others. Further, I have attempted to complicate straightforward readings of prejudice and racism – that racism is a unidirectional phenomenon only occurring from one group to another – whereby, in the words of Māori lawyer and prison abolitionist Julia Whaipooti, “…just because you stand for one kaupapa [(purpose)] does not inoculate you from perpetuating other forms of oppression” (Whaipooti, 2018). In other words, prejudice and

\(^{20}\) Work and Income New Zealand, the department that facilitates employment and provides financial assistance. There is considerable ire held towards this department for its many failings (Armstrong, 2018; Edmunds, 2018; Hutton, 2018; Ineson, 2018; Newshub, 2018; Radio New Zealand, 2018a), and is comparable to that of Centrelink in the Australian context.
oppression can be perpetuated by anyone, at any time and place, regardless of our social, cultural, economic, and political orientations – what post-colonial feminist Chela Sandoval has referred to as “horizontal hostility” (2000: 74). As one of my Uncles once remarked, “At times, we Māori are our own worst enemy.” This reinforces how messy, disordered, and complex our existences really are, especially so for growing up brown in a white community.

Reflexivity in my doctoral research

This brief autoethnographic reflection has sought to highlight my ‘uniqueness of self’, and the constellation of factors that have made me who I am. While a discussion of the intersecting axes of race, gender, class, and education was central to this, the latter two of these most notably differentiated me from whānau in Ruatoki while I was there. When I first accompanied Waitangi to her home in 2014, I was very much read as an urbanised ‘city Māori’, who did not conform to common expectations of what it meant to ‘be Māori’. Later, on other occasions, whānau often remarked, “You’re what we call a learned Māori”, a gesture not only to my formal education, but also my style of spoken speech. In situations such as these, I felt caught between two tensions. While I recognised this as a compliment, and in no way wanted to rebuke it for fear of appearing disrespectful, the status of superiority it implied made me decidedly uncomfortable. It assumed that knowledge I possessed was somehow of a greater order to that of whānau, and on numerous occasions, they would defer to my ‘expertise’ during discussion. I would often attempt to redirect this by asking for their opinions, without being disingenuous (for if I had a perspective to add, and it was asked of, I would produce it). Being honest and truthful was what whānau preferred above all else, and we often laughed about my quirks and idiosyncrasies as a ‘city Māori in Ruatoki’ to this end. I made many, many mistakes, but endeavoured to learn from them all the same.
One such blunder was underscored during my fortnightly kai (food) shop for the whānau. The brands of products, cuts of meat, and even type of toilet paper I selected were all reflective of my own bourgeois shopping choices. Although my whānau struggled when I was young, I now lead a life of comparative privilege. This upward class mobility, however, has meant that I have become conditioned to such a lifestyle, and in the crucible of the supermarket, this was very much revealed through what I bought. On one occasion, for example, I returned to the homestead with, among other things, frozen organic free range chickens, and mint, lime and sage infused handwash(!). This created an uncomfortable situation in which the whānau were anxious about using these products, and served to accentuate the relations of force between me (as an urbanised, educated, comparatively wealthy person) and the whānau themselves. I had inadvertently exposed them to humiliation, insinuating that their shopping choices were somehow ‘less than’ mine. I kicked myself at having made such a foolish mistake, as this was the reverse of all that I had intended.

However, it is not about the intent, but rather the effect of our actions that is the salient issue. Allow me to carefully qualify this: my purchasing of kai was a way in which I felt I could materially contribute to whānau life. Although it never occurred to me, I would have felt that modulating my shopping preferences would imply the whānau were not deserving of that which I was. [The mere tone of this makes me uncomfortable]. This would be an unmitigated act of disrespect, and a deep insult to their mana, which is why it never occurred to me in the first place. However, upon realising the alternate way this gesture could be interpreted, I quickly modified my practice. While this is one example of many, it was the most acute moment that drew attention to my class-determined positionality. This highlights the complex nature of
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power relations in a research setting, and demonstrates the need to take a considered approach in mitigating the effects of the dynamics each situation brings. As whānau ‘got to know me’, this process became more straightforward. I remain, however, a fledgling in all of this, and this is why the exercise of reflexivity is paramount. This will be an on-going learning curve for me, as I nurture in perpetuity the relationships I have with Waitangi and her whānau.

As a final comment, this is not simply a ‘thesis project’, but rather a reflection of relationships forged through matemate-ā-one. For me, this means continually returning to Ruatoki as and when I can, in ‘popping in for a cup of tea’ – with Griffin’s finest in hand\(^{22}\) – to update whānau on my PhD progress, and to simply catch up on how life is going. In closing this Introduction, I offer two reflections that both inspire and capture the passion I have for my doctoral project. They are fitting words to inaugurate the discussions ahead:

First there [were the great ancestors of Tūhoe,] Pōtiki, Toi and Hape. They claimed the land and held it. Then came the canoe Mataatua and its people. They tilled the earth and made laws for the benefit of and to ensure the survival of all the people. Then the Pākehā came to settle, they forced our people off the land and claimed it for themselves.

— Paki ‘Kūpai’ McGarvey at Te Rewarewa, Ruatoki, October 25, 1970.\(^{23}\)

Because they claim to be concerned with the welfare of societies, governments arrogate to themselves the right to pass off as profit or loss the human unhappiness that their decisions provoke or their negligence permits. It is a duty of this international citizenship to always bring the testimony of people’s suffering to the eyes and ears of governments, sufferings for which it’s untrue that they are not responsible. The suffering of men must never be a silent residue of policy. It grounds an absolute right to stand up and speak to those who hold power.

— Michel Foucault, *Libération*, 1984.\(^{24}\)
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\(^{22}\) These being biscuits.

\(^{23}\) In O’Connor, 1997, p. 8.

\(^{24}\) In Chomsky and Foucault, 2006, p. 212.
Figure 6: Ruatoki, with no macrons! This is a flag for the Ruatoki Kōhanga Reo, draped in Uncle Smokey and Whaea Kēke Awhi’s shed. Ruatoki, 2016. Photograph by Tatsiana Chypsanava.
Figure 7: Gazing into the heart of Te Urewera from the basin of the Ruatoki Valley. Our view is flanked on the left by the ridgeline, Te Tāhū o Haokitaha. Ruatoki, 2016. Photograph by Tatsiana Chypsanava.
CHAPTER II: THEORETICAL ORIENTATIONS

Figure 8: Te Kāhui o Matariki, known also as Makali‘i, Pleiades, the Seven Sisters, Mutsuraboshi, Subaru, and Messier 45. Matariki (Alcyone) is the most radiant, prominent star of the cluster (at centre left), who “…married Rehua (Antares) and is the mother of the other eight stars of the Pleiades known to Māori. The other eight stars are: Tupuārangī (Atlas), Waipunarangi (Electra), Waiti (Maia), Ururangi (Merope), Tupuānuku (Pleione), Waitā (Taygeta), Pōhutukawa (Sterope) and Hiwa-i-te-rangi (Calaeno). The first appearance before sunrise of Matariki in the north-eastern sky, in the Tangaroa phase of the lunar month, indicates the beginning of the Māori year – about mid-June – and is the cause for celebrations” (Moorfield, 2018a). Photograph by NASA, ESA and AURA/Caltech (2004).

A GALAXY OF INTELLECTUAL INSPIRATION

In times past, our forebears gazed heavenward for guidance and direction, as they circumnavigated the tremendous breadth of the Pacific Ocean, and nurtured life and existence therein. Deified both in the sea and in the stars, our primal ancestors responded in kind, offering their wisdom and knowledge to allow our tūpuna (ancestors) to chart their oceanic
voyages, or tend to crops of kūmara (*sweet potato*) in the earth. The lunar calendar of the Māori year, for example, is inaugurated by the appearance of Te Kāhui o Matariki on the horizon, the brilliant cluster of stars, known also as Pleiades, observed throughout the northern and southern hemispheres. In writing my methodology, I am reminded of this interplay between earth and sky, and similarly, consider the thinkers and philosophers from whom I draw inspiration an intellectual galaxy that has shaped and informed the contours of my research project. The brightest stars of this island universe are the elders and whānau of Ruatoki, who, through various kōrero over kai and cups of tea, helped refine and give nuance to my topic, including Waitangi, Mum, Dad, Juanita, Des, Whare, Aunty Waicy, Angie, Uncle Peho, Koro Bill, and the dozens of tamariki and pakeke (*adults*) therein.

Elsewhere in the constellation are found a series of poststructural and postcolonial philosophers, such as Michel Foucault, Edward Said, and Roland Barthes, and in later chapters of this thesis, Brendan Hokowhitu, Aileen Moreton-Robinson, and Irene Watson. I realise that it is problematic to use Foucault, a white, French intellectual with no ostensible connection to Indigenous existence, in a distinctly Indigenous research project, since, as Hokowhitu observes, “his work was not designed to examine the postcolonial condition” (2013: 226). Nevertheless, his meditations on power and resistance offer compelling insights into the violent operation of contemporary Western liberal democracies, and his methods of historical investigation afford a cogent opportunity to debunk prevailing stereotypes of Tūhoe. For Aileen Moreton-Robinson, a scholar of Goenpul descent, deploying Foucault’s thinking within an Indigenous context is a matter of necessity and convenience, both because his work “gave a name to something I already knew”, but also because “Indigenous knowledges don’t hold the epistemologically privileged position within the academy. [W]e have to find people we can fight
with” (2015). This, in conjunction with Foucault’s analysis of state sovereignty, is the principal reason I draw so heavily from his oeuvre.

I begin by outlining poststructuralist, postmodernist, and social constructionist approaches to research, before carefully examining Foucault’s conceptualisation of power and discourse. Power and resistance, he argues, are two ends of the same continuum, and I explain how this presents opportunities for challenging the colonially-influenced stereotypes of Tūhoe that continue to hold authority today. I then turn to outline Foucault’s archaeological and genealogical methods, before exploring the usefulness of semiotics to the analysis of racialised visual representations of Tūhoe. I conclude with a discussion of the methods of visual ethnography employed in my thesis project. I begin by returning to my 17 year-old self, and my reaction to news of the ‘Tūhoe raids’.

POSTSTRUCTURALISM AND POSTMODERNISM: “YOU CAN’T HANDLE THE TRUTH!”

When I first heard news of the ‘anti-terror’ raids in October 2007, I was in my seventh form (or final year) of secondary school. The implicit, unquestioned assumption that lay at the forefront of my mind, as I consumed the barrage of media imagery and text about the raids, was that the stories recited on the news represented an unassailable, irrefutable truth about ‘Tūhoe terrorists’. For me, the narrative proliferated by the police, newspapers, and television broadcasts – that Tūhoe, the rebellious, ‘savage’ inland tribal people of the eastern North Island, had conspired to commit acts of terrorism, and the New Zealand Police had intervened in the interests of ‘protecting public safety’ – was precisely what had transpired in fact. To take apart this pervasive series of assumptions is to reveal the inherent instability of what is deemed ‘truth’, for the stories that Tūhoe have of their own experiences of the raids are irreconcilable with the account espoused by the police.
In the throes of this, however, one version of events – the ‘official’ narrative – is given precedence at the expense of others. Recognising this difference jars open the assumptions and beliefs we have of the world around us, for both stipulations cannot simultaneously claim to be the exclusive bearers of truth and reality – yet only one interpretation is stamped with the signature of authority in the retelling of this story. Coming to terms with the unreliability of ‘truth’ is confusing, disconcerting, and uncomfortable, as it shakes apart our taken-for-granted beliefs of the worlds we occupy and exist within. Indeed, there is something to be said of the belligerent Colonel Jessup’s (Jack Nicholson) irate exasperation that Lieutenant Kaffee (Tom Cruise) “…can’t handle the truth!”, in the infamous court martial scene of *A Few Good Men*. Hollywood theatrics aside, let us turn to examine this through a more theoretical lens.

**SOCIAL CONSTRUCTIONISM**

What I have been urging here is to be critical of the way we think about and interact with the world, and that the categories that shape our existence (expectations bound up in masculinity or ‘race’, for instance) are not indicative of pre-existing divisions in the worlds we live within (Burr, 2015a: 3). Rather, “…our knowledge of the world, including our understanding of human beings, is a product of human thought rather than grounded in an observable, external reality” (Burr, 2015b: 222). This way of critiquing our embedded assumptions of the world is what is known as ‘social constructionism’, an approach that urges us to be critical of what is considered common-sense knowledge about ourselves and our realities (Burr, 2015a: 2; see also Hall, 1997). We may appear to have ostensibly obvious definitions of ‘man’, ‘woman’ and ‘child’ in our minds, but a social constructionist approach implies that these categories are neither fixed nor naturally occurring, but are culturally and historically specific. That is, “…all ways of understanding are historically and culturally relative … [as] products of that culture and
history, dependent upon the particular social and economic arrangements prevailing in that culture at that time” (ibid. 4).

Consider, for example, the term ‘Māori’. Before the arrival of European voyagers, there was no need for the multitudinous independent sovereign peoples – who occupied the lands now described as New Zealand – to identify themselves in an overarching way beneath one ‘catch-all’ term (Baker, 1945: 288-9; Howe, 2005). “Faced with newcomers who were physically, culturally and linguistically different”, describes famed social anthropologist Dame Joan Metge, “[those peoples] identified themselves as tāngata Māori, qualifying the plural noun tāngata (human beings) with the adjective māori meaning ‘normal, usual, ordinary’ as opposed to the unusual or extraordinary” (Metge, 2010: 59; see also Williams, 1975: 179; Walker, 1985). ‘Māori’, therefore, is not an intrinsic, pre-existing term exclusively used to describe a ‘kind of person’, but is instead an historically and culturally specific referent that emerged – and is accurately grasped only – from within this colonial context of encounter. To suggest otherwise implies that there is “…one reality unchanging through time and space, eternal and existing independently of us” – that ‘the Māori’, like an archetypal individual, is a static and unchanging figure throughout the vicissitudes of fate, exterior from economic, political, and social tides – and that there is an “essential nature of objects in the world” (Anderson, 2008: 49). The point that I am making, directly inverse to this proposition, is that there is no such rigid, universal or “true” reality: “…reality (the world) is constructed in and through the language we use” (ibid. 51). This is what is called a ‘poststructural’ or ‘postmodern’ way of thinking.

_Scepticism of universal truth_

Poststructuralism and postmodernism critique the notion that the world can be understood through a single, all-encompassing principle. They represent a break in thought from
positivism – the belief that reality can only be understood through scientific observation – and developed as modes of thinking in the latter half of the twentieth century (Anderson, 2008: 51). At their core, these theories urge us to be sceptical of claims to universal truth, or declarations that the world can be revealed to us through empirical observation. Postmodernism and poststructuralism reject the notion that there is a coherent structure undergirding reality to be discovered by scientific analysis (Burr, 2015a: 12-4), and reiterate that while there are multiple ways of understanding the world, only one version therein prevails as ‘the truth’. Michel Foucault considers this

…a battle ‘for truth,’ or at least ‘[a battle] around truth’ – it being understood … that by truth I do not mean ‘the ensemble of truths which are to be discovered and accepted,’ but rather ‘the ensemble of rules according to which the true or false are separated and specific effects of power attached to the true,’ it being understood also that it’s a matter not of a battle ‘on behalf’ of the truth, but of a battle about the status of truth and the economic and political role it plays (1984: 74).

In other words, there is no such thing as ‘one truth’, but rather multiple truths competing for space and authority (Anderson, 2008: 53; Burr, 2015a: 14). Social constructionism is informed by the broader tidal forces of postmodern and poststructural philosophy, and Roland Barthes, Louis Althusser, and Foucault are prominent proponents of this intellectual milieu (Anderson, 2008: 48, 51).

It is important at this point to clarify what I am speaking of. I am broadly highlighting the way in which European epistemologies have repudiated or delegitimated other knowledge systems or ways of being, such as Māori or other Indigenous epistemologies. While I have drawn on social constructionism to question the dominance of these Eurocentric ‘truths’, there is a risk

---

25 Some have suggested that postmodernism and poststructuralism are synonymous theoretical matrices, but this has been met with much debate. I am interested less in the technicality of these debates, but more in the essence shared by both theories, which proclaim a “scepticism about universal truth” (Anderson, 2008: 48-9; Burr, 2015a: 12-3).
that Indigenous epistemologies can similarly be undermined following this poststructural logic. Certain Māori epistemologies, for example, may be anchored by one all-embracing principle, such as whakapapa (genealogical ordering of the universe). These philosophical underpinnings can unintentionally become the object of poststructural critique, the reverse of my intentions here. I am not, therefore, commenting on Indigenous knowledge systems or ways of being, but rather colonial ontologies and epistemologies that have eroded the validity of the former.

Foucault’s modality for understanding the social world anchors around the intimate relationship between power and knowledge in constructing our realities (Foucault, 1980, 1978: 92-102; Foucault, Rabinow, Nikolas & Faubion, 2003; see also Smart, 1995: 71-120). As Nicole Anderson explains, “[Foucault’s] nexus between discourse, power and knowledge is the means by which he explores the ways people become both constrained and enabled to think in particular ways” (2008: 52). My interest here lies in how we speak and think about certain peoples, and how our treatment and interaction therein is predicated upon such ways of thinking. Central to this is the power and gravity that words have in shaping our realities. Similarly, Māori language expert Professor Timoti Karetu reflects on the violent potentiality of words themselves, within a Māori worldview:

The Pakeha have a rhyme which has the lines ‘sticks and stones may break my bones, but words will never hurt me’. In Maori society quite the opposite applies. The word is a very potent force as is evidenced by the following whakatauki [(proverb)], ‘He tao rakau e taea te karo, he tao kupu e kore e taea te karo’ (a wooden barb can be parried, but a verbal barb cannot) (Karetu, 1978: 71).

In brevity: words matter. For Foucault, language – and the way we use words – is of consequence because it informs everyday material practice: what we ‘say’ impacts upon how we ‘do’. A social constructionist approach to research underscores this by recognising the “constructive force of language” in constituting our realities (Burr, 2015a: 28). This is
fundamental for my research because the way in which Māori – and, more specifically, Ngāi Tūhoe – have been talked about and imagined in popular Pākehā consciousness, has directly impacted upon their treatment over the past two centuries. For my thesis, this entails a close investigation of words, descriptions, accounts and narratives of Māori and Ngāi Tūhoe from the perspectives of Europeans throughout history, from early encounters in the nineteenth century, right through to today. I deploy Foucault’s archaeological and genealogical methods to achieve this, but before explaining that, allow me to first introduce Foucault, and his conceptualisation of power and knowledge.

**FOUCAULT: LE SAVOIR-POUVOIR (POWER/KNOWLEDGE)**

Michel Foucault was a twentieth century French philosopher and historian of thought and ideas, who sought to understand the operation of power. Throughout his many research projects, including his analyses of the prison (Foucault, 1982a), madness in the age of reason (1973), and sexuality (1978), Foucault urged us to see power not as a property possessed by some who dispossess it of others, but rather as a series of interlocking “force relations” (1978: 92, 94). Power, he described, “…is produced from one moment to the next, at every point[,] … in every relation from one point to another” (ibid. 93). As queer theorist David Halperin explains, power is a relation of force that is “not possessed but exercised” (Halperin, 1995: 16, his emphasis, 16-19).

A brief example from my research is instructive. While in one moment, an elderly kuia was a subject of state violence during the October 2007 raids, in other moments she is a grandmother; an Aunty; a patron at a dairy; a member of a Board of Trustees; a principal of a school. The ‘force relations’ at play as a subject of state violence are vastly different from a principal speaking to pupils at morning assembly, and equally so for when a Ministry of Education official conducts a review of her performance in her role as school principal. This underscores
Foucault’s emphasis that “…[p]ower is everywhere; not because it embraces everything, but because it comes from everywhere” (1978: 93). Foucault’s summary is helpful:

Power is not a substance. Neither is it a mysterious property whose origin must be delved into. Power is only a certain type of relation between individuals. Such relations are specific, that is, they have nothing to do with exchange, production, communication, even though they combine with them. The characteristic feature of power is that some men can more or less entirely determine other men's conduct – but never exhaustively or coercively. A man who is chained up and beaten is subject to force being exerted over him, not power. But if he can be induced to speak, when his ultimate recourse could have been to hold his tongue, preferring death, then he has been caused to behave in a certain way. His freedom has been subjected to power. He has been submitted to government. If an individual can remain free, however little his freedom may be, power can subject him to government. There is no power without potential refusal or revolt (Chomsky and Foucault, 2006: 208).

As he identifies, subjecting an individual to extreme force is not an example of power (this, rather, is an instance where power has lost its hold), as power always entails the ‘potential for refusal’ and resistance. To be clear, Foucault was acutely aware of the oppression and domination perpetuated throughout modern society – and indeed, the political struggles of the time “directly inspired” his meditations on power (ibid. 25-6) – but was at pains to point out that this is not “…the whole story there is to tell when it comes to power” (ibid. 17).

**Power and resistance: Two sides of the same coin**

To traditional liberal scholarship, however, this statement – regarding the ‘all-encompassing’ nature of power – was controversial. It appeared to suggest a totalising, oppressive scenario, rendering escape, resistance or freedom impossible. However, this rests on the assumption that power is a substance possessed and oppressively wielded, an outlook that ignores Foucault’s cardinal qualification that “[w]here there is power, there is resistance[…] … points of resistance

---

26 My thanks go to Vivien Burr (2015a: 80-1) for this subtitle, and more generally for her incredible skill at translating the intellectual complexity of thinkers like Foucault into easily accessible explanations (Burr, 2015b).
[exist] everywhere in the power network” (1978: 95). To assume a coercive view of power is misguided, as he elaborates:

If power were never anything but repressive, if it never did anything but to say no, do you really think one would be brought to obey it? What makes power hold good, what makes it accepted, is simply the fact that it doesn’t only weigh on us as a force that says no, but that it traverses and produces things, it induces pleasure, forms knowledge, produces discourse. It needs to be considered as a productive network which runs through the whole social body… (Foucault, 1984: 60-1).

Therefore, power is not just about denial or suppression, but is a productive potentiality that “produces possibilities of action, of choice – and, ultimately, … produces the conditions for the exercise of freedom” (Halperin, 1995: 17). It is this productive nature of power that lies at the heart of contemporary Western liberal democracies, in which subjects choreograph their bodies and behaviours toward particular state-determined ends. Foucault explores these notions through his discussions of disciplinary power (Foucault, 1984: 169-256), biopower (ibid. 257-290) and governmentality (Foucault, 2008: 51-70). For now, the salient point is that the strategic effectiveness of power, from Foucault’s perspective, concerns the stimulation of action to facilitate economic – that is, efficient – population management (Randell-Moon and Tippet, 2016a: ix). Through the delineation of societal norms, individual bodies “gravitate towards objectives of population” that work in the interests of the state’s careful balance between resources and population (ibid. x, their emphasis).

Let us take New Zealand’s ‘5+ a Day’ campaign as an example, a ‘healthy eating’ mantra designed to encourage the consumption of at least “three servings of vegetables and two of fruit each day” (5+ a Day Charitable Trust, 2013). Promoting such staples as an appropriate diet produces a norm of behaviour around food and eating, and when whānau recognise and subscribe to this as a baseline for what are considered ‘healthy lifestyle choices’, they are
disciplining their bodies towards the ‘objectives of population’. For, as Foucault would suggest, disciplining the social body through diet produces a more resilient and healthy workforce – less reliant on state resources via regular medical intervention – and from whom the maximum potential for labour can be extracted. The ‘objectives of population’ here concern the body’s productivity within a capitalist economy, in which individuals freely (that is, without ostensible coercion) animate themselves towards supposedly apolitical ambitions (‘I am choosing to be fit and healthy’). Through this process, however, they are unwittingly rendered more docile subjects. This operation is a more effective form of social control because the state need not rely on its arsenal of violence to achieve its ends (although it retains this capacity through its monopoly on force), as exemplified by monarchical forms of authority through the spectacle of torture (Foucault, 1982b). While individuals ostensibly appear to make their own choices and decisions, this reflects the more calculated and insidious nature of these strategies of power (Foucault, 2008: 65). Liberal democratic states intrinsically depend upon individuals actively manipulating themselves in the overall direction of the ‘health’ of the body politic, by willingly inserting themselves into power relations as I have described here. “Relations of power-knowledge are not static forms of distribution”, therefore, but are “matrices of transformation” (Foucault, 1978: 99).

Nevertheless, power itself offers the means to resist because of its internal potentiality – it can produce effects of domination inasmuch as it can opportunities for resistance. This is because there are always alternative representations of reality, and so the prevailing systems of representation (discourses) can always be challenged (Anderson, 2008: 53). In other words, that which is considered ‘truth’ is constantly in danger of being knocked off its epistemological perch. The reappropriation of words is a striking illustration of this, exemplified in Halperin’s (1995: 48) discussion of San Francisco gay nightclub ‘Club Hypothalamus’. Here, an overtly
medicalised term – which had actively fuelled the objectification of the homosexual community – metamorphosed to become an insignia of gay pride and identity. This contextualises Foucault’s stipulation that “…the points, knots, or focuses of resistance are spread over time and space at varying densities, at time mobilizing groups or individuals in a definitive way, inflaming certain points of the body, certain moments in life, certain types of behaviour” (1978: 96). To summarise my discussion by way of metaphor, gravity may keep us tethered to the earth, but by our very existence we are always resisting its alluring pull, whether we are climbing hills, jumping up and down, or, to use a painful double entendre, doing ‘resistance’ training at the gym.27 Power is everywhere, indeed, but so is resistance.

The question of agency

In discussions with colleagues of mine about the deployment of Foucault’s thinking, many repeatedly asked “…where does agency fit into your discussion?” This remark, however, is complicated by my above descriptions of power. As I have already mentioned, relations of power are everywhere, but so too are possibilities to resist. Agency is often understood as embedded in a Western notion of individuality, that subscribes to the idea that power is something possessed. Yet as we have seen, for Foucault, resistance is always already imbued within the operation of power itself. For Professor of African American Studies Alexander Weheliye, using agency as a lens to make sense of power is unhelpful, because, “…as explanatory tools, these concepts have a tendency to blind us, whether through strenuous denials or exalted celebrations of their existence, to the manifold occurrences of freedom in zones of indistinction” (Weheliye, 2014: 2). He continues:

27 I am indebted to Holly Randell-Moon for this reflection during one of our many intellectually stimulating conversations, as well as her and Ryan Tippet’s discussion likewise deploying the same analogy in exploring Foucault’s conceptualisation of power (Randell-Moon and Tippet, 2016: x)
As modes of analyzing and imagining the practices of the oppressed in the face of extreme violence …[,] resistance and agency assume full, self-present, and coherent subjects working against something or someone … [W]e might come to a more layered and improvisatory understanding of extreme subjectification if we do not decide in advance what forms its disfigurations should take on (ibid. 2).

As he ponders, “Why are formations of the oppressed deemed liberatory only if they resist hegemony and/or exhibit the … agency of the oppressed?” (Weheliye, 2014: 2). Foucault’s response to this would again draw attention to the imbrication of power with resistance, and urges that every situation, every web of power relations, brings with it the potential to resist and ‘speak back’. This approach emphasises that articulations of resistance are manifold in everyday life, and we, as individual people, are ever-capable of such expression.

**Discourse**

Thus, power’s productive capacity frames how we think about certain topics (Anderson, 2008: 52). For Foucault, this functionality is facilitated by what he terms ‘discourse’: ways of knowing about a topic, event, or person, through a particular lens and from a particular perspective. More specifically, discourse denotes a “system of representation” (Hall, 1997: 44); a “set of meanings, metaphors … images, stories, statements and so on that in some way together produce a particular version of events” (Burr, 2015a: 74-5). Discourses, therefore, should be understood less as a series of linguistic statements (as an ordinary dictionary definition might suggest), and instead as bodies of power/social knowledge that frame how we think about certain topics (Anderson, 2008: 52). Discourses operate both to demarcate the bounds of what is knowable and sayable about certain topics at specific periods in history, but more crucially, also inform corporeal social practice in those realms. This is the linchpin for Foucault:
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28 It would be interesting to consider whether compliance with hegemony can be ‘liberatory’ – but for another time.
discourse is not just about what is said, but rather concerns what happens in everyday, material life. Foucault conceptualises power as knowledge because – and allow me here to repeat my earlier comment – what we ‘say’ impacts upon how we ‘do’; discourse influences how material practice unfolds. He describes this as ‘discursive formations’ of thought, in which

…a group of relations [is] established between authorities of emergence, delimitation, and specification[;] … one cannot speak of anything at any time; it is not easy to say something new[; discourse] does not pre-exist itself [but] exists under the positive conditions of a complex group of relations (Foucault 1982b: 44-5).

Similarly drawing on Foucault, renowned intellectual, literary critic and founder of postcolonial studies Edward Wadie Said points to the way in which

…texts can create not only knowledge but also the very reality they appear to describe. In time such knowledge and reality produce a tradition, or what Michel Foucault calls a discourse, whose material presence or weight, not the originality of a given author, is really responsible for the texts produced out of it (1978: 94, his emphasis).

The ‘Fact of Blackness’, for example, as revolutionary Black Algerian philosopher Frantz Fanon stipulates, ‘seals one into a crushing objecthood’ from which escape is impossible (1986: 109). He agonises over this in his visceral reflection in Black Skin White Masks:

‘Dirty nigger!’ Or simply, ‘Look, a Negro!’ I came into the world imbued with the will to find a meaning in things, my spirit filled with the desire to attain to the source of the world, and then I found that I was an object in the midst of other objects. Sealed into that crushing objecthood, I turned beseechingly to others. Their attention was a liberation, running over my body suddenly abraded into nonbeing, endowing me once more with an agility that I had thought lost, and by taking me out of the world, restoring me to it. But just as I reached the other side, I stumbled, and the movements, the attitudes, the glances of the other fixed me there, in the sense in which a chemical solution is fixed by a dye. I was indignant; I demanded an explanation. Nothing happened. I burst apart (1986: 109).
Alas, he laments, the Black body is unassailably black through and through. Yet, as Foucault reminds us, power itself presents us with possibilities of resistance, and it is within this very space, ostensibly so oppressive and totalising, that we may find possibilities for change.

Emphasising my earlier discussion of postmodernism and the absence of universal ‘truth’, discourses do not exist exterior from, but rather, are created through, human experience, at specific moments in time. Such ‘group relations’, Foucault identifies, are fostered through “institutions, economic and social processes, behavioural patterns, systems of norms, techniques, types of classification [and] modes of characterization” (ibid. 45). Discourses, then, are produced within specific historical and cultural contexts, and cannot be read as exterior from such sociohistorical matrices. Two brief examples helpfully illustrate this. The discourse of homosexuality – defined in contrast to the ‘normativity’ of heterosexuality – would have been absurd and fantastic in ancient Greece, where it was common practice for senior-ranking aristocrats (all of whom were men) to take a younger male as his sexual companion and “form an intimate bond” therein (Cole, Symes, Coffin & Stacey, 2012: 61-2). Secondly, the discourse of race – according some members of the species homo sapiens the status ‘fully human’ (white men), vis-à-vis those ‘biologically determined’ to be ‘less-than-human’ (the rest of the peopled non-European world) (Mills, 2011) – would not have made sense in the Roman Empire, where citizenship was the principal defining factor of belonging to the Roman world (Garnsey, 2006: 155; see also Eberle, 2017).29 As Jamaican-born cultural theorist Stuart Hall has observed, “[t]hings meant something and were ‘true’, [Foucault] argued, only within a specific historical

29 This is not to say that the Roman Empire did not have its own oppressive systems of representation, but is rather a reflection on the sociohistorical contingency of discourse. See Mary Beard’s work for more information (2009, 2015).
context’ (Hall, 1997: 46, his emphasis). Expressed in the alternative, discourse, therefore, is knowledge accepted as ‘common sense’ within a particular historical period.

The point here is to recognise that discursive formations render it preposterous to “…think outside [the confines of such formations] … [to do so is,] by definition, to be mad, to be beyond comprehension and therefore reason” (Young, 1981: 48). We ‘know’ people as they are situated within prevailing discourses, and by virtue of the ‘truth’ such discourses purport to uphold, we cannot know them in other ways. This is ‘common sense knowledge’, and is what Foucault terms ‘regimes of truth’:

‘Truth’ is … a system of ordered procedures for the production, regulation, distribution, circulation and operation of statements … Each society has its regime of truth, its ‘general politics’ of truth: that is, the types of discourse which it accepts and makes function as true; the mechanisms and instances which enable one to distinguish true and false statements, the means by which each is sanctioned; the techniques and procedures accorded value in the acquisition of truth; the status of those who are charged with saying what counts as true … [Truth] is produced under the control, dominant if not exclusive, of a few great political and economic apparatuses[, such as the] university, army, writing, [and] media (1982b: 74, 72-3).

In this manner, discursive formations sustain regimes of truth (Hall, 1997: 49). Only one discourse is inscribed with the signature of authority, and this version is maintained through institutions such as the academy, media, and popular literature.

The crucial point, however, is that discursive formations are fundamentally unstable because the ‘battle of truths’ is constantly being fought, which means that the prevailing notions of ‘truth’ can always be displaced. To underscore a point I made earlier, this is because every topic, event or person can be interpreted and remembered from a variety of different perspectives, just as the same sunset will be viewed differently from the belvedere of separate beaches. What I am urging, however, is that only one beach is promoted as ‘the beach’ to view the sun’s descent
into the oceanic horizon. Unintended or otherwise, therefore, discursive formations and
regimes of truth ultimately serve some political purpose. This is exemplified by the discourse
of ‘Māori the savage’, where, since first contact, Māori have been typecast as an innately savage
people in European consciousness, a consequence of Enlightenment thinking that “ranked
societies along an evolutionary scale from 'barbarism’ to ‘civilization’” (Hall, 1997b: 239).

As in other encounters between Europeans and the thousands of Indigenous peoples across the
planet, the rendering of non-European peoples (such as Māori) as subhuman was an
underlying rationale that mobilised the mass expropriation of Indigenous lands and resources
(Mills, 2011). As Walter Mignolo has elsewhere observed, “…you cannot exploit and
expropriate an equal. You have to make people inferior in order to … [manage] them and take
away their labor and their land” (2012). This is why, as Professor of Critical Psychology Vivien
Burr points out, dominant groups may look favourably on the ‘en-truth-ening’ of some
discourses and not others, because of the real-world implications that flow therein (2015a: 88).

Knowledge and power are interdependent components in a closed-circuit system: discourse
influences practice, which then reinforces that discourse as ‘true’ (Hall, 1997: 48-9, see also
2001: 74; Derrida, 1976: 158). It is a circular process, and is the means by which social control,
subjection, and domination is effected in modern society. This is the meaning behind
Foucault’s curious statement that discourses are “practices that systematically form the objects
of which they speak” (Foucault, 1982b: 49).

When an individual is exposed and susceptible to certain discourses, they are subject to the
operation of power-knowledge. For Foucault, this is the process of subjectification:
subjectivities (or ‘subject positions’) are produced when one is subject to power (1984: 7-11).
The principal effect of discourse is to give rise to (or ‘manufacture’) subjectivities, which
facilitates modes of social control. This involves a two-part process: first, power-knowledge produces recognisable subject positions through discourse, which are then ‘taken up’ by individual people. In order to apply for Māori scholarships at university, for instance, a person must generally ‘prove’ both their genealogical heritage, and a demonstrable contribution to their hapū and marae. This articulation of Indigeneity (of ‘being Māori’) is one produced in and through what might be described as the ‘Treaty-industrial complex’, and as one of my Ngāti Awa kuia mentioned some years ago, “We are seeing a new generation of Māori who are ‘Māori’ only when they need to be”. This is the productive capacity of power in action, and is why Foucault stipulates that “[m]y objective … has been to create a history of the different modes by which, in our culture, human beings are made subjects” (ibid. 7).

Burr summarises the imbrication of power-knowledge in the following way:

Any version of an event brings with it the potential for social practices, for acting in one way rather than another, and for marginalising alternative ways of acting … What it is possible for one person to do to another, under what rights and obligations, is given by the version of events currently taken as knowledge. Therefore the power to act in particular ways, to claim resources, to control or be controlled depends upon the knowledges currently prevailing in a society. We can exercise power by drawing upon discourses, which allow our actions to be represented in an acceptable light … To define the world or a person in such a way that allows you to do the things you want is to exercise power. When we define or represent something in a particular way we are producing a particular form of knowledge, which brings power with it (2015a: 80).

A few points of clarification are important here, as Burr provides (2015a: 90). Discourses are not consciously invented by powerful groups to effect forms of social control, but instead, different cultural and historical contexts provide the social, economic and political environments that foster and give rise to certain modes of representation, which may then be capitalised upon for particular political purposes. However, this in no way means we can predict the contours of future discursive formations, nor foresee how current discourses might
be co-opted to suit other future agendas, exemplified in the resignification of homosexuality from pathology to the celebration of queer identity through ‘Club Hypothalamus’. Rather, once we realise that all knowledge(-power) is the product of nuanced historical and cultural contexts, we are able to “give voice to those whose accounts of life cannot be heard within the prevailing knowledges” (Burr 2015a: 90). Because so many alternative representations of life exist, there are always possibilities to disrupt that which is considered ‘true’. We must continually remind ourselves that possibilities for resistance are always-already imbued in the productive potentiality of power, and the more we are able to produce alternative systems of representation, the less hegemonic prevailing discourses will be.

**FOUCAULT: ARCHAEOLOGY AND GENEALOGY**

In my discussions thus far, we have examined how the strategic use of power-knowledge shapes and informs the way we think about and act toward certain peoples, how this is operationalised through discourse, and how this legitimises certain systems of representation at the expense of others. It is this calculated use of knowledge, and in particular its translation and inscription onto the body and corporeal reality, that Foucault was so interested in throughout his archaeological work (1975, 1982b, 2007). Archaeology, therefore, is an approach to uncover and identify the contours, boundaries and limits of discursive formations and practices, in what he describes as

…an attempt to reveal discursive practices in their complexity and density; to show that to speak is to do something – something other than to express what one thinks; to translate what one knows …; to show that to add a statement to a pre-existing series of statements is to perform a complicated and costly gesture, which involves conditions (and not only a situation, a context, and motives), and rules (not the logical and linguistic rules of construction) (1982b: 209).

As Foucault here identifies, archaeology brings to light the rules, context, and conditions within which discursive formations emerge. What is particularly valuable about the archaeological
method is that it emphasises the historically contingent nature of knowledge and discourse: discourse is produced as a result of circumstance, not predestination. This is more broadly reflective of Foucault’s approach to understanding history, which he does not see as a linear progression towards utopian equality, but rather as a sequence of discursive formations that are “merely the current episodes in a series of subjugations” (Foucault, 1984: 83, see also 1982b: 230). This is Foucault’s ‘genealogy’.30 History is not about cause and effect, but rather concerns discourses, located in specific historical and cultural matrices, that enable and constrain us to think and act in particular ways (Burr, 2015b; Hokowhitu, 2013). Foucault outlines his genealogical approach to history in the following way:

Genealogy does not pretend to go back in time to restore an unbroken continuity that operates beyond the dispersion of forgotten things; its duty is not to demonstrate that the past actively exists in the present, that it continues secretly to animate the present, having imposed a predetermined form on all its vicissitudes. Genealogy does not resemble the evolution of a species and does not map the destiny of a people. On the contrary … it is to identify the accidents, the minute deviations – or conversely, the complete reversals – the errors, the false appraisals, and the faulty calculations that gave birth to those things that continue to exist and have value for us; it is to discover that truth or being does not lie at the root of what we know and what we are, but the exteriority of accidents (1984: 81)

Genealogy, then, is not about the “search for ‘origins’” (Foucault, 1984: 77), but concerns the accidents and moments of happenstance that engender the realities we occupy. For my research, this outlook insists that the discursive formation of ‘Tūhoe the savage’ is not naturally occurring, but is rather a result of specific historical circumstances (an ‘accident’). Tūhoe existed millennia before the arrival of Europeans, but it is this brevity of contact, infinitesimal in comparison to Tūhoe existence, that has produced the regime of truth that proclaims to be the exclusive way of knowing and interacting with Tūhoe. More importantly, this is the only

30 This is not the same as the concept of whakapapa, even though both use the English term ‘genealogy’. 
discourse through which the state, and its institutions, ‘know’ Tūhoe. The genealogical method, by comparison, seeks to uncover alternative systems of representation that are marginalised by the predominance of prevailing discourses (Foucault, 2003: 8).

There is no one universal ‘truth’, nor one unitary formation of history, but discourses (‘current episodes in a series of subjugations’) that highlight one way of ‘knowing’ at the expense of others. In this manner, genealogy gives voice to “subjugated knowledges”, “…a whole series of knowledges that have been disqualified as nonconceptual knowledges, as insufficiently elaborated knowledges: naïve knowledges, hierarchically inferior knowledges, knowledges that are below the required level of erudition or scientificity” (Foucault, 2003: 7). A genealogical investigation decentres prevailing discourses by uncovering the subjugated knowledges – the alternative forms of representation – that are marginalised by discursive formations.

Genealogy, then, is a

…way of playing local, discontinuous, disqualified, or nonlegitimized knowledges off against the unitary theoretical instance that claim to be able to filter them, organize them into a hierarchy, organize them in the name of a true body of knowledge … [Genealogies] are about the insurrection of knowledges … an insurrection against the centralizing power-effects that are bound up with the institutionalization and working of any scientific discourse organized in a society such as ours … Genealogy has to fight the power-effects characteristic of any discourse that is regarded as scientific (Foucault, 2003: 9).

For Tūhoe, the ‘disqualified’, ‘nonlegitimized’ and ‘subjugated’ knowledges are the alternative ways of ‘knowing’ Tūhoe that counter the prevailing regimes of truth I have been speaking of, beyond the state’s parochial imagining of Tūhoe as predisposed to violence. They are the experiences whānau in Ruatoki have of state violence, the stories of everyday life as tamariki embark on adventures up the bush to collect blackberries for jam, and the desires of pakeke as they envision what life will be like for their mokopuna in fifty years’ time. Providing their
experiences in this manner constructs a ‘counter-discourse’ that demonstrates that there are different ways of ‘knowing’ Tūhoe beyond state-sanctioned modalities.

If, as Foucault stipulates, discursive formations are an “archive” (“systems of statements”) that frame the ambit of how we think about certain topics (1982b:128-9), the political objective of my thesis is to produce a ‘counter-archive’, a counter-narrative that is, that disrupts the dominant discourse of Tūhoe currently in circulation. This is the reason why ethnography and photography are prioritised modes of representation in my thesis, to give voice (and vision!) to the many alternative ways of ‘knowing’ Tūhoe and Ruatoki whānau. This is also why I have interwoven my diary entries and fieldwork reflections throughout my thesis, to give expression to elements of the ‘everydayness’ of Ruatoki life. Such representations neither rely nor subscribe to those proliferated by the state or press, and are not anchored in colonial tropes of violence, primitivism, and savagery. Doing so provides a critical counterpoint by interrupting and displacing this discursive hegemony, exemplifying what Foucault means by ‘fighting the power-effects’ of ‘scientific’ – that is, ‘authoritative’ – regimes of representation. This, for Foucault, is the “[reestablishment of] the various systems of subjugation: not the anticipatory power of meaning, but the hazardous play of dominations” (1984: 83). In other words, genealogy gives volume to the many marginalised voices and perspectives of life, in an attempt to de-perch prevailing regimes of truth. Hokowhitu underscores the usefulness of the genealogical method by explaining that “…genealogy … is far more complex, dense and partial toward unravelling the heterogeneous threads, which bind historical narratives together” (Hokowhitu, 2013: 237). My interest lies in the unstitching of that heterogeneity to reveal the alternative possibilities of Tūhoe representation that need not remain tethered to the colonial imaginary.
To summarise, therefore, the archaeological method uncovers the ambit, rules of formation, and delineations of discursive formations. The genealogical approach builds off this to examine the effects of discourse, by interrogating what modes of representation dominate in a given historical period, and those, *ipso facto*, relegated to the side-lines. As Foucault summarises, “Archaeology is the method specific to the analysis of local discursivities, and genealogy is the tactic which, once it has described these local discursivities, brings into play the desubjugated knowledges that have been released from them.” This approach to history, he explains “sums up [my] overall project” (Foucault, 2003: 10-11). Genealogy thus examines the forms of subjectification that arise by virtue of discourse, and what forms of knowledge are being strategically used to this end. In brevity: archaeology outlines the parameters of discourse; genealogy gives voice to those marginalised therein.

The guiding impetus of the genealogical method is to “expose a body totally imprinted by history”, because “[t]he body is the inscribed surface of events” (Foucault, 1984: 83). Foucault here is gesturing to the way in which the body itself is rendered readable and intelligible through discourse – depicting the male Tūhoe body, for example, as one of viciousness, warriorhood, and savagery. The role of genealogy is to disrupt this by showing that this is an effect of discourse, and not preordained nor naturally occurring. In this manner, the body becomes the locus of our investigation when attempting to disrupt the dominant discourses of Tūhoe perpetuated by the state. The latter half of the my thesis, through genealogical investigation, is an ethnographic and photographic narrative of Tūhoe – ‘subjugated knowledges’ – that offers a different way of ‘knowing’ Tūhoe and Ruatoki whānau.
Permit me a brief moment of departure to clarify an important parameter of my research outlook, concerning racism, essentialism, and the body. To reiterate a point I earlier alluded to, from a poststructuralist perspective, the body – like knowledge – is not naturally occurring, but a distinct product of circumstance (that is, discourse). The way we come to know and understand different peoples (and their bodies) is informed by the prevailing regimes of truth in a given historical period, as I captured in my own life history of feeling ‘too brown’ or ‘too white’ in particular contexts. This statement must be carefully qualified: I am speaking here of the way in which Māori and Tūhoe are constituted as certain kinds of beings through discourse, and how they have been imagined and depicted in Pākehā discourse. In the context of European imperialism over what is today the Middle East and North Africa, Said similarly drew on Foucault’s methodology to interrogate the discourse of ‘Orientalism’, which refers to the “making [of] statements about [the Orient], authorizing views of it, describing it, by teaching it, settling it, ruling over it: in short, Orientalism as a Western style for dominating, restructuring, and having authority over the Orient” (1978: 3). Drawing on Foucault’s conceptualisation of power-knowledge, Said demonstrated how, from the eighteenth century, the depiction of the ‘East’, by scholars, writers, politicians, travellers, and so forth, posited the Orient as inherently inferior to European civilisation. These ‘imaginings’, through discourse, were central to the furthering of specific geopolitical, economic and military agendas (ibid. 12-3, 42, 203-4, 96), to the principal benefit of British and American interests in the Middle East. This remains the case today, in the context of anti-terrorism and military interventions into these areas.

Orientalism was consequently the “Western projection onto and will to govern over the Orient” (ibid. 95). As a certain kind of being (or body), the ‘Oriental’ was portrayed as “possessing
regular [(knowable and fixed)] characteristics” (ibid. 42), and it was impossible to know or think of ‘Orientals’ in any other way, according to the discursive parameters of this discourse in the West. Orientalism was both a (pseudo-)academic discipline, as well as a system of representation consisting of the “…collection of dreams, images, and vocabularies available to anyone who has tried to talk about what lies east of the dividing line” (ibid. 73, see also 203). Such ‘dreams’ were informed and reified by “travel literature, imaginary utopias, moral voyages, and scientific reporting” (ibid. 117). The very imagining of the West/East division arose using these cardinal axes of imperial cartography. This, therefore, was the way in which the West came to know, represent, and interact (through material social practice) with the East, essentialising the Oriental body as one of “despotism … sensuality, and the like” (ibid. 203). This is what political theorist and Professor of Middle Eastern Studies Timothy Mitchell describes as the “Orientalist reality”, and, summarising Said’s thesis, highlights the tripartite nature of Orientalist thinking:

…[the Orientalist reality] is understood as the product of unchanging racial or cultural essences; these essential characteristics are in each case the polar opposite of the West (passive rather than active, static rather than mobile, emotional rather than rational, chaotic rather than ordered); and the Oriental opposite or Other is marked by a series of absences (of movement, reason, order, meaning and so on). In terms of these three features – essentialism, otherness, absence – the colonial world can be mastered, and colonial mastery will, in turn, reinscribe and reinforce these defining features (Mitchell, 1992: 289).

As a discursive formation, then, Orientalism sought to essentialise the body of the Other, representing it as an inverse reflection of cardinal Western principles such as rationality, intellectuality, and restraint. Hall describes these as “racialized discourse[s, …] structured by a set of [powerful] binary oppositions … [such as that] between ‘civilization’ (white) and ‘savagery’ (black)” (Hall, 1997b: 243). The communication of meaning in this manner fundamentally relies on such binary representations (ibid. 235), in which people “…seem to be
represented through sharply opposed polarized, binary extremes – good/bad, civilized/primitive, ugly/excessively attractive, repelling-because-different/compelling-because-strange-and-exotic” (ibid. 229). Said’s meditations upon Orientalism are context-specific to the Middle East, and were not designed to apply in settler colonial contexts (although they have been extrapolated to these spaces by others). Aspects of his work, however, were anticipated by Bernard Smith in the Pacific context, through Smith’s ground-breaking work, *European Vision and the South Pacific* (1969). While it is not my intention to describe Tūhoe experiences of state violence through the lens of Orientalism, Said’s work is nonetheless useful for two central reasons. Firstly, *Orientalism* is a helpful example of what Foucault’s methodology looks like in practice. Secondly, Said’s thinking highlights how certain bodies can be reduced to binary and ‘unchanging essences’ – to be exploited or persecuted – through discourse.

Discourse, therefore, ascribes particular traits to particular bodies, and in this process, generates the illusion that such bodies are naturally predisposed to those characteristics. This collapses together nature and culture as a chimerical *fait accompli*, and we must remain vigilant of the dangerous tendency to conflate the two. [After all, this nature/culture binary is a distinctly Eurocentric one.] Let us remind ourselves that such thinking rationalised countless injustices across the planet, merging together epidermis with skill, intellect, and prowess – or, more saliently, a lack thereof (Mills, 2011). A particularly devastating consequence of this process is the internalisation of these discourses within black and brown bodies, in which we think (and believe) we are ‘less than’ because of our skin colour. Amongst African American communities in the United States, for instance, ‘being Black’ has long held a negative connotation, encapsulated in the adage “Act your age, not your color” (Harris, 2003: 1). Yet as Foucault insists, resistance is the flipside of power: rejecting prevailing notions of truth is
central to the destabilisation of such discursive formations. As James Baldwin implored his nephew in *The Fire Next Time*, “You can only be destroyed by believing that you really are what the white world calls a nigger. I tell you this because I love you, and please don’t ever forget it” (cited in Harris, 2003: 13; see also Baldwin, 1963).

Read from within this nuanced context, therefore, there is no ‘true essence’ of being human, and no divine template that predetermines the behaviours certain peoples will express. To posit that there are fixed, unchanging characteristics of certain peoples is, by definition, an essentialist and racist way of thinking, exemplified in the ‘warrior gene’ debate that argued that Māori men were predisposed to violent and ‘warrior-like’ tendencies (Stokes, 2006). Such a claim was resolutely debunked by bioethicist Grant Gillett and clinical psychologist Armon Tamatea, who together argued that

…[t]here is no direct evidence to support the claim that the MAOA gene confers ‘warrior’ qualities on Māori males, either modern or ancestral … [T]he use of the ‘warrior gene’ label in the context of MAOA aggression studies; generalizing from a sample of 17 individuals not representative of the general Māori population; and the lack of scientific investigative journalism have combined to do science and Māori a disservice (Gillett and Tamatea, 2012: 42-3).

Despite these epigenetic considerations, discourses such as ‘the lazy Māori’ and ‘the savage Tūhoe’ have inscribed violence, laziness, savagery, deceitfulness and intellectual inferiority onto the brown body. Conversely, to recognise that all knowledge is historically and culturally specific is to realise that there are no ‘natural’ predispositions innately tied to certain bodies: savagery does not define the Tūhoe body inasmuch as it does any other. Moreover, expository statements and questions such as, ‘You’re Tūhoe? Oh, that must mean you’re a terrorist!’, or ‘If
you’re Māori, why aren’t you good at sports?” are equally untenable, because they rest on the assumption that there is an unchanging essence of certain bodies, and by extension, a static, non-negotiable definition of what it means to be Tūhoe or Māori. Similarly, the term ‘Māori’ itself inadequately represents the heterogeneity amongst the peoples described as such, with the potential here for reducing diverse lived experiences to static essences. Preeminent Tūhoe leader John Rangihau meditated upon this in relation to his identity, some forty years ago:

My being Maori is absolutely dependent on my history as a Tuhoe person as against being a Maori person. It seems to me that there is no such thing as Maoritanga because Maoritanga is an all-inclusive terms which embraces all Maoris. And there are so many different aspects about every tribal person. Each tribe has its own history. And it’s not a history that can be shared among others. How can I share with the history of Ngati Porou, of Te Arawa, of Waikato? Because I am not one of those people. I am a Tuhoe person and all I can share in is Tuhoe history (Rangihau, 1981: 174).

To take this analysis one step further, there is no criteria that determines one’s worthiness of being Māori, and no right or wrong way to ‘be Māori’. This reflection, which I gestured to in my autoethnographic narrative, emerges from my own life experiences, in which I have seen, time and again, people who are told that they do not qualify as Māori because their skin is ‘too white’, they are unable to speak te reo or perform in kapa haka (performing arts) groups, they are disconnected from their hau kāinga, or they prefer intellectuality over sports and athleticism. ‘How can it be that these realities disqualify one from ‘being Māori’?, I often ask of myself. Jolly has similarly mused on this in her discussion of tradition and ‘inauthenticity’ in the Pacific context:

But why shouldn’t church hymns, the mass, and bislama be seen as part of Pacific tradition, alongside pagan songs and indigenous languages? Hymns and church rituals

---

31 The former of which a kuia in Ruatoki had asked of her; the latter, a constant question to me while I was at secondary school.
have been significantly remade by Pacific peoples, so that Christianity may appear today as more quintessentially a Pacific than a Western faith (Jolly, 1992: 53).

The kind of thinking I have been describing here likewise hinges on the dictum of ‘unchanging essences’, and invokes the same mechanisms of prejudice exemplified through the discourses of savagery and laziness inscribed upon Māori and Tūhoe bodies. This is why this conversation is not simply about combating Pākehā stereotypes of Māori, but confronting oppression wherever it may surface.

Discourse and visual representation

Having explored the power of the written word in constituting reality, I now turn my attention to the similar functionality of visual modes of representation. Our world today is dominated by the omnipresence of the image, and as German philosopher Martin Heidegger remarked some fifty years ago, it is a world characterised by the demand to represent human experience in visual form. This is what he describes as the “…world picture[:] … the world conceived and grasped as picture” (1977: 130). Discourses manifest themselves through visual media – the ‘picture’ – inasmuch as they do through written or spoken speech, which is why Burr (2015) explains that a ‘text’ is anything from which meaning can be gleaned. This is because Western empiricism requires the written text as confirmation of the veracity of the visual. Such ‘texts’ may include newspaper articles, television bulletins, films, images and stories, but can extend also to ostensibly mundane (but no less important) patterns of bodily behaviour, like the gestures we make or the clothes we wear (ibid. 78).

The discourses that depict Tūhoe as a savage and primitive people (again, manufactured and preserved in Pākehā discourse) are sustained through both written and visual articulations. The ‘picture’ has sought to render Tūhoe knowable and understandable as a certain kind of being.
By this, I mean that the use of the visual image has been strategically central to the knowledge-power process that produces ‘common sense’ knowledge about Tūhoe, characterising them as a ‘savage’, ‘backward’, and ‘violent’ people. My particular interest here is in how visual narratives naturalise sets of social and political arrangements prevailing in particular historical periods (Mirzoeff, 2009: 17), a discursive effect that proclaims to speak ‘truth’ about topics, events, or peoples. This necessitates a careful examination of visual texts to reveal their discursive foundations, to “…expose the underlying ideas, values and beliefs [such texts] embody about society and politics” (Howells and Negreiros, 2012: 83). To do so, let us first familiarise ourselves with semiotics, or the study of signs.

SEMIOTICS AND THE COMMUNICATION OF MEANING

Semiotics draws upon the work of the late nineteenth-century Swiss linguist Ferdinand de Saussure, and concerns the interplay between representation and interpretation through the study of signs and symbols (Hall, 1997: 30-9; Howells and Negreiros, 2012: 112-36). Saussure demonstrated how language communicates meaning through a “lexicon of signification” (Howells and Negreiros, 2012: 113), where the ‘sign’ is the union of the signifier and signified (Culler, 1976: 19). The signifier is the word or image – the form – and the signified is the constellation of ideas that comes to mind when the signifier is made mention of (Hall, 1997: 31; Howells and Negreiros, 2012: 113). In the New Zealand context, for instance, the signifier ‘K-I-W-I’ signifies the flightless bird whose silhouetted (side-elevation) profile is shaped somewhat like a lopsided figure-of-eight, with a beak protruding from the smaller of the two circles, and legs from the larger. That combination of letters is not itself such a flightless bird, but instead stands in for it when we use it in our day-to-day language. This means that we need not constantly carry our feathered friend around should we wish to refer to them, but, through the linguistic intermediary of the word ‘K-I-W-I’, we can do so all the same.
The defining proposition of Saussure’s semiotics is that the link between the signifier and the signified is arbitrary. Consider that the genus to which our flightless friend belongs is known in English by the signifier ‘B-I-R-D’, and yet in te reo Māori is ‘M-A-N-U’, and, further afield, ‘鳥 [tori]’ in Japanese. The signified (feathered creatures of flight)\textsuperscript{32} remains constant, but each language uses its own, independent, unrelated – and therefore arbitrary – signifier (‘B-I-R-D’, ‘M-A-N-U’, ‘鳥’). Echoing my earlier discussion on poststructuralism’s contention that there is no essential nature to objects in the world, semiotics insists that there is no “…indelible, intrinsic, God-given relationship between the signifier and signified”. Rather, “[semiotics] reminds us that nothing inevitably means anything; meaning is not natural [but] cultural (Howells and Negreiros, 2012: 113–4; see also Culler, 1976: 19). Reality, as we know and experience it, is produced in and through discourse, and, by the same token, semiotics reminds us that knowledge and meaning is situated and produced from within specific historical and cultural matrices.

ROLAND BARTHES: SEMIOTICS AND THE ANALYSIS OF THE VISUAL

Semiotics’ insistence that the relationship between signifier and signified is arbitrary helps reveal the cultural situatedness of meaning and knowledge. Moving from Saussure’s focus upon language, French philosopher Roland Barthes sought to demonstrate how a semiotic analysis is equally useful in the examination of visual culture (such as photography, films, and news reports) (1972: 109–11, and 107-59 more generally), and, more crucially, how such an approach brings to light the “underlying ideological assumptions of the society in which [the visual text] was created” (Howells and Negreiros, 2012: 115). While written text is central to semiotic analysis, Barthes places a stronger emphasis on visual texts because of their instantaneity in

\textsuperscript{32} Which, of course, includes those of our feathered friends who, alas, can no longer take to the sky.
communicating meaning, or rather, their ability to “impose meaning at one stroke” (1972: 110). This, for Mirzoeff is the ability of the visual to “…[offer] a sensual immediacy that cannot be rivalled by print media … It is the feeling created by the opening sight of the spaceship filling the screen in *2001: A Space Odyssey* [or] by seeing the Berlin Wall come down on live television” (Mirzoeff, 1998: 9).

This is particularly salient for my research in terms of how ‘race’, as a discursive formation, is visualised and ‘made real’. As scholar of Art History and African American Studies Michael D. Harris has noted, “[r]acial discourses … ultimately rely on the visual in the sense that the visible body must be used by those in power to represent nonvisual realities that differentiate insiders from outsiders”, a thesis he thoroughly explores in the North American context in his magnum opus *Colored Pictures: Race and Visual Representation* (2003: 2). The point I later draw attention to is that the body must be made to adhere to its racial significations by repeated discursive force, because the body itself does not ‘naturally’ signify race.

Barthes built on Saussure’s work to posit that linguistic signs can themselves come to signify another level of meaning, in what he terms a “second-order semiological system”. That is, when organised (and visualised) alongside other signs, ‘first-order’ signs (such as the signifier ‘K-I-W-I’ for our flightless feathered friend) can produce new constellations of meaning (1972: 114-5). This is what Barthes has famously termed ‘myth’, where an altogether new concept (beyond the meaning contained in the original linguistic sign) is “formed by a sum of signs” (ibid. 116). This is the process of *signification*, where first-order signs (now the *signifier*, or form), come to represent a new idea (the *signified*, or concept) (ibid. 117). Our flightless feathered friend, for example, can signify nationalism and patriotism, its invocation as a token of cultural pride more widely reflected by the common use of the demonym ‘Kiwi’. This was more humorously
articulated through a parodic entry in the 2016 New Zealand flag referendum (New Zealand History, 2018) (see Figure 10 below).

![Figure 9: 'Laser kiwi flag'. Entry to the Flag Consideration Panel during the 2016 New Zealand flag referendum (New Zealand History, 2018).](image)

Whereas in first-order signs the relationship between signifier and signified is arbitrary, mythical signification arises from an intent to represent something in a certain way; signification, therefore, is “never arbitrary [but] always in part motivated” (Barthes, 1972: 126). In other words, myth is the conscious assignation of a concept to a particular signifier, in what Barthes describes as the “transform[ation of] … meaning into form” (ibid. 131). Consider, for example, the careful positioning and manipulation of text and images within a single frame to elicit a certain kind of emotion or appeal, choreographing the image so that bodily gestures, clothing, lighting, and other paraphernalia all align to communicate and produce that myth.

---

33 Whether unintentionally or not, the comedic representation of a kiwi with laser eyes, submitted as a legitimate entry for consideration as a potential national flag, drew attention to the farcical nature of the 'flag debate'.
message. By way of brief illustration, consider the front-page headline from the Whakatane Beacon on October 16, 2007 (see Figure 10).

![Whakatane Beacon Headline](image)

**Figure 10:** 'Terrorism Alert' (Kinita, 2007: 1). *Whakatane Beacon.*

Here, the bold emphasis on ‘terrorism’, ‘Urewera ranges’ and ‘Ruatoki’, in conjunction with the images of paramilitary police equipment, together produce the myth that these geographic areas are predisposed to violence, deviance and rebellion, and must be vehemently brought into line through state-sanctioned force. This message is reinforced by using an unrelated 2005 photograph of Tame Iti, prominent Tūhoe activist, in camouflagge dress, to literally embody the ‘paramilitary’ section of the headline. The photographs do not show the ‘terror’ on the faces of
whānau and tamariki as the state cascaded into their homes on the morning of October 15, but, like the bottom-left image, subjectifies Tūhoe as criminals from whom ‘good New Zealanders’ must be protected. Here, the written text (such as ‘ARREST’, ‘NO GO ZONE’, ‘CAMOUFLAGE’, and ‘POLICE RAID’) is anchored by each attendant image, in the production of this myth. This embodies Hall’s stipulation that “[t]wo discourses – the discourse of written language and the discourse of photography – are required to produce and ‘fix’ the meaning [of a text]” (Hall, 1997b: 228). As this example suggests, meaning can be conveyed by any number of forms, and that media outlets constantly bombard us with legions of images to represent certain ideas “…demonstrate[s] that the store of mythical signifiers is inexhaustible” (Barthes, 1972: 127).

**Myth: Naturalisation and exnomination**

In the same way that discourse produces ‘common sense’ knowledge about particular topics, the power of myth, explains Barthes, is that it “transforms history into nature” (ibid. 129). Myth naturalises meaning to give the impression that it is naturally occurring (and not historically contingent), thereby eliding the intent and motivation that gives rise to mythical signification in the first place. Myth, then, veils its cultural and historical specificity to resemble a “factual system, whereas it is but a semiological system” (ibid. 131). Similarly, as Hall notes, meaning is never fixed, but always floating: it is the strategy of representation that seeks to highlight a preferred interpretation of the text to ‘naturalise’ its meaning (Hall, 1997b: 228, 245). In this manner, for example, Tūhoe men with tā moko (*traditional Māori tattooing*) can become a signifier of violence, warriorhood, and – from 2007 – even ‘terrorism’. “‘Naturalization’”, he describes, “is therefore a representational strategy to fix ‘difference’, and thus secure it forever (ibid. 245, his emphasis). The artificial fixing of meaning gives rise to the creation of stereotypes, a mechanism that substantially reduces people to unchanging essences (ibid. 257).
By similar token to the insecurity of meaning, and gesturing to my earlier discussion of the falsehood of universal ‘truth’, the practice of photography – and the photograph itself – must be critically interrogated. The development of photographic technologies in Europe during the Enlightenment period “proffered a mathematical exactitude of reality, a reducible, calculable mechanism for the scientific reproduction of nature”, which precipitated, through sciences such as criminology, a “consciously exaggerated faithfulness of photographic likeness” (Oguibe, 2010: 571). This marvellous and ostensibly infallible technology offered the unprecedented capacity to capture ‘truth’, a truth undoctored by, and exterior from, human experience (and thus, perceptual error). Yet, as Nigerian-American artist Olu Oguibe stipulates,

[b]ehind this rather essentialist and fundamentally flawed view of photography lay the myth of automatism, the rather interesting conviction that photography, unlike all other techniques of representation, had through its supposed substitution of machine for the human hand, finally and thankfully elided subjectivity and the fallibility of human agency (2010: 571).

The point that I am here underscoring is that photography, as one of innumerable media of representation, projects a selective mediation of social reality, and is, like written text, inexorably chained to the prejudices of its maker. The ease with which photography can be manipulated (both in the process of taking the photograph, as well as in post-production) exemplifies this selectiveness, for while “[p]hotographs and other communication technologies may give us very recognisable images … they are no more reliable at retrieving reality than any other medium” (Schirato and Webb, 2004: 76). We have, at this juncture, arrived at the fundamental dilemma of representation: representations are nothing more than ‘copies of copies’. For Plato, as Mirzoeff describes, “…this reproduction [is] like the shadows cast by a fire on a cave wall – you can see who or what case the shadow but the image is inevitably
distorted from the original’s appearance … For an artist to make a representation of what is seen would be to make a copy of a copy, increasing the chance of distortion” (2009: 21-2). This thinking urges us to remain sceptical and mistrustful of visual and written text alike: photographs and written accounts of Tūhoe are not indisputable ‘truths’, but are historically and culturally contingent texts produced out of specific circumstances. As Mirzoeff also points out, “[t]he mistrust of representation as inherently dangerous remains part of Western thought today. It was the guiding theme of [the cinematic epic,] The Matrix, in which appearances cover up ‘the desert of the real’ created by machines” (2009: 22). Inasmuch as photographs may seduce us into thinking that meaning is naturally occurring, Mirzoeff’s outlook both reminds us that meaning is never fixed, but more importantly, urges us to resist the temptation of collapsing together form with essence.

It was this process, of the naturalisation of meaning at the complete expense of historical contingency, that informed Barthes’ political project: “…I resented seeing Nature and History confused at every turn, and I wanted to track down, in the decorative display of what-goes-without-saying, the ideological abuse which, in my view, is hidden there” (1972: 11). Myth plays an instrumental role in reinforcing prevailing regimes of truth, and the task Barthes sets himself in Mythologies (1972) is to deconstruct texts and reveal their ideological foundations – those assumptions that ‘go without saying’ (Howells and Negreiros, 2012: 125). While Barthes’ methodology has been critiqued for its idiosyncrasies and lack of sustained intellectual rigour (see, for example, Howells and Negreiros, 2012: 126), his approach is nonetheless of great benefit because it demonstrates how we might “…peer behind the scenes of our own society [and] question anew things that we had previously taken for granted” (ibid. 131).
Barthes insists our society remains quintessentially bourgeois, a society dominated by merchants and owners of businesses, rather than workers and labourers (Barthes, 1972: 137; Howells and Negreiros, 2012: 122). In Mythologies, he is preoccupied with exposing bourgeois ideology. He explains how dominant groups (the bourgeois, or otherwise) naturalise their dominant position in society by concealing their name and identity, in what he terms “exnomination” (‘outside of naming’) (Barthes, 1972: 138-9). By this he means that the dominant group and the ideologies they endorse “…become so obvious or common sense that they don’t have to draw attention to themselves by giving themselves a name. They’re just the ‘normality’, against which everything else can be judged” (McKee, 2003: 106). Barthes reiterates this function by emphasising the explicitly deliberate purpose of exnomination to render the bourgeoisie ‘anonymous’:

The flight from the name ‘bourgeois’ is not therefore an illusory, accidental, secondary, natural or insignificant phenomenon: it is the bourgeois ideology itself, the process through which the bourgeoisie transforms the reality of the world into an image of the world, History into Nature. And this image has a remarkable feature: it is upside down (1972: 141).

Exposing the norm – the standard from which ‘everything else is judged’ – necessitates a close examination of the text to reveal who is visibilised, and by contrast, who is rendered invisible (that is, who or what is exnominated). A cursory glance at news headlines more than suffices for present purposes. ‘Māori lawyer says it’s time to abolish prisons’ (Hurihanganui, 2017), and ‘No police future for Tūhoe woman’ (Morning Report, 2016), are two pertinent exemplifications from Radio New Zealand, New Zealand’s public service radio broadcaster.34 Employing the qualifications ‘Māori’ and ‘Tūhoe woman’ ideologically construes such bodies

---

34 I mention Radio New Zealand’s description to denote its perceived ‘authority’ as the principal broadcaster for New Zealand, and the effect this has on reinforcing the norm.
as exterior from the standard (that is, abnormal), and we are able to conclude, *ex post facto*, that the norm is the white male body. This is not to diminish the significance and mana of one’s identities (of being Māori or Tūhoe), for they are important regardless, but is rather a comment on the role of exnomination in the service of perpetuating certain discourses. In these new bulletins, then, whiteness has been exnominated.

**VISUAL ETHNOGRAPHY**

Having explored my theoretical and methodological ‘toolbox’, I turn finally here to outline my visual ethnographic approach. I begin by way of social anthropologist Sarah Pink’s conceptualisation of visual ethnography, which for her, is a method

…concerned with the production of knowledge and ways of knowing rather than with the collection of data. [E]thnography [is] a process of creating and representing knowledge or ways of knowing that are based on ethnographers’ own experiences and the ways these intersect with the persons, places and things encountered during that process. Therefore visual ethnography … does not claim to produce an objective or truthful account of reality, but should aim to offer versions of ethnographers’ experiences of reality that are as loyal as possible to the context, the embodied, sensory and affective experiences, and the negotiations and intersubjectivities through which the knowledge was produced. This may entail reflexive, collaborative or participatory methods (Pink, 2013: 34-5).

The usefulness of adopting Pink’s definition is that it is consistent with my earlier discussions on discourse, representation, and the fallacy of universal truth. As she points out, visual ethnographic research is not about the collection of data, but rather concerns nuanced representations of experience that emerge in the process of research. For my thesis project, this is expressed both through in-depth ethnographic interviews, as well as a photographic narrative of my time in Ruatoki. Pink’s emphasis on the subjectivity of the researcher’s experiences aligns with the perspectives of renowned philosopher the Reverend Māori Marsden, who urges that the examination of Māori culture and philosophies should only be done through intimate
subjectivity (here invoking a non-Foucauldian conception of subjectivity). He states, “…abstract rational thought and empirical methods cannot grasp the concrete act of existing which is fragmentary, paradoxical, and incomplete. The only way [to examine “Māori life”] lies through a passionate, inward subjective approach” (2003: 22).

Secondly, Pink’s gesture towards collaborative research is a central element of my work. Collaboration here denotes an on-going process of consultation and negotiation in the development of one’s research, from conception, to methodology and write-up. As I explained in the Introduction, the reason I entered doctoral research was because, for me, the violent paramilitary raid upon Waitangi’s whānau homestead represented an unassailable violation of justice. From my earliest discussion with Waitangi about the raids on her home, I explored with her how my project might unfold, and directions it might take. After discussing this with her parents, Waitangi, in a great gesture of manaaki, offered to have me stay with her parents on their farm in the Ruatoki Valley. I organised the remainder of my doctoral tenure around this, and both Waitangi and her parents suggested people I should speak with during my stay. At this direction, I spoke with key whānau affected by the various paramilitary raids of the last decade. Intermittently throughout my research, I spoke with Waitangi – either in person, through text, or via videolink – to update her of my progress, and seek clarification on questions or issues I had. This type of approach is crucial in decentring myself as ‘researcher’, in reiterating the collaborative – and not unidirectional – nature of my work. Thus, Waitangi and I are better understood as co-researchers within the same kaupapa.

This approach is often absent from outside researchers who conduct their work in Ruatoki, or Tūhoe more generally. Time and again, whānau I spoke with in Ruatoki likened themselves to “monkeys in a zoo” when it came to outside researchers, who “come here, get what they want,
and then piss off”. [Indeed, this became so problematic, that at one point it lead to Ruatoki elders emplacing an embargo on outside researchers entering the Valley.] This has the effect of objectifying Ruatoki as a place from which to extract data, without concern for the on-going lived realities of whānau in the Valley, many of whom, as quickly became apparent, were more interested in physically seeing your involvement and return to the community than anything else. Allow me to be clear: just because something exists ‘out there’ in no way means that we have a right to ‘study’ it. In the immortal words of Federation President Ra-ghoratreii, during his speech to Klingon and Federation delegates at the Khitomer Conference in 2293, “…just because we can do a thing, it does not necessarily follow that we must do that thing.”  

Research, for me, concerns the maintenance and strengthening of relationships over time and through generations, and it was through my close relationships with Waitangi and her whānau that my project emerged. This began when I first met Waitangi at a leadership retreat for young Māori in 2013, and continues ad infinitum. In this manner, research is not about ‘debts owed’, but rather about relationships to be honoured and upheld in perpetuity, in the on-going articulation of matemate-ā-one. As Waitangi once remarked to me, “You’re different to those other researchers, because you’ve come back”, and I am reminded of this each time I return for a visit to Ruatoki, however brief.

**Manaaki: A guide to research**

During one conversation with Waitangi, we explored how my approach to research was based (in practice) on the concept of manaakitanga, or gestures of kindness and hospitality. For her, the central aspect of manaaki concerns the “sacrifices” made in the upholding of your guest’s mana. This can, of course, refer to everyday practices of ensuring that you arrive at someone’s

---


36 There are other non-Tūhoe researchers who have ‘come back’, such as Dame Judith Binney; this comment is a general reflection on patterns whānau such as Waitangi have witnessed.
house with a koha (form of reciprocity) to gift (often kai), but extends also to the coordination of research itself. Exercising manaaki in my research concerned the way in which I organised my time in Ruatoki. It was of paramount importance for me to remain flexible in terms of my availability, to work in tandem with, and at the convenience of, the day-to-day lives of whānau I spoke with. This was essential to ensure that I could, at a moment’s notice, pop over and visit whānau to chat over a kai and a cup of tea. In one instance, Aunty Waicy and I had been ‘phone-tagging’ for eight months to organise a time to kōrero, but for various reasons we had to keep postponing. When I eventually sat down with her, I was humbled that she dedicated an entire day to kōrero with me – from 10am in the morning until after 8pm in the evening – to do just that. When I explained this situation to Waitangi, she immediately indicated that this was an interplay of manaaki: my manaaki to Aunty Waicy was remaining flexible throughout, reciprocated by her manaaki to me of setting aside an entire day for my research project. I return to the practice of manaaki, as a critical counterpoint to the state’s operation of biopower, in my final chapter.

On photography

My final comment before closing this chapter concerns the use of photography as an expression of ethnographic representation. As I noted earlier, the political reason for incorporating a photographic essay within my thesis is to develop a counter-archive and counter-narrative to the prevailing representations and stereotypes of Tūhoe. The photographs offer an alternative discourse through which Ruatoki life can be ‘known’, in combating the prevailing regimes of truth surrounding Tūhoe. As Pink suggests, “[p]hotographs, videos and other images … can be understood as routes to knowledge and tools through which we can encounter and imagine other people’s worlds” (Pink, 2013: 39). This is similarly achieved through Terry O’Connor’s rich collection of photographs of Tūhoe whānau in his compelling photographic essay, Te
Manawa o Tūhoe: The Heart of Tūhoe (O'Connor, 1997). Moreover, it is the combination of the interviews I conducted, in conjunction with the photographs themselves, that is particularly powerful in producing a counter-narrative: “…represent[ing] ethnographic knowledge is not just a matter of producing words, but one of situating images, sometimes in relation to written words, but also in relation to other images, spoken words, and other sounds” (Pink, 2013: 161). Katerina Teaiwa adopted a similar approach in her insightful work into the experiences of the devastatingly destructive mining of phosphate in the Kiribati island of Banaba (2015), juxtaposing ethnography with archival images to “…offer what I see as an appropriately partial view, in the sense of expressing specific interests and in the sense of both an incomplete and a motivated reading of diverse Banaban sources and experiences” (ibid. 11).

A point of clarification is here important, relating to my use of Pink and Barthes. I have found semiotic analyses useful in my research, as they have allowed me to interrogate the ‘taken for granted’ nature of visualised representations of Tūhoe. My critiques are intended to ‘shake loose’ the ideological foundations upon which such representations sit, communicated especially through media imagery surrounding Operation Eight. There is a risk, however, that the visual ethnography interwoven throughout my thesis may unintentionally be subject to the same critique. Indeed, at first glance, Barthes’ and Pink’s separate perspectives of representation do appear to sit in tension with one another. To remedy this, allow me to clarify that adopting Barthes’ thinking was done exclusively to critique the mediatised imagery (photographs and video) following Operation Eight – not my visual ethnography. By contrast, photographs from my time spent in Ruatoki are better understood as ‘ethnographic images’, produced out of the relationships and whakawhanaungatanga of my doctoral project.
Fieldwork update: I showed everyone my skills riding the horse until, of course, I made an ‘abrupt descent’ to the ground. And it was glorious. Entertainment for the afternoon!

The majority of the photographs in this thesis were taken by professional photographer Tatsiana Chypsanava, a friend both of mine and the Teepa whānau. Before going to Ruatoki, Tatsiana and I had discussed how the project might unfold. She had already taken photographs of the Teepa whānau after the 2014 raids, with a similar aim to mine of offering a different ‘picture’ of Ruatoki life. Tatsiana spoke of how whānau members would suggest moments or events she should photograph, similarly underscoring a collaborative approach in research. She
again followed this method during our trips to Ruatoki in 2016 and 2017, and both her and I would always ask for permission to photograph before proceeding. While I would conduct the interview, Tatsiana would photograph.

25 November 2016 – Ruatoki

“Come on tamariki, dishes!”, calls Mum as the evanescent sunlight heralds the evening. Tatsi and I finish our game of ‘go fish’ with the tamariki as they head off to the kitchen. “You just lost!”, says Whare gleefully as he veers off toward his duties. Tatsi and I laugh at our ineptitude at card playing, admiring the sharp minds that have claimed victory over us. We go over and sit with Mum to enjoy a cup of tea, as the heat of the day finally recedes into the night. Tonight we’re chatting about a hāngi (food cooked in an earth oven) fundraiser the school is having for their leavers’ trip to Hawai’i. “You get a lot for $15”, she describes, “your hāngi comes with a pudding and a thing of seafood.” “Yum!”, I reply, “will you and the other parents be helping to prep them?” “That’s just what we do here. That’s life”, says Mum.

I pour myself a glass of milk fresh from the milking shed, relishing the richness of flavour and its cool, refreshing taste. The tamariki finish the dishes and join us at the table. With their glasses now filled with milk, they start chatting about America’s recently elected president. “They should just send him to jail for the next two years”, says one of them. Mum, Tatsi, and I chuckle.

Figure 12: Losing go-fish to the pros. Ruatoki, 2016. Photograph by Tatsiana Chypsanava.

37 To clarify, I was in Ruatoki throughout early Spring and Summer of 2016, until the Autumn of 2017. Tatsiana made a few visits during this time.
It is important at this juncture to reflect on Terence Wright’s stipulation that “…anyone who uses a camera or who views a photograph will most probably be subscribing, albeit unwittingly, to some or other theory of representation” (Wright, 2004: 35), and indeed, a “fly sitting on a wall” method was how Tatsiana explained her approach. My discussion here is by no means a criticism of that, for that would be tantamount to trampling on her mana, but is rather a reflection that her (compelling and brilliant) photographs were informed by, and a product of, her own subjectivity [that is, in the non-Foucauldian sense of the word]. This is, indeed, precisely the method that Māori Marsden urged as fundamental to understanding Māori culture. Reflexivity in visual ethnographic research entails a careful consideration of the subjectivity of photographic practice, whereby researchers remain aware of the theories that inform their own photographic practice, of their relationships with their photographic subjects, and of the theories that inform their subjects’ approaches to photography. In projects where ethnographers collaborate with photographers rather than taking the images themselves, the same question applies to reflecting on the photographers’ own subjectivity (Pink, 2013: 76).

Pink’s second comment above is particularly salient, in reflecting on Tatsiana’s subjectivity. Thus, while the mantle of photography was Tatsiana’s to hold, I am musing on her subjectivity to highlight the alternative expressions of photographic representation that could equally be used in visual ethnography, especially with regards to Indigenous peoples. For example, in her innovative research, Wiradjuri scholar Jessa Rogers-Metuamate developed the ‘photoyarn’ method, an approach to Indigenous research that centres and prioritises the subjectivity of participants’ experiences. Here, participants are given the camera to visually capture the objects of meaning to them in their lives. Yarning circles – dynamic dialogues of fluid back-and-forth conversation – are then incorporated into this process to produce “…a space for Indigenous students to discuss, analyse and theme their own images towards deciding on major themes
and findings for dissemination through their own student-led and organised exhibitions in their own school communities” (Rogers, 2017: 6). Such an approach echoes my discussion on collaborative research, and offers rich possibilities for future visual ethnographic endeavours within Indigenous spaces.

Collaboration is similarly demonstrated by ensuring “participant input into the question of what images might be used and produced and how” (Pink, 2013: 63). This is indicative of the fundamental need for ensuring “ongoing consultations and re-negotiation of consent” (ibid. 63). A few months after our kōrero with the whānau we met and spoke with, Tatsiana and I returned with copies of all of the photographs, including some I had taken during my extended time in Ruatoki. I produced an index of the entire repository of photographs (in a ‘filmstrip’-like format), and when we visited whānau, I went through each individual one to seek permission or note its proscription from use, by firstly asking “Which photos do you like?”, followed by, “Which may I use?”. I had intended to mark off in my catalogue with a red cross each of those that whānau did not want to have published, but as it transpired, every photograph was agreed to. In one instance, a kuia I spoke with was excited to see the results of our endeavours, and looked forward to seeing them published. This process is, however, on-going, and throughout my doctoral project I often got back in touch with whānau to check if use of the photographs was still permitted. As Pink explains, co-researchers “…together discuss and agree questions relating to the production and content of visual materials and their subsequent uses” (Pink, 2013: 63). My thesis is therefore the result of on-going collaboration and consultation, and I am continually humbled by the manaaki I have been shown in co-producing this piece of work. In closing this chapter, I am hopeful that the knowledge stitched throughout the pages that follow actively challenges and disrupts the stereotypes and prevailing discourses of Tūhoe, and through ethnographic and photographic insights of everyday Ruatoki
life, may we glimpse an alternative way of knowing Tūhoe that breaks free from the prison of the colonial mind.
CHAPTER III: BORN OF EARTH AND SKY

INTRODUCTION

As I explained in the Introduction, the themes of representation and place are the principal threads interwoven throughout my thesis. In this chapter, I focus upon the latter of these in exploring the intrinsic relationship Tūhoe have with Te Urewera, as a people born of the primal elements of earth and sky. This establishes the counter-narrative I spoke of earlier, in giving nuance to Tūhoe’s historical interactions with the Crown. What follows is a brief narrative of Tūhoe stories of creation, which emphasise their ancestral emergence from within the

Figure 13: Te Tāhū o Haokītaha ridgeline, part of the eastern demarcation of the Ruatoki Valley, which extends into the mountainous Te Urewera ranges. Here was located the pā (fortified village) of Tūhoe’s eponymous ancestor, Tūhoe Pōtiki (Teepa 2015: 5). Photograph by Pounamu Jade Aikman.
landscape itself: for, as I repeat throughout this thesis, Tūhoe are the land inasmuch as the land is Tūhoe. I begin this exploration from the moment of genesis, in the epoch of the ancient forebears, to draw attention to the autochthonous nature of Tūhoe whakapapa. This contributes both to the discursive framing of Tūhoe as ‘the most savage of all Māori’, and the rationalisation of the acute levels of violence repeatedly inflicted upon their communities by the state. From here, I turn to examine Tūhoe-Crown interactions in the nineteenth century, characterised by an aggressive expansionism as the foundations of the settler colonial state were established in the lands now described as Aotearoa New Zealand. In order to fully appreciate the state violence experienced by Tūhoe through the paramilitary raids of the last decade, it is important to first familiarise ourselves with the broader historical picture within which these events are situated. This helps develop the key theoretical argument of my thesis, that the sovereignty of the settler colonial state is maintained through periodic flashes of violence against Indigenous peoples, so perpetuating its exclusive right of sovereign rule (Moreton-Robinson, 2015b; Watson, 2009). In contrast to the discursive framing of Tūhoe as primitive, violent and isolationist, the histories presented here are defined by movement, communication, openness to new people and ideas, and of seeking out new horizons and opportunities.

Tūhoe history has long asserted and strived for autonomy and self-determination, but this was progressively eroded by the Crown as both land and authority was lost to government rule (Binney, 1997). Although Tūhoe did not sign the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840 – New Zealand’s ‘founding document’ from whence the British presumed representatives of Māori relinquished their sovereignty and self-determination38 – it proceeded to claim that Crown sovereignty extended over all of New Zealand through the process of cession. Following this proclamation,

---

38 They did not.
“…the Crown made no attempt to contact the peoples of Te Urewera or to establish a relationship with them. They did not become part of the colonial state” (Waitangi Tribunal, 2009: 128).

Before beginning, I wish to make three final, important points. This chapter contains a number of aerial photographs of Te Urewera’s expansive landscapes. At such a scale, these panoramic epics can become somewhat distantly from the peopled nature of Tūhoe’s homeland, which can alter the way in which we envisage and understand such landscapes. It is important to keep in mind that colonial depictions of ‘wilderness’ and ‘native bush’ have often depended on the initial evacuation of Indigenous peoples, and these photos may unintentionally contribute to that discursive positioning. I have incorporated these images because they articulate the grandeur of Te Urewera in a way my words could not, but these concerns are nonetheless important.

Secondly, I am inspired by, and draw heavily from, the renowned work of esteemed New Zealand historian the late Dame Judith Binney, who had deep relationships with many of Tūhoe’s senior leaders and intellectuals (Binney, 2010, 2009, 1997, 1996; Binney, Chaplin and Wallace, 1996). While I was in Ruatoki, whaea Judith was the only Pākehā researcher who received universal acclaim from whānau, and in honour of her relationship with Tūhoe, she was bestowed with the title ‘Tōmairangi o Te Aroha’ – ‘the heavenly dews of love’ (New Zealand Herald, 2011a). This is my ethical and methodological justification for basing this and the following chapter upon her work. Finally, I am not an historian of Tūhoe history, but I have had the great privilege of studying elements of that through oral and written histories. As Binney continually insisted throughout her vast corpus of work, a complete history of Tūhoe is, as always, for Tūhoe, and Tūhoe alone, to write.
Te Urewera is a vast, forested, mountainous region which lies adjoining the Bay of Plenty and Hakwe’s Bay in Aotearoa New Zealand’s North Island, composed of rivers, valleys, and crested peaks that form the ancestral base of countless generations of people, chiefly amongst them those of Ngāi Tūhoe. Interwoven within the trees, rocks, streams, lakes and mist of Te Urewera, is an ever-unfolding story binding ancestor to descendant, implanting knowledge and kōrero throughout the evergreen landscape. In the bosom of Te Urewera stands Ngāi Tūhoe’s most sacred ancestral mountain, Maungapōhatu (see Figure 4). One of Tūhoe’s prodigious ancestors, Pōtiki I (Pōtiki Tiketike, Pōtiki the First), was born of a union between Maungapōhatu and the great ancestress Hinepūkohurangi, maiden of the mist (Binney, 2009: 21; Miles, 1999: 13). Tūhoe are known as ‘Ngā Tamariki o te Kohu’, the ‘Children of the Mist’, immortalised in Eldson Best’s early twentieth-century two-volume tribal history of the same name (1925). I return to Best later, but for now, his work is useful in describing the origins of Pōtiki I and Ngāi Tūhoe, as a people elementally rendered from the heart of Te Urewera. As Tūhoe kaumātua Tamati Kruger explained regarding the genesis and creation of the people of Ruatāhuna (of the western Urewera),

…[i]f you can trace where the mist comes from and if you can age it then you have discovered how long we have been here and where we come from. That to me is the true meaning of Nga Tamariki o te Kohu … it’s the Ruatāhuna people saying we are the descendants of these mountains and the mist. A very poetical way of saying ‘We’ve been here forever. We didn’t come from anywhere else. I tipu mai matou i te whenua … We are this land and we are the face of the land. When this land emerged from wherever we were on it … Wherever those mountains come from that’s where we come from. Wherever the mist emerges from and disappears to, that’s where we come from …’ That is the meaning of ‘The Children of the Mist’. That is why it is referred to as the Kohanga of Tuho… the origins of Tuho… (Kruger, 2002 in Waitangi Tribunal, 2009: 31).

Kruger’s description echoes the fundamental connection Tūhoe have with the land – for Tūhoe are the land – stretching right back to (and beyond) the birth of Pōtiki I. As Binney explains,
“[a]lmost all the hapū living in the Urewera mountains trace back to Potiki I”, an ancestor described as ‘born of the earth and sky’ (Binney, 2009: 22).

However, since the earliest encounters with Pākehā, the landscape of Te Urewera has invariably been described through a European lens as rugged and unaccommodating country, particularly uncooperative for the (European) traveller. This was the case for both missionaries and early colonial government emissaries to the region (Binney, 2009: 61). Tūhoe’s genealogy is thus inscribed into the mountains and rivers of Te Urewera since time immemorial (Binney, 2009: 21), and as the Waitangi Tribunal emphasises, the descendants of Pōtiki I (Ngā Pōtiki) were “a people born entirely of the land” (2009: 22). This is noteworthy because it demonstrates how Pōtiki and his progeny lived and existed in Te Urewera “long before” the arrival of the waka (ancestral canoe) Mataatua (Wiri, 1994: 29). Unlike many other Māori creation narratives, which locate genesis and origin beyond the oceanic horizon – in the spiritual homeland of Hawaiki (Royal, 2005) – the dawn of Ngāi Tūhoe began in the forested expanse of Te Urewera. As Kruger explained in 2004, “Kare he waka o Nga Potiki. Kare a Nga Potiki e korero ana mo Hawaiiki. Koinei tona Hawaiiki. Kare ona tipuna e hoe mai i nga moana whatiwhati a Kupe” (in Waitangi Tribunal, 2009: 29).

The eastern Bay of Plenty is known as Te Tini-o-Toi (‘the multitude of Toi’), which refers to another of Tūhoe’s ancestors, Toi. Among other names, Toi is known as Toi-kairākau – Toi the woodeater – which refers to his residence in the area before the cultivation of kūmara (Binney, 2009: 23). Tūhoe-pōtiki, the eponymous ancestor of Tūhoe, is both a descendant of Toi and Pōtiki I, as well as a great-grandson of Toroa, the captain of the waka Mataatua. One

---

39 Mataatua was one of the ancestral waka that carried the Pacific ancestors of Māori to the shores of the eastern coasts many generations ago.

40 “Potiki did not have a canoe, Nga Potiki do not talk about Hawaiki. This is their Hawaiki. Their ancestors did not row the breaking seas of Kupe.” Translation Kruger’s.
of his pā was located upon Te Tāhū o Haokitaha, the ridgeline flanking the Teepa homestead in the Ruatoki Valley (see Figure 13). In this manner, Tūhoe claim heritage from both autochthonous and immigrant whakapapa, captured in the whakatauki “Na Toi raua ko Potiki te whenua, na Tuhoe te mana me te rangatiratanga.” This whakatauki, urges Binney, emphasises Tūhoe as the “dominant tribal grouping in Te Urewera” (2009: 23).

Figure 14: Hinepūkohurangi in the distance as the sun rises over the Ruatoki Valley. Ruatoki, 2016. Photograph by Pounamu Jade Aikman.

41 ‘The land is of Toi and Pōtiki; the power and chiefly authority is of Tūhoe.’ Translation by Judith Binney.
42 There were numerous other early peoples that populated Te Urewera, which is more fully discussed in the Waitang Tribunal’s Te Urewera: Pre-publication – Part I (2009: 21-4). Pōtiki I’s genesis from within the land (‘born of the land’) is the rationale for principally focusing on him.
Figure 15: Key features of Te Urewera and the Tūhoe world. CartoGIS Services, College of Asia and the Pacific, Australian National University, 2018, adapted from Binney, 2009, p. 20.
TE UREWERA: MANA WHENUA

The ancestral boundaries of Te Urewera were defended and contested in the on-going negotiation of mana whenua, or the “exercise of authority over land” (Waitangi Tribunal 2009: 97). In the time of Pōtiki I, as explained by the elder John Ru Tahuri in the late 1990s, these boundaries extended in a roughly circular route from Te Upoko Ngā Waka near Maungapōhatu in the east, to Ōhiwa in the north, across to Awakeri and Waiohau in the west, and extending across vast tracts of ranges to Tarapounamu in the south (see Figure 15) (John Ru Tahuri, 1998 in Binney, 2009: 20-2). Ngā Pōtiki, from whom Tūhoe descend, gradually came to encompass the districts of Ruatoki, Te Whaiti, Papuni and Waikaremoana (Miles, 1999: 4). Much more detail is included in Koro John’s description, which also alludes to the contested nature of boundaries within the rohe (region): “Some of these kaumātua say the boundary went down to the Rangitaiki River at about Waiohau … but others say it didn’t go over the Ikawhenua range”. He further exemplifies the disputed nature of boundaries by explaining that, at the time of Pōtiki I, Waikaremoana and Waikareiti (lakes that are today considered definitional parts of Te Urewera) were not part of this description because they were contested boundaries with other East Coast tribes, namely Ngāti Ruapani and Ngāti Kahungunu (Binney, 2009: 21-2; see also Best, 1972: 17 for a comparable description).

Such contestation draws attention to the fluid nature of ancestral boundaries, which were continually challenged, maintained, and reinforced over time. Other peoples based in Te Urewera (such as Ngāti Whare in the west) maintained their territory, and expansions thereof, with equal determination. Although there were “long phases of peace”, describes Binney, “there were times of intense fighting” (2009: 20). Nevertheless, as generations grew, and descendants multiplied, hapū of dual autochthonous and immigrant whakapapa established themselves throughout Te Urewera. The central Te Urewera region, for instance, was occupied by Ngāti
Karetehe, Te Urewera, Ngāti Rongo, and Ngāti Tāwhaki, in which the “…Ohinemataroa and Tauranga Rivers became important highways between the principal areas of settlement: Ruatoki and Ruatahuna in the west, and Maungapohatu and Waimana in the east” (Waitangi Tribunal, 2009: 26).

*Tangata whenua: Eternal legacies of place*

It is fitting at this point to explore the relationship between people and the land, captured in the phrase ‘tangata whenua’. Tangata whenua is generally used to denote the ‘people of the land’, but more specifically encompasses a people’s genetic bond with their landscape. To this end, the word ‘whenua’ contains the double meaning of land and placenta – both of which sustain and nourish. As I have discussed elsewhere, “In times past, the nourishment provided by the land – through staples such as kūmara (sweet potato) – became part of the DNA of kin, and so their genetic makeup became embedded and solidified in the land. In this way, tangata whenua figuratively and literally means ‘people of the land’” (Aikman, 2015: 76). This is most ardently reiterated in the ritual practice of burying placenta in the land, a tradition well established throughout the Pacific (Jolly, 2007: 515). As Jolly explains, “In many Austronesian languages, the word for land (whenua, fanua, vanua) is the same as that for placenta, and a person’s attachment to place is secured by the planting of the placenta soon after birth” (2007: 515).
Figure 16: Wisps of Hinepūkohurangi, the illustrious ancestress of the mist, above Lake Waikaremoana. 1986. © Dougal Townsend, GNS Science, 2825.
Figure 17: Lake Waikaremoana flanked by the august ancestral palisade, Panekiri Range. 2000. © Dougal Townsend, GNS Science, 87907.
Figure 18: Lake Waikareiti, with Rahui and Te Kahaatuwai Islands upon its waters. 1986. © Dougal Townsend, GNS Science, 2826.
Upon the Teepa homestead in Ruatoki on a hot Summer’s afternoon, Dad explained to me that “All my moko’s [(grandchildren’s)] [whenua (placenta)] are buried over there” beneath the Tōtara tree yonder, and that his and his sisters’ rest beneath the Rhododendron adjacent to the house. Such action serves to bind people to place, and is repeated through the constancy of its practice. At the time of our kōrero, Dad’s most recent moko was awaiting the burial of her whenua, to join her whānau beneath the shelter of the Tōtara tree. This reflects how, as Jolly describes, the “imbrication of body and land is palpable in language and in corporeal practice” (2007: 515).

In Te Urewera, these observations were (and are) embodied in the exercise of mana whenua. This is reinforced both in knowledge of the landscape, and the everyday practices of living on the land. For Tūhoe, land and people are not separate, isolated entities, but are one in the same (Te Awekotuku and Nikora, 2003). Born of and from the land, Ngāi Tūhoe’s ancestry are the rivers and mountains of Te Urewera as much as they are the human manifestations of that heritage. Kuia Ani Te Hare of the Waimana Valley (the whārua contiguous with the Ruatoki Valley) meditates on this connection in the following:

E hoki ana nga whakaaro ki to tatou Whaea o te motu, ki a Papatuanuku. Ko ia to tatou whenua, ko ia to tatou Turangawaewae. Piripono tonu o tatou wairua ki te whenua, piripono tonu o tatou aroha ki te whenua. I te whanautanga o te tangata, i paiheretia te Mauri, te Mana o tona Iho ki te whenua, ki a Papatuanuku, kia mau tonu ai tona Rangatiratanga (Waitangi Tribunal, 2009: 98).43

Here, Kuia Ani expresses the integral relationship of humanity with Papa-tūā-nuku, Mother Earth, as the ultimate provider and nourisher of our living on the earth. The natural world and its denizens are not seen as split apart from humans, but are kin or ancestors to us. Such a

43 ‘My thoughts return to our mother of the island, to Papatuanuku [(the ultimate primal ancestor)], she is our land, she is our place to stand. Our spirits are as one with the land, our love is as one with the land. When a person is born the essence, the authority and his connections are made with the land (with Papatuanuku) so that his own authority will be permanent.’ Translation of the Waitangi Tribunal.
worldview sees rivers and forests not as exploitable resources, but as estates requiring careful tending to provide sustenance in perpetuity. This ontological distinction, in which people are seen to be part of the land and share in its custodianship over generations, is entirely different from settler colonial understands of land as an exploitable resource (see also Salmond’s (2014) discussion of the Whanganui River becoming a ‘legal person’).

As Koro Hakeke McGarvey of Ruatoki explained in relation to the ancestress Ohinemataroa, a principal river of the whārua, “He uri katoa matau o Tuhoe no Hine-mata-roa o Nga Potiki. No reira mai te take tipuna, tae mai ki a matau nei, me to matau noho tuturu, hapai hoki to matau kaitiakitanga”44 (Waitangi Tribunal, 2009: 100). Maintaining trusteeship over the land and its bounty is exemplified in the exercise of mana whenua, and for generations, Tūhoe were able to establish rules of resource use, including who could use what, when, and how. Which hapū within Tūhoe had the mana to negotiate this was often a point of conflict; control over access to resources was often a cause of struggle and war. Rangatira (ennobled chieftains) had to be dedicated arbiters of resource management in the interests of various stakeholders (Waitangi Tribunal, 2009: 103-4). While these struggles may play out differently today, Jolly’s statement, “…the land is seen as active not inert, as possessed of people, living and dead” (2007: 515), finds potent meaning in Te Urewera.

There is much more to be said about the many peoples that today inhabit Te Urewera. I have barely touched upon the numerous other ancestors of Te Urewera and their present day descendants, their kōrero, histories and whakapapa, but I leave that to the comprehensive body of scholarship already dedicated to such a chiefly inquiry (Binney, 2009; Waitangi Tribunal,

44’All of us of Tuhoe are descendants of Hine-mata-roa of Nga Potiki. Our ancestral claim is from this source to ourselves, and to our continuing occupation and trusteeship. All of Tuhoe can whakapapa to our tupuna, Hinemataroa and the river belongs to all of Tuhoe.’ Translation of the Waitangi Tribunal.
My purpose here has been to provide a brief sketch of the early ancestors of Te Urewera that demonstrate Ngāi Tūhoe to be a people literally and figuratively born of the land. From here, I turn to early articulations of Tūhoe sovereignty.

*The consolidation of Tūhoe as an iwi*

Amidst the loss precipitated by intertribal warfare, the hapū of Te Urewera eventually coalesced together to become the iwi (*people; nation; tribe*) Ngāi Tūhoe (Waitangi Tribunal, 2009: 26; 33-9; 46). Numerous groups inhabited other domains of Te Urewera and became their own distinct iwi, such as Ngāti Manawa (descendant of Ngāti Whare), Ngāti Hineuru and Ngāti Rangitihi, all to the west (ibid. 26), but our focus here is on the emergence of Tūhoe proper. Initially, ‘Te Urewera’ was the name of a hapū living at Ruatāhuna, but by at least the nineteenth century, the term had become synonymous with Tūhoe as an iwi – much to the chagrin of the other iwi within the region (Binney, 2009: 28). Nevertheless, as historian Angela Ballara notes, the “…title [Te Urewera] embraced the collective descent groups of the Urewera country, regardless of their original lineage”, the term denoting a grouping of people in the same way that “…‘Whanganui’ [was used] to name the collective descent groups of that river” (1998: 295-6).

This collectivity was not in name alone. By the late 1860s, it became clear that a unified series of Urewera hapū were much more suited to defend their territory than if they remained isolated from one another (ibid. 296). While this unity suffered setbacks, it became epitomised in Tūhoe’s establishment of Te Whitu Tekau, the Council of Seventy chiefs assigned with protecting Te Urewera’s boundaries from external aggressors (Binney, 2009: 5). The logic of strength through unity was at the heart of Te Whitu Tekau. Through interactions with the
Native Land Court, other tribes, and the negotiation of challenges and provocations from outside Te Urewera throughout the nineteenth, twentieth, and twenty-first centuries, Ballara charts how Tūhoe became a consolidated grouping comprised of multiple distinct hapū identities. In concluding her discussion on Tūhoe proper, Ballara notes that “…[b]y the 1990s these peripheral peoples were reasserting their separate identities, but the concept of Tūhoe as one tribe – one corporate group to confront the outside world – endured” (Ballara, 1998: 301).

Today, Te Urewera is used to describe the physical landscape and its many descendants – Ngāi Tūhoe being the dominant, but not the exclusive iwi. I refer throughout to ‘Tūhoe the iwi’, ‘Ngāi Tūhoe’ and ‘Te Urewera’ not only because descendants today affiliate themselves as such, but also because colonial hostility towards Te Urewera invariably tarred all its inhabitants with the single brushstroke of ‘rebels’, ‘savages’, and, more recently, ‘terrorists’. The consequences of this were and continue to be felt by all Tūhoe, and my discussion throughout this thesis examines such repercussions as they pertain to Tūhoe as a whole.

The latter half of the 1800s saw the emergence of Tūhoe proper, in which the series of amalgamated hapū emerged as a “strong, cohesive political and military unit” with great capacity for both defence and attack (Waitangi Tribunal, 2009: 46; Binney, 2009: 45). However, it is important to note that in the unfolding of the nineteenth century, hapū exercised their own chiefly autonomy in the management and control of their own affairs. Nevertheless, decisions of significant gravity were not made in isolation. Hui were consistently held amongst the leadership echelon to “reach consensus on a range of vital issues” throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (Binney, 2009: 28). Although hapū chiefs could oppose decisions made by the collective, which did happen from time to time, this mind-set, of independent hapū with a shared purpose and belonging to a larger group, remains a hallmark of Ngāi Tūhoe in the nineteenth century (28–9). While disagreement may have manifested for individual
decisions, the core values of maintaining relationships and localised control of hapū affairs, expressed through the collective hapū leadership, remained consistent throughout (E.T.J. Durie, 1998 in Binney, 2009: 29). This collectivity interwoven amongst autonomous groups would be repeatedly called upon, as strange visitors and ideas arrived within Te Urewera from the early nineteenth century.

*Nineteenth century intertribal warfare and the introduction of guns*

Prior to the emergence of Tūhoe, New Zealand was engulfed in intertribal warfare, intensely exacerbated by the introduction of firearms technology in the early nineteenth century. The period 1818 to 1835 heralded significant intertribal conflict within and at the margins of Te Urewera, through an “…almost continuous series of raids and battles [in which Tūhoe were] surrounded by enemies on all sides” (Miles, 1999: 26; Waitangi Tribunal, 2009: 39). Numerous battles were waged, including those with Ngāti Kahungunu, Ngāti Pūkeko, Ngāti Awa, Ngāti Manawa, and Ngāti Whare. As Ballara remarked, “…[a]t one point different hapū of Tūhoe were at war from one end of the East Coast to the other” (1998: 293). Intermarriage between Tūhoe and non-Tūhoe hapū gradually saw the end to major conflicts of this nature, but the consolidation of these hapū (into a single iwi) did not diminish individual hapū autonomy, nor their ability to function as “separate corporate units” within Te Urewera (ibid. 294).

The introduction of European technology into nineteenth century tribal landscapes of present-day Aotearoa New Zealand drastically altered the socio-political and economic structures of the time, bearing rapid agricultural and scientific development. Drawing on the observations of the missionary Samuel Marsden in the Bay of Islands in the early 1800s, Ballara has elsewhere written that the increasing demand by Europeans for Māori agricultural products (principally, potatoes), coupled with the phenomenally transformative deployment of iron tools in
agricultural practices, saw remarkable surges in both productivity and wealth for the northern people of Ngā Puhi (2003: 189; see also Petrie, 2006). For renowned Ngā Puhi chief Hongi Hika, this economic expansion was critical in the acquisition of firearms, which he eventually achieved upon returning from a journey to England (Ballara 2003: 192). Knowledge of this new technology spread rapidly amongst Māori communities, transmitted through the robust communications infrastructure of “messengers and heralds, trading and visiting parties” (2003: 405). Galvanised with economic prosperity and new weaponry, Ngā Puhi warring expeditions could be ‘financed’ over greater distances and longer periods of time (Belich, 1996: 159). This was the case with the 1822 Ngā Puhi raids in Te Urewera, targeting, among other kāinga (villages), Ruatoki. On this occasion, however, the more coastally-based Ngāti Awa and Ngāti Pūkeko endured the majority of Ngā Puhi’s wrath, while Tūhoe retreated to support their forces engaged elsewhere in Te Urewera (Miles, 1999: 29; Binney, 2009: 44). A peace was later forged in 1823 between Ngā Puhi and Tūhoe, secured by the great chief Te Maitaranui (Miles, 1999: 29-30).

Tūhoe were to eventually acquire their own muskets, and in the cessation and aftermath of the widespread (and hugely costly) armed hostility amongst Māori in the early 1830s, had extended their rohe and its bounty to now include, amongst other areas, the “fertile alluvial flats of Opuriao and Waimana”. Here, Tūhoe began to solidify their rohe as a “single sovereign territorial state” (Milroy and Melbourne, 1995: 80 in Miles, 1999: 52).45 Today, over sixty Tūhoe hapū exist, dispersed throughout Te Urewera, with descendants living both there and elsewhere in New Zealand, Australia, the United Kingdom, and Canada.46 The principal hapū based

46 See http://www.ngaituhoe.iwi.nz/nga-hapu-o-tuhoe-authority for more detailed information on the various hapū of Tūhoe and their associated marae.
around Ruatoki are Hāmua, Ngāti Tāwhaki, Te Whānau a Pani, Ngāti Rongo, Ngāti Koura, Ngāti Mura, Te Māhurehure, and Te Urewera, each linking to one or more of the eleven marae of the Valley.

Snippets of Tūhoe histories, such as those described above, reiterate a key point of this chapter: Tūhoe history is not one of seclusion and isolation, but of movement and communication. Summarising this reflection, the Waitangi Tribunal offer the following:

The history of the peoples of Te Urewera is characterised by successive waves of expansion, integration and resettlement. From the beginning, Te Urewera has seen continuous interaction between old and newer groups: those who, according to their traditions, originated from the land itself and those who migrated across the ocean. Kinship bonds woven between peoples stretched beyond the region, to hapu and iwi throughout Te Ika a Maui [(the North Island)]. This is a human history that defies the common depiction of Te Urewera as isolated and removed. In the Maori world isolation was rarely the norm. Te Urewera was no different: the net of whakapapa stretched far across neighbouring regions and further afield (2009: 20-1).

The human composition of present-day Te Urewera may have transformed significantly from the time of the founding ancestors, but “…Tuhoe still refer to these ancient identities, and the importance of these connections has seemingly not diminished over time” (Miles, 1999: 4). The interconnection and whanaungatanga (relationship) between different iwi reflected a network of relationships that continues to be the “lived experience of Te Urewera communities”, despite intermittent antagonism towards one another. Ngāti Whare and Ngāti Mana speak of their common heritage and identity with Tūhoe, an important distinction shared also with Ngāti Kahungunu and Ngāti Ruapani (Waitangi Tribunal, 2009: 8). Again, these histories emphasise animation and communication, a theme that similarly unfolds as Pākehā evangelists first set foot into Te Urewera.
The arrival of foreign theologies into Te Urewera

Christianity arrived in Te Urewera from the 1830s, as missionaries sought to spread their versions of faith and institutionalised spirituality. The first Anglican missionary to establish a presence in Te Urewera was Reverend John Wilson in 1839, situated at Ōpōtiki, who made regular evangelical visits to Waimana and Ruatoki (Binney, 2009: 46). However, my interest here lies not so much in the proliferation of denominations, but rather in the flows of movement and interaction engendered by the arrival of these new ideas and opportunities.

Binney’s descriptions of the missionary journeys into the region highlights receptive responses from people in Te Urewera (2009: 46-61). Reverend William Williams arrived in late 1840, and upon reaching Ruatāhuna (where he was to deliver religious sermons), noticed that most were away in Whakatāne to sell corn to Europeans (ibid. 46-7). In the same year, William Colenso (“the Anglicans’ printer”) wrote of his entry into a pā at Te Onepoto (at Waikaremoana), in which he was received by a “…young chief bearing a Testament in his hand to show that he was not a Roman Catholic” (ibid. 48). In other areas, Tūhoe taught themselves the content of the religious teachings through oral transmission (ibid. 47), and the ‘Anglican’s printer’ was awestruck by people near Waikaremoana, through biblical texts, teaching themselves to read.

The prized nature of the written word amongst Tūhoe was underscored in Colenso’s distribution of books at Oputao, which was met by people “shout[ing] for joy” (ibid. 51). Colenso was preceded at Waikaremoana by the Catholic Father Claude Baty, who noticed the universal “desire for literacy in Māori” throughout Te Urewera (ibid. 51), more broadly reflective of the general trend amongst Māori to become literate (Miles, 1999: 67). Elsewhere, Baty visited settlements “some espousing Catholicism, others Protestantism”, and on one occasion, he wrote of a Catholic chapel being erected “…where no European priest [before himself] had been before”. Wherever he visited, knowledge or practice of these religions existed
(Binney, 2009: 51-3). This did not represent devout conversion to, or outright rejection of, foreign religions, but rather represented an on-going debate surrounding the place of these ideas in relation to Māori theology. This context indicates that Te Urewera was “…clearly not isolated from the latest ideas in circulation” (ibid. 47).

These are not scattered and unrelated observations. They reflect a people keen to engage and interact with newcomers and their attendant philosophies, who demonstrated endeavour to achieve parity in both spoken and written discourse, and who, from at least the 1840s, were trading on the coasts of the eastern Bay of Plenty (see also Miles, 1999: 60-1). This is reinforced by the observations of Henry Brown, the first government representative to visit Te Urewera in 1862, who noted that much of the population were tending gardens, trading, or away seeking work in Hawke’s Bay (Binney, 2009: 62).

Trade would continue in earnest for Tūhoe throughout the 1840s, with their economy expanding so that they now frequented the trading posts at Ōpōtiki and Whakatāne (Binney, 2009: 55). This was propelled by Tūhoe’s agricultural development of land at Ruatoki and Opuriao in the 1830s, to cultivate European crops such as potatoes, corn and wheat (Miles, 1999: 60-1). It is of no surprise, then, that the Ruatoki plains – as well as those in Waimana – emerged as “intimate part[s] of the Tūhoe world in the early 1840s” (Binney, 2009: 55). The snapshot here is of networks of information pulsating across the breadth of Te Urewera’s mountainous reach: “The impression gained is not one of isolation, but rather a flow of information and messages passing through the Urewera” (Binney, 2009: 51). Despite this, however, imagery and discourse of Tūhoe as an isolated and secluded people persisted.
First encounters with the colonial government

The government’s earliest encounters with the people of Te Urewera, through the emissary Henry Brown in 1862, were met with caution. The well-established networks of communication within and out of Te Urewera ensured rangatira were acutely aware of the broader political situation Māori were facing, in the burgeoning eclipse of colonial authority and aggression. This was exemplified by the invasion of the Waikato during Crown campaigns against the Kingitanga, and in the unlawful taking of land at Waitara by the government following the war in Taranaki. Brown journeyed to Te Urewera supposedly to ‘get the feeling’ of a proposition, put forward by Governor George Grey, for “…‘rūnanga’, or self-governing Māori district councils with powers to determine land titles” (Binney, 2009: 61, 61-5; O’Malley, 1998: 22-3; Waitangi Tribunal, 2009: 132). The desire here was to create a universal land tenure system that would appease both Pākehā and Māori, to ostensibly balance tribal autonomy with the settlers’ ‘want’ of land [forgive me for the contradiction in terms here]. O’Malley (1998: 24) suggests that had such a policy been pursued, it “…might have prevented nearly a decade of bloody fighting and racial conflict” against the Kingitanga in Waikato. He goes further to propose that “[c]ontrolled settlement of Maori districts on terms not inconsistent with the Treaty of Waitangi might have been possible”.

In Te Urewera, there was thoughtful interest in such a system, but fears of the government taking land lay at the forefront of rangatira anxieties. These concerns were not unfounded. The overriding motivation behind the rūnanga system, indeed behind the colonial government in general at this time, was to prise open Māori land for settler expansion (ibid. 24-5). For Tūhoe,
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47 As a response to colonisation, the Kingitanga emerged in 1858 to arrest the sale of Māori land, politically unify Māori, and create a representative body on par with the British monarchy. The movement was seen as a threat by the state, and the Kingitanga became the object of the Crown’s invasion of the Waikato in 1863. Consult Stokes, 2002, Department of Internal Affairs, 1996, O’Malley, 2016, Jones, 1959, and Jones and Biggs, 1995 for more in-depth information.
this meant that the “sanctuary’ of the Urewera had to be broken open” (Binney, 2009: 99; see also Brooking, 1992). Nevertheless, Tūhoe had demonstrated a fervent interest in the concept of law, and were keen to develop a system of self-governance, in co-operation with Governor George Grey (Binney, 2009: 65). This would be predicated, Tūhoe specified, upon collective agreement from each hapū. Nevertheless, the rūnanga system never matured past infancy. As it became abundantly clear, rūnanga would not function in the interests of European expansion, and, unsurprisingly, many hapū and iwi were not keen on “full-scale colonisation” (O’Malley 1998: 25). Overall, Tūhoe were a politically attuned people, well aware of the unfolding circumstances of mid-nineteenth century colonial New Zealand, fully appreciative of the Crown’s capacity for violence, and at every possible step, remained willing to work with the colonial administration, to avoid the loss of land, and the social, economic, and political fallout that would inevitably follow.

**VIOLENCE: OF THE SWORD AND OF THE PEN**

From the 1860s onwards, Tūhoe were subject to the full arsenal of colonial weaponry, both of the sword and of the pen – that is, both in overt acts of violence, and the structural violence contained within the machinations of law and bureaucracy. The widespread confiscation of Tūhoe land in 1866 is pivotal to this, but is only part of a much larger story. In recounting this narrative, we must first explore the key events that collectively triggered the confiscations, and paved the path for Crown invasions into Te Urewera.

*The siege of Ōrākau and the solidification of Tūhoe the savage’ in Pākehā consciousness*

Our discussion begins with Tūhoe’s involvement in the battle of Ōrākau in 1864 (Ballara, 1998: 294-5; Binney, 2009: 68-73; Miles, 1999: 100-2), the final encounter with British forces in the invasion of the Waikato. From here, the imagery of Tūhoe as a wild, savage people, bent on haphazardly waging war, became solidified in European consciousness (Binney, 2009: 68, 73).
Depictions of Tūhoe as a secluded, savage people had already dominated Pākehā discourse, but it was from this critical juncture that the discursive weight and authority of these imaginings began to influence government thinking towards Te Urewera. Binney highlights the lesser known rationales for Tūhoe’s entry into the ‘siege of Ōrākau’, emphasising the contested nature of involvement in the war (2009: 68-73). Ngāti Maniapoto chief Rewi Maniapoto, representing the Kingitanga, had canvassed the Urewera region in the early 1860s, in search for assistance in the protection of the Waikato against government forces (Miles, 1999: 98). Among some people he found support, but in others the question of aligning with the Crown was being contemplated (Binney, 2009: 69-70; see also Miles, 1999: 98).

There were a number of considerations in these debates, such as whakapapa links between Tūhoe and Waikato, and the desire for conflict to be contained in the Waikato and not to transgress the threshold of Te Urewera (Binney, 2009: 70-1). To this end, a scattering of people were sent in support of Ngāti Maniapoto, but as Best explains, the hapū of the Ruatoki and Waimana Valleys refused to participate (Best, 1972: 566; Miles, 1999: 99). The sentiment here was a “majority decision … to protect their own borders” (Binney, 2009: 71). Armed resistance was the last resort – only if the security of Te Urewera were compromised – and as the chief Te Ahoaho famously pronounced, “‘Kia Tawhatautia a Mataatua’, or ‘Let Mataatua [(an aphorism for Te Urewera)] be sheltered’” (Miles, 1999: 99). Tūhoe’s ultimate decision to send a small contingent to the battlefront had been a carefully measured response, and one that prioritised caution over confrontation. Despite being heavily outnumbered, the combined Tūhoe and Waikato forces in the citadel at Ōrākau “…resisted five sustained assaults and fifty-six hours of continuous fighting” (Binney, 2009: 72). Alas, Tūhoe suffered devastating losses. Of the one hundred kin that were sent, thirty did not return (Miles, 1999: 100).
The battle of Ōrākau is a crucial moment in Tūhoe’s genealogy of colonial encounter, as, through the eyes of government, it began to establish Tūhoe culpability for rebelling against the Crown. Such ‘rebellion’, it was argued, justified extensive confiscation of lands belonging to all major tribal groupings of the eastern Bay of Plenty.48 From here, the discursive authority of Tūhoe as a secluded, wild, and now rebellious Other, becomes clear. Binney’s reflection is fitting:

From this point on, Tūhoe had to contend with a reputation among Europeans for being the most determined of Māori fighters. The idea that they possessed a territorial ‘sanctuary’ in the mountains, and yet had given support (however limited) to Ngāti Maniapoto’s defence ensured that Tūhoe were distrusted. The colonists who had convinced themselves that Maniapoto’s resistance to military invasion was an act of rebellion against the Queen now became equally convinced – by their own rhetoric – that Tūhoe’s autonomous existence threatened European authority. But, in reality, Tūhoe’s responses to the spread of war had been considered, and cautious (2009: 73).

These depictions of Tūhoe are inconsistent with the historical narratives explored thus far, and this contextualisation, augmented by my ethnographic-focused chapters in the latter half of this thesis, disrupts the dominant discourses that proclaim truth of and about Tūhoe in contemporary New Zealand society.

Pai Mārire, Völkner, and Fulloon

Two other watershed incidents precede the confiscation of Tūhoe land, and the subsequent invasions of Te Urewera by British forces. These were the killings of the Anglican missionary, Carl Völkner, and the interpreter and government agent, James Te Mautaranui Fulloon. Both of these were read by the government as evidence of Tūhoe rebellion (Binney, 2009: 86), and I discuss the context surrounding each in turn. In 1865, representatives of the Pai Mārire (Good and Peaceful) movement were sent by their leader, Te Ua Haumene, to the “four quarters’ of

48 And elsewhere in New Zealand of course, but our focus here is upon Tūhoe and the surrounding hapū and iwi.
the land” to spread word of their faith (Binney, 2009: 73). Pai Mārire emerged out of the war-ravaged Taranaki in 1862, but importantly, and contrary to commonly held belief, “…Te Ua did not preach or incite ‘war at the end of the world’. He offered a theology of a future liberation in a colonial situation” (ibid. 75). Stimulated by Pai Mārire’s philosophy of defending territorial boundaries, the faith quickly dispersed across tribal borders (Head, 1991: 284; Miles, 1999: 101). To this end, Te Ua sent Kereopa Te Rau and Patara Raukatauri to search for converts in Te Urewera. He was explicit in his instructions to Kereopa and Patara: ‘kaua e aha ki te pakeha’49 (Binney, 2009: 74). The events they subsequently partook in suggest their actions were of their own volition and unsanctioned by Te Ua.

Pai Mārire received mixed responses from Tūhoe hapū, and while many joined the new faith, others were not so receptive. Te Whāiti chiefs, for example, quickly wrote to the Civil Commissioner to recount the emissaries’ arrival, that they had received death threats from them should they not convert, and informed the Commissioner that they had refused to convert. More generally, the arrival of Pai Mārire missionaries divided Māori communities because of the significant potential for British retaliation (Miles, 1999: 102). Such colonial reprisal is crucial to understand: as Miles points out, Pākehā were “extremely threatened by Pai Mārire or the ‘Hauhau religion’, in spite of its pacifist origins, and viewed adherence to the cult as synonymous with rebellion” (1999: 102). This sentiment is unsurprising, given that the principles underpinning Pai Mārire were diametrically inconsistent with those of an expanding settler colonial state. From the Crown’s standpoint, it would tangibly link Tūhoe to the killing of Völkner.

49 ‘Don’t do anything at all to the pakeha’. Binney’s translation.
In 1865, Kereopa and Patara arrived at Ōpōtiki, and both here and in Whakatāne, they emplaced a kati, or 'stoppage', to bar ships from entering either port. Their objective at Ōpōtiki was to stop Völkner from returning to the region (Binney 2009: 76). Völkner’s complicity with the government was well known, to the extent where he was advised not to return to his parish in fears for his safety. Nevertheless, in violation of the kati, Völkner defiantly returned to Ōpōtiki on March 1, 1865. The following day he was escorted to his death, a decision which, as Binney observes, Kereopa was directly involved in (2009: 76). However – and more to the point – Tūhoe collusion in these events is inconclusive. There is a remotely limited suggestion of Tūhoe involvement contained within “two scraps of evidence” (letters with marginal references to Te Urewera), but indications of Tūhoe participation in this plot are tenuous at best (2009: 77-80). Nevertheless, this, in conjunction with Kereopa later seeking shelter in Te Urewera, would eventuate as a fundamental pillar of the Crown’s justification for a military response.

The killing of James Fulloon proved to be the proverbial last straw, instigating a heavily militarised response to ‘rebellion’ in the eastern Bay of Plenty. Fulloon had aristocratic whakapapa within the region, linking to Tūhoe through his grandparents. As an interpreter, he also accompanied Brown to Te Urewera in 1862, passed intelligence along to Governor Grey, and led the charge for hunting those responsible for Völkner’s killing (Binney, 2009: 80-1). His efforts were part of the broader government strategy to capture Kereopa, which, by June 1865, was in its full operation. The pursuit of Kereopa left a polarising wake throughout the region, and when Fulloon was deployed to Whakatāne in July, “…instead of defusing the tension and speeding the search for Kereopa, he created a war” (ibid. 85). Landing at Whakatāne, he intended to recruit support to fight against the rebellion. In the process, however, he broke an

---

50 This was not helped by Völkner’s “prediliction to turn everything into a conspiracy” (Binney, 2009: 76).
aukati (enforced boundary), a “…boundary against armed invasion [and] … an attempt to stave off war” (Binney, 2009: 86; see also Miles, 1999: 103). The Kate (the cutter carrying Fulloon) was then boarded by a contingent of Ngāti Awa and Pai Mārire. Their interactions were brief. In his act of trespass, Fulloon was “killed as a spy” (ibid. 86). In Fulloon’s killing, as in Völkner’s, Tūhoe’s involvement remains unsubstantiated. Doubt is further cast on Tūhoe complicity in Fulloon’s case because of shared whakapapa he had with Tūhoe (Miles, 1999: 103). In the eyes of the government, however, both killings were perpetrated by Pai Mārire, and in the case of Tūhoe, mere association with the faith was evidence enough of their involvement, however remote or non-existent that may have been.

The hunt for Kereopa

The government’s response was immediate. In September 1865, Governor Grey announced a ‘proclamation of peace’ that the Taranaki wars had ended, pardoning the tribes who had fought against the government, but importantly (and ironically), excluded those ‘responsible’ for the deaths of Völkner and Fulloon. It declared that forces were being sent to the eastern Bay of Plenty in pursuit of the culprits for these murders, and categorically stated that refusal to cooperate with government orders, or sheltering the perpetrators, would be met with the swift confiscation of land (Miles, 1999: 105). This ultimatum would be unforgiving. Two months after Fulloon’s murder, martial law was imposed in Ōpōtiki and Whakatāne, in which the “…government ordered a full-scale military occupation” of the region (Binney, 2009: 88). The troops deployed to Ōpōtiki arrived without any prior warning or notice of the proclamation, and pillaged the land and its bounty with impunity (Miles, 1999: 106-7). As Miles explains, “…the Government forces punished the iwi by plundering and wasting great quantities of Whakatohea’s and Ngai Tama’s food and property while indiscriminately skirmishing with various Maori they encountered in the vicinity” (1999: 107). In practice, the actions of
government troops indicate a force more interested in the pacification of threats ("hostile tribes") rather than the capture of Pai Mārire fugitives. As it became clear, “any community associated with Pai Marire might suffer the attention of the expeditionary forces” (ibid. 108).

Confiscation as penance

Eager to give what was wanted, Fulloon’s close Tūhoe whanaunga (relation), Rakuraku, supported the government forces in seeking out Kereopa, a move to both protect Tūhoe lands and “[avenge] a [fallen] kinsman” (Binney, 2009: 89). For other Tūhoe chiefs, however, this would be interpreted as allegiance to the Crown, and Rakuraku later suffered retaliation to this end. Rakuraku provided intelligence on the whereabouts of Kereopa in Te Urewera, and when expeditionary forces entered Tūhoe’s territory, even fed them. His support was praised in official communications, and his actions more widely reflect a people desperately trying to “keep trouble out” of their homeland. A group of perpetrators were eventually captured (or were surrendered) and tried in Auckland in 1866. The punishment for those charged was the confiscation of land, a penance that extended also to Tūhoe, “…to whom none of those who were charged belonged” (Binney, 2009: 93, her emphasis). For Binney, this is clear evidence that for the government, “the existence of rebellion was secondary to the confiscation of land” (ibid. 94).

The confiscations were punitive, divisive, and designed to foster settler expansion:

The confiscations were a different form of looting, intended to take the wealth and break the autonomy of the people of this region. In this agenda, Tūhoe were included … This was a policy designed explicitly to divide Māori into loyal and rebel categories, and to force Māori to prove their 'loyalty' by acts, deeds and a compulsory oath of allegiance to the Crown … It was a policy also designed explicitly to make land accessible to European settlers … It was a policy to ‘tame’ ‘wild men’ by dispossessing them (Binney, 2009: 94, her emphasis).
Tūhoe were further implicated in rebellious activity by allegedly providing support for Kereopa and other ‘rebels’ that had fled the East Coast. In reality, the shockwaves from battles with colonial forces on the East Coast had forced many to flee into Te Urewera for safety. However, in the eyes of government administrator Donald McLean, an “autocratic” individual who “deplored democracy” (Ward, 2017), Te Urewera was actively sheltering Kereopa, hostile towards the government, and capable of armed resistance to this end. (It is possible Kereopa was hiding in Te Urewera at this time, but definitely not at the behest of Tūhoe (Binney, 2009: 95, 99)).

Four issues converge here. Firstly, the search for ‘rebellion’ in a context where this was repeatedly shown not to be the case. Secondly, Tūhoe’s association with Pai Mārire. Thirdly, the state’s desire for Māori land to accelerate settler expansion. Finally, the rhetoric that saw Te Urewera and its inhabitants as savage, ‘rebel’, less-than-human, in need of taming, isolated from the light of civilisation, and whose “…autonomy was threatening to those who looked in its direction … who had had little, or no, contact with its people”. This dangerous cocktail sought to rationalise Crown retaliation, and for McLean, it justified the confiscation of Tūhoe lands (Binney, 2009: 94-5; see also Waitangi Tribunal, 2009: 166).

One other episode is important to discuss in relation to the Crown’s confiscation of Tūhoe land. As I explained, Tūhoe chiefs were keen to aid in the government’s hunt for Kereopa throughout 1865 and 1866. Binney’s is the only research that discusses the following instalment of the pursuit of Kereopa, through a close reading of archival material (2009: 101-111). In March 1866, a delegation of Te Urewera chiefs met with Colonel William Lyon, who oversaw the army and its deployment of martial law in the wider region. The chiefs in attendance included Te Pūrewa II of Ruatāhuna and Ruatoki (who led the delegation), Hetaraka Te Ahuru,
Winiata Taratoa, Atama Te Kikiwi, and Ihakara. The chiefs reiterated that they were not involved in Völknner’s murder, but simultaneously made clear they would defend their boundaries from attack (Binney, 2009: 104-5). Their condition for capturing and delivering Kereopa, who was in Te Urewera at this time, was predicated upon receiving an endorsement by Te Ua agreeing to this course of action. This would be an unwavering condition, as Tūhoe did not want to provoke unwanted reprisals from within Māoridom, should they proceed with the capture before receiving official support from Pai Mārire’s leader. During this precise time, Te Ua was being held prisoner by Governor Grey; further, it was known that Te Ua did not sanction Völknner’s execution (ibid. 109). No letter was sent, despite the government’s knowledge that such a communication would immediately precipitate Kereopa’s apprehension. As this unfolded, the government also sent expeditions from the east in the belief that Kereopa was hiding at Maungapōhatu (ibid. 110). Tension was escalating, and the climate was uneasy. In conjunction with receiving no letter from Te Ua, Tūhoe leaders, in an atmosphere of heightened anxiety, were split on the matter of apprehending Kereopa and delivering him to his likely death. Tūhoe found themselves unenviably stuck between a colonial rock and a hard place: they were eager to engage in dialogue, but their requests fell upon deaf ears. These observations are why Binney asserts that,

…in an attempt to protect their lands from invasion, [Tūhoe’s leaders] made a collective effort to capture Kereopa. The government failed to respond to their request for a letter from Te Ua, at a time when Te Ua was the government’s personal prisoner. Conclusive documentary evidence does not exist, but it seems reasonable to suggest that the government did not wish to settle for peace terms with Tūhoe’s leaders. The confiscations were to be pushed through, without the policy being jeopardised by the success of Tūhoe’s negotiations. The government wanted to break the autonomy of Te Urewera. If this is the case, then it can be understood why this entire episode concerning Kereopa has been obliterated from all previous historical accounts (2009: 111).

This discussion reinforces a key point I would like to emphasise, as the Waitangi Tribunal (1999: 64) and Binney have already made clear: the government’s overriding priority was the
acquisition of land for settler expansion, and not cooperation and negotiation with Tūhoe. This meant putting a decisive end to Tūhoe’s autonomy, irrespective of the cost (Waitangi Tribunal 2009: 162). Alas, as Binney remarks, “a rebellion [was created] where there had been none” (Binney 2009: 100).

CONCLUSION

This brief historical overview has explored Tūhoe’s emergence as a sovereign people born of ‘earth and sky’, detailing some of their stories of creation as well as their later colonial interactions in the early nineteenth century. Throughout, these stories have emphasised Tūhoe as a people open to dialogue with the outside world, but equally so, a people determined to protect their territorial sovereignty. Their responses to Crown hostility were carefully measured rejoinders made in full cognisance of obligations to other hapū and iwi in the Māori world. Te Urewera, then, was a place of movement, connection, and communication, inconsistent with the colonial depictions of Tūhoe as a purely savage and isolated people. Nevertheless, as we have seen, these discourses continued to inform colonial attitudes and thinking towards Tūhoe and their homeland, and played no small role in the eventual seizure of Tūhoe’s most fertile lands and estates. Understanding this broader context is crucial in making sense of the on-going state violence Tūhoe are subject to, for Tūhoe, as a people born of the land, maintain a superior sovereign claim to guardianship over Te Urewera. This claim, however, was repeatedly and aggressively challenged by the Crown in the decades that followed, unfolding as a tale of loss and destruction. The ‘competition of sovereignties’ this saga highlighted forms the basis of the following chapter.
CHAPTER IV: COMPETING SOVEREIGNTIES

INTRODUCTION

“Territoriality, the fusion of people and land, is settler colonialism’s specific, irreducible element”, suggests Patrick Wolfe in Traces of History: Elementary Structures of Race (Wolfe, 2016: In Whole and In Part, 2006: 388). In continuing our discussion on the theme of place, Wolfe’s meditations on settler colonialism are fitting in directing the trajectory both for this chapter, and the remainder of my thesis. For him, settler colonialism is an on-going project predicated upon a ‘logic of elimination’, which “strives for the dissolution of native societies [and] erects a new colonial society on the expropriated land base” (Wolfe, 2006: 388). At the heart of this rests a contestation between settler and Indigenous (‘Native’) sovereignties (hence

---

51 Note that several white anthropologists of Indigenous Australia are critical of Wolfe and his work, such as Howard Morphy (1996). Jolly (2004) has provided an insightful review of Wolfe’s meditations on the logic of elimination, in conversation with elements of these critiques. Consult her work for more detail.
the title of this chapter), and because of the “stubborn exteriority” of the latter, the vehement campaign against Indigenous existence is multifaceted and on-going (Wolfe, 2016: *In Whole and In Part*). Colonialism seeks the disappearance of Indigenous peoples (Wolfe, 2016: *Introduction*), and as hallmarks of settler colonialism, this is articulated through the “…breaking-down of native title into alienable individual freeholds … religious conversion, resocialization [and] frontier homicide” (Wolfe, 2006: 388). Because Indigenous sovereignties remain, however – despite concerted historical and contemporary efforts to the contrary – this is a perpetual process: “settler colonizers come to stay: invasion is a structure not an event” (Wolfe, 2006: 388, 2016: *In Whole and In Part*). This offers considerable insight into the repetitious nature of state violence experienced by Tūhoe over the last decade.

In this chapter, our historical investigation of Tūhoe histories follows the inscription of Crown sovereignty over Te Urewera, histories which are saturated in bloody violence as control of Tūhoe’s most sacred and treasured inheritance – land – was prised from their control. As Wolfe emphasises, “Land is life – or, at least, land is necessary for life. Thus contests for land can be – indeed, often are – contests for life” (Wolfe, 2006: 387). For Tūhoe, this contest was characterised by confiscation, invasions, infrastructural obliteration, and complicated and duplicitous legal manoeuvres. I trace these events from the late nineteenth century up until the “…worst clash between the Crown and a Māori community [in the early twentieth century]” (Binney, 2009: 572), the police raid on Rua Kēnana’s community at Maungapōhatu in 1916.

---

52 The struggle for Indigenous sovereignty and self-determination, especially in the Pacific context, is a broad body of scholarship (Cram, 2005; Kauanui, 2005a, 2005b; McMullin, 2005; Ontai, 2005; Perez, 2005; Pihama, 2005; Rohrer, 2016: 3.; Silva, 2004; Smith, 2003). My focus here is upon the negation and elimination of Indigenous sovereignties, and the framework of logic that informs how this unfolds in settler colonies.

53 Assimilation is also a means of elimination, and in the New Zealand context, Richard Hill’s research focuses on colonial policing and the relationships between Māori and the Crown. This was reflected through the “…state’s longstanding aim of fully assimilating Maori to ‘European’ modes of behaviour and ways of viewing the world” (Hill, 2009: 1, see also 2004, 1989, 2003; Hill and Butterworth, 1986).
This narrative, then, is an outline of the originary violence (per Watson (2009)) that contributed to the establishment of the New Zealand settler colonial state, a context that we must be familiar with in order to fully appreciate the state violence suffered by Tūhoe whānau in the last ten years. However, we must resist the allure of resigning ourselves to despondency, because regardless of all of this, Tūhoe have resisted – and survived – against the logic of elimination. We must similarly keep in mind Foucault’s reminder that power infers resistance, and by simple virtue of Tūhoe’s continued existence, they deny the colonial machine the satisfaction of full and final ‘settlement’ (that is, extermination). Let us begin by returning to where we left off in the previous chapter, on the precipice of Crown confiscation of Tūhoe lands.

**OF THE PEN: CONFISCATION ENSUES**

Eastern Bay of Plenty lands became confiscated through an Order in Council under the *New Zealand Settlements Act 1863*, legislation that enabled “land of any rebellious tribe” to be taken as recompense and punishment (Waitangi Tribunal, 2009: 161). (Confiscation is referred to as ‘raupatu’ in Māori discourse). As we shall see, this reflects a history of punishing Māori resistance through the expropriation of land, a crucial context in which the more recent paramilitary raids are situated. The *Settlements Act* coincided with the ascension of the *Suppression of Rebellion Act 1863*, designed to “suppress a rebellion and punish those responsible for certain acts of ‘atrocity and outrage’”, and amongst its measures of punishment, included the use of summary execution (ibid. 295). The confiscated area, gazetted in 1866, was drawn as follows (see Figure 20):

All that land bounded by a line commencing at the mouth of the Waitahanui River, Bay of Plenty, and running due south for a distance of twenty miles, thence to the summit of (Mount Edgecombe) [Pūtauaki], thence by a straight line in an easterly direction to a point eleven miles due south from the entrance to the Ohiwa Harbour, thence by a line running due east for twenty miles, thence by a line to the mouth of the Aparapara
[Hāparapara] River, and thence following the coast line to the point of commencement at Waitahanui (New Zealand Gazette, in Binney, 2009: 102). 54

This evinces how surveying was a critical technology of colonial dispossession. Here, by the blade of a bureaucrat’s pen, Tūhoe’s most fertile and bountiful lands were seized as punishment for a rebellion they were not party to. The confiscation, it was argued in Tūhoe’s Statement of Claim, was intentional, designed both to severely impair Tūhoe’s economy, and subjugate Te Urewera to Crown authority (Waitangi Tribunal, 2009: 162-3). The seizure of the most fertile lands from Ruatoki, Waimana, and Ōhiwa, was a deliberate move by the Crown (ibid. 162), 55 and in the Ruatoki and Waimana Valleys, it was taken “without warning” (ibid. 167).

In retrospect, the Crown conceded that the confiscations were “unjust and excessive” (ibid. 155). Inscribing linear lines atop a nineteenth century tribal landscape reflected an inherent incompatibility between differing epistemologies relating to land. They may have made sense in the surveyor’s drawing room, in the language of colonial cartography, but no consideration was given to the lived realities of hapū at the flaxroots levels, where lines such as these appeared arbitrary, haphazard, and hastily drawn. This, I suggest, is palpable only when read in the context of an expanding settler colonial state. The confiscation lines were entirely inconsistent with the exercise of mana whenua, which saw tribal boundaries as continuously in flux, and within the purview of diplomacy, negotiation, and conversation amongst hapū and iwi. This, for Wolfe, is the process of violent replacement, again premised on the battle of sovereignties: “Rather than replacing one owner with another, settlers seek to replace an entire system of ownership with another. The settler/Native confrontation … is between sovereignties, which are primordially external to one another” (Wolfe, 2016: In Whole and in Part). Again, we are

54 New Zealand Gazette, 11 September 1866, p. 348.
55 See ‘Statement of Claim for Wai 36 Tuhoe, 16 February 2000’ (claim 1.6(a)), p. 4, for more information.
confronted with divergent ontologies of land, one being a fusion of body and place, the other, of extraction and exploitation.

Internationally, the confiscations were met with objection. Edward Caldwell, British Secretary of State for Colonies, cautioned Grey that the confiscations would ‘render insecure’ native land tenure, and “drive to despair those who are but half our enemies” (Binney, 2009: 103). Nevertheless, confiscation continued. Tūhoe appealed to the Compensation Court, a body established to “grant compensation to claimants found not to have been in ‘rebellion’” (Waitangi Tribunal, 2009: 161). Given the principal reason for confiscation – Völkner’s killing – was a charge brought upon no Tūhoe individual, an appeal would appear more than justified. All of their claims, however, were dismissed by the court, two of which had no explanation or reason for the dismissal (ibid. 161). For Binney, “…the court was a crude – and misconceived – device. It was intended to divide Māori ‘loyalists’ from ‘rebels’, to carve out some pieces of land for the former, and dispossess the latter” (2009: 100). The legal bureaucracy determined that Tūhoe had only two months to lodge their claims, and in conjunction with the burdens of cost and time incurred, inland rangatira were essentially incapable of applying to the court (ibid. 115).
Figure 20: Bay of Plenty Confiscation line, 11 September 1866. CartoGIS Services, College of Asia and the Pacific, Australian National University.
Figure 21: Remembrance of Crown injustices against Tūhoe, inscribed in white upon the exterior wall of the Te Kaokao a Takapau building, Tāneatua, 2016. Photograph by Tatsiana Chysanava.
Figure 22: Awahou Road in the Ruatoki Valley is the present-day marker of the 1866 confiscation line, and it was at this very place that police established their roadblock during the 2007 raids. Photograph by Tatsiana Chysanava.
It is here that the multipronged nature of the logic of elimination becomes manifest, articulated through the erasure of native title to pave the way toward “alienable individual freeholds” (Wolfe, 2006: 388). Violence, therefore, was effected both through armed conflict and the stratagems of law, echoing Professor of African American Studies Alexander Weheliye’s argument that law is fundamental to the maintenance of inequality and oppression. Law is not ‘colour-blind’ – and nor has it ever been – but has served to define those who are deserving of the status ‘human’ contra those relegated to subpersonhood (Weheliye, 2014: 79; Mills, 2011). This is important to recognise because

…the law itself has been thoroughly violent in its endorsement of racial slavery, indigenous genocide, Jim Crow, the prison-industrial complex, domestic and international warfare, and so on… [I]t continues to be one of the chief instruments in creating and maintaining the racializing assemblages in the world of Man (Weheliye, 2014: 81-2).

From the time of gazetting and into 1867 and 1868, this process, of ‘Indigenous genocide’, was gradually felt through the impacts of confiscation. Tūhoe living on the seaward side of the boundary were forced to seek shelter inland, as the Crown progressively evicted hapū from their original settlements (Waitangi Tribunal, 2009: 162).

Resistance came in different forms. Appeals to the Compensation Court were made (and dismissed), and in 1867 Tūhoe established an aukati to “[forbid]entry into their lands”, a circular boundary that would eventuate as Te Rohe Pōtae o Tūhoe (Binney, 2009: 112, 113). The aukati temporarily acknowledged the confiscation boundary, and precipitated the expulsion of refugees who had sought shelter in Te Urewera. It was a move of self-preservation and defence to keep trouble out, but, more importantly, was “not a declaration of war” (ibid. 113). Tūhoe were to retreat into their own territory (now circumscribed through confiscation), and defend it from within. However, Crown Commissioner for Confiscations, John Wilson,
saw things decidedly differently. He insisted on the presence of an unchecked threat in Te Urewera, and “…endorsed that recurring delusion of Empire: that a decisive victory over an ‘untamed native enemy’ was necessary, and possible. His fears conjured up the dangerous ‘Other’” (ibid. 114). Although he commissioned surveillance sweeps to monitor parts of Te Urewera to this end, collective Tūhoe meetings urged the desire for peace above all else (ibid. 126).

More aggressive resistance emerged after the deployment of the aukati in 1867, and Binney observes that some northern rangatira decided upon “strategies of guerrilla war to uphold their claims to the confiscated lands” (2009: 114). For Binney, such instances reflect that Tūhoe retaliation was “manufactured by the government” (2009: 119, 123). The status quo had shifted greatly out of Tūhoe’s favour, as it became impossible to negotiate and cooperate with the Crown. When backed into a corner, there tends only to be one recourse for action. Tūhoe responses hereinafter emphasise this axiom.

*The scorched earth policy*

It is in this context that the famous and fiercely independent chief Erueti Tamaikōha enters this story (see Figure 23). In 1868, he led protests against government surveying on Tūhoe land, and later undertook a “singular guerrilla campaign” against confiscation and the “injustices created by the exercise of law” (Binney, 1995: 154). When intelligence of Tamaikōha’s raids reached the colonial military, they reacted by sending troops into Waimana and Waioeka. The commanders were explicitly ordered not to go beyond the confiscation line, an instruction ignored by Lieutenant-Colonel St John. St John attempted to push up to Maungapōhatu, fully aware of his insubordination, but his Te Arawa-based forces decided against it once they encountered resistance. As the troops returned back down through the Waimana Valley, they
laid waste to crops and food supplies in the region. This was the infamous and malicious ‘scorched earth’ policy: the obliteration of infrastructure as a weapon of war, through the destruction or theft of cultivations and supplies (Binney, 2009: 129-31; Miles, 1999: 175). In Whakarae, for example, troops “…took the stored food, turned their horses out into a large field of corn, broke calabashes of oil, and stole property and clothing from the houses” (Binney, 2009: 130).

Figure 23: The famous Ngāi Tama rangatira, Erueti Tamaikōha, of the Waimana Valley. Sir George Grey Special Collections, Auckland Libraries, 7-A6189.
This tactic was used to chilling and devastating effect throughout Te Urewera, a strategy used to equally destructive ends elsewhere in the Indigenous world, as exemplified through Navajo histories in what is today the United States (Bailey, 1964). At this point, armed invasion into the region was being prepared, in which St John was a principal protagonist (Binney, 2009: 133). Amidst an atmosphere of panic and stress, Tūhoe responses to confiscation were measured rejoinders to what they saw as an injustice of the Crown’s own creation. Tūhoe’s actions, however, triggered violent responses from government forces, underscored in the invasions of Te Urewera beginning in 1869. This was preceded by what is referred to as the ‘flight of Te Kooti.’

**OF THE SWORD: TE UREWERA INVADED**

*The flight of Te Kooti*

The invasions of Te Urewera were foreshadowed by the escape of the renowned Ngāti Maru prophet Te Kooti Arikirangi Te Turuki in 1868, from his government-ordered imprisonment on Rēkohu (*Chatham Islands*). The next three years saw several incursions into Te Urewera as the government initiated a manhunt to apprehend Te Kooti, and “destroy the basis of his support” (Waitangi Tribunal, 2009: 259; Miles, 1999: 175). This was to no avail, however, for as a master of stealth and strategy, he remained always two steps ahead of his pursuers. Te Kooti’s epic in Te Urewera is referred to as his ‘flight across the land’. He was the leader of the Ringatū faith (‘the Upraised Hand’), “…the oldest of the surviving, indigenous, scripturally based religions in Aotearoa, the means by which Maori analysed their colonial situation in the 19th century” (Binney 1995: 1).56 This legacy is felt today through the many steadfast Tūhoe
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56 Refer to Binney’s comprehensive biography of Te Kooti in *Redemption Songs: A Life of Te Kooti Arikirangi Te Turuki* (1995) for more information.
followers of Ringatū, and my own immersion into te ao Māori (*the Māori world*) has been through Ringatū teachings and karakia (*recitation of prayer*).

Te Kooti sought to arrest the on-going seizure of land – a sentiment no doubt dear to Tūhoe – and in 1868 sought active support from Te Urewera rangatira. Despite significant tensions, in 1869 Tūhoe leaders eventually made a covenant with him to this effect, and supported him in his campaigns (Binney, 2009: 141, 143-4, 146; Miles, 1999: 173-4). Conversely, Tamaikōha “remained utterly opposed” to Te Kooti and his religion, and did not support him at all (Binney, 1995: 154). In April of that year, Te Kooti’s forces raided Mōhaka, in Hawke’s Bay, to plunder caches of weapons and supplies stored there. The kōkiri (*war party*) also attacked and killed nearby settler families, leaving a significant combined death toll in its path (ibid. 160). This triggered the government’s invasion of Te Urewera, to both apprehend Te Kooti and render Tūhoe incapable of harbouring him. It was here that Te Kooti “had brought war into the Urewera” (Binney, 1995: 162; see also Binney, 2009: 148).

**STRATEGIES OF INVASION**

War arrived with overwhelming vigour, as government forces launched a number of invasions and expeditions into the region. In the first invasion of May 1869, roughly 1300 troops were deployed into Te Urewera, a number far outstripping the region’s entire population (Binney 1995: 162; Miles 1999: 176). Nearly every settlement in the Ruatāhuna area was destroyed, with colonial military commanders “…[observing] an old whakataukī of Tūhoe known to them: ‘If my neck is to be severed, it must be at Ruatāhuna’” (Binney, 1995: 165; 2009: 152). The scorched earth policy burned with a vengeance across Te Urewera, as food crops and stores were explicitly targeted for destruction (Binney, 1997: 117). Echoing Wolfe’s description on the logic

---

57 Binney extensively details the minutiae of the incursions; consult her comprehensive work for more information (1995: 162-5; 2009: 148-163).
of elimination, it was held that Tūhoe “must be exterminated”, the obliteration of their economic infrastructure – to “kill by starvation” – a sure-fire way to achieve this (Binney, 1995: 165; 2009: 150-2, 152). Writing in this context in 1869, then Attorney-General James Prendergast declared that the ‘Laws of War’ did not apply to Māori rebellion or insurrection:

The Maoris now in arms have put forward no grievance for which they seek redress. Their object, so far as it can be collected from their acts, is murder, cannibalism, and rapine. They form themselves into bands, and roam the country seeking a prey. In punishing the perpetrators of such crimes, is the Sovereign to be restrained by the rules which the laws of nature and of nations have declared applicable in the wars between civilized nations? Clearly not. Even if those in arms had not been guilty of such enormous atrocities, it does not appear to me that those who, having taken part in it, are captured ought to be treated as prisoners of war. I see no reason why they should not be treated as persons guilty of levying war against the Crown. No doubt, in so treating them, the Crown would exercise its power with mercy: the numbers of those in arms, and who have been and are likely to be captured, and the fact that the men are of a savage race, afford sufficient reasons for confining the highest penalties of the law to those who are the leaders of the revolt, or have actually participated in the atrocities that have been committed. Unfortunately, however, the revolt has been carried on in defiance of all the laws of nature, and there can be no doubt that all who have taken part in it have forfeited all claim for mercy: certainly, all title to the observance towards them of the usages of war, if they ever had such title (Waitangi Tribunal, 2009: 305).

Māori – gesturing also to Tūhoe – are here discursively framed as savages bent on constantly waging war, to whom the Crown’s ‘mercy’ is both unavailable and undeserved. This is because Tūhoe were not recognised as possessing Westphalian sovereignty, in terms of the Peace of Westphalia, and as such, were not considered a legitimate sovereign nation. To this end, the ‘normal’ rules of war and engagement did not apply to Tūhoe. As Te Kooti continued to evade capture, a second invasion was planned and executed in February 1870. Driven by the common objective of obliterating what remained of the food supplies, a three-pronged attack was again
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58 That is, the principle of a state’s exclusive right of sovereign rule in the bounds of its territory. The ‘Peace of Westphalia’ (from which the term derives) was comprised of a series of peace treaties to this effect, held in Westphalia (in present-day Germany), to bring an end to the devastating religious-fuelled European wars of the time (Encyclopaedia Britannica, 2018).
executed to outflank Tūhoe’s military capacity, and apprehend Te Kooti (Binney, 2009: 159-60).

**Tamaikōha’s attempts at peace**

Unexpectedly in March, amidst the theatre of battle, Tamaikōha made a peace agreement with Te Keepa Te Rangihiwinui of Whanganui, a Kāwanatanga Māori (*chief allied with the Crown*) (Waitangi Tribunal, 2009: 263). Both Tamaikōha and Te Keepa were chiefs of “great rank” in Māoridom (Binney, 2009: 160). Tamaikōha, vividly outspoken about his hostility towards Te Kooti, passed Te Keepa intelligence about Te Kooti’s whereabouts and intentions (ibid. 160). The peace secured by Tamaikōha was “…intended by Te Keepa to extend to the whole of Tūhoe” (Miles, 1999: 180), and hapū leaders proceeded to act under this assumption. At first, this peace was not sanctioned by government, but was later honoured after an unauthorised attack on the peace negotiations by St John, which specifically targeted Tamaikōha (Binney, 2009: 165). Tūhoe then reinstated their aukati as a means of ensuring peace, banishing all refugees from Te Urewera, including Te Kooti (ibid. 162). To this end, Tamaikōha asserted: “If you intrude my place there will be trouble. If you invade me when Te Kooti is not here, there will be trouble” (Miles, 1999: 181). Tamaikōha then contacted Te Keepa and other military leaders about the peace negotiations, and reiterated that Te Kooti was no longer being harboured in their rohe. The government, however, remained unconvince. From their perspective, Tamaikōha’s statement appeared tenuous because two hapū remained in support of Te Kooti (Binney, 2009: 164). By this time, however, Te Kooti had already departed Te Urewera.

**‘Hounded to extinction’**

The recently appointed Native Minister Donald McLean was zealously pushing for a Tūhoe surrender (Miles, 1999: 181). McLean believed Tūhoe needed to be forcibly evacuated from
their mountains, and interned under the surveillance of Kāwanatanga Māori such as Ngāti Awa, or upon allotted reserves (Binney, 1997: 117; 2009: 163). He urged that should Tūhoe surrender and leave their mountains, no harm would come to them, but essentially demanded the abandonment of their livelihood and way of life. To this end, Te Pūtere was established as a reserve in the dunes westward of Whakatāne. Less than 300 acres, Tūhoe and Ngāti Whare refugees were forced to live on this reserve until 1872. No equipment was provided to cultivate the land, a prospect difficult to realise anyway considering it was either swamp or sand. In Binney’s comparison, Te Pūtere was a concentration camp analogous to those used by the British in the Boer War (Binney, 2009: 175). Maintaining arms against the government, stipulated McLean, would be interpreted as treason and punishable by death (ibid. 163-5). Tūhoe fears, however, centred upon the prospect of losing more land to confiscation (ibid. 169). Despite assurances this would not happen, the government’s third military campaign raged on the shores of Waikaremoana, “[destroying] every kainga they encountered” (Binney, 2009: 170; Miles, 1999: 183). The sustained extermination of cultivations and food stores crushed Tūhoe’s ability to survive, and led to an agreement, or rather, acquiescence, in peace. Formal surrender occurred in July 1870 (Miles, 1999: 184), but the chiefs who delivered the surrender refused to leave their home. While those Tūhoe who ‘came down’ were incarcerated under Ngāti Awa surveillance, others – predominantly the inland rangatira – staunchly remained and avoided internment at Te Pūtere (Binney, 2009: 175-7). It remains unsurprising, then, that

…Tūhoe thought they were being hounded to extinction. In the official documents also, the intention to break the territorial enclave of the Urewera emerges clearly. The ‘colonialist’ mindset of the government … brought about the persecution of the small – and very poor – Urewera population (ibid. 177).
Having essentially liquidated the majority of Te Urewera’s population, McLean (also Defence Minister) had established military domination over Tūhoe’s rohe. For him, as for the colonial government, the hunt for Te Kooti was overshadowed by the desire to subjugate Te Urewera to its own interests. Movement became heavily restricted, and refugees were permitted in only three reserves throughout Te Urewera’s vast expanse. Te Pūtere was possibly the worst of these, with the refugees interned there unable to survive on land never intended for cultivation or habitation. Tūhoe had become imprisoned, impoverished and resigned to exile (ibid. 181-2).

Pockets of resistance against the government did exist, principally at Ruatāhuna and Maungapōhatu. To repress this, the ‘fourth Urewera expedition’ was launched in January 1871 (Miles, 1999: 185), propelled by intelligence that Kereopa Te Rau, who continued to elude capture, was sighted in the region (Binney, 2009: 183). Moreover, the government made clear that any pā sheltering Te Kooti would be razed, and demanded Tūhoe support should they ever wish to return to their ancestral homelands (Miles, 1999: 186; Binney, 2009: 190). This premise, which the Crown had long reiterated, created significant conflict. Much of Te Kooti’s support amongst Tūhoe was grounded in his gospel of resisting land seizure, and many did not see him as a criminal.

Through the instrumental use of Kāwanatanga Māori such as Rōpata Wahawaha of Ngāti Porou, the government, who had already confiscated large tracts of fertile Tūhoe land, was systematically purging Te Urewera of its inhabitants, in what was becoming a pursuit of “conquest rather than peace” (Binney, 2009: 186). Other commentators of the time abhorred the overactive military invasion of Te Urewera, stating that the war was vindictive and “shamefully forced upon the natives” (ibid. 203). More recently, it has been acknowledged by the Crown that this level of destruction “served no military purpose” (Waitangi Tribunal, 2009:
In the face of complete infrastructural and economic disintegration, and amidst the banishment of whānau and hapū out of their homelands, Ngāti Rongo – former ardent supporters of Te Kooti – pledged their allegiance to the government, and indicated that “all Tūhoe had agreed to cooperate” (Binney, 2009: 190). The government continued to insist upon active support in the hunt for Te Kooti, a condition that had to be met in order for Tūhoe refugees to be repatriated to their homes. In submissions made to the Waitangi Tribunal in 2005, the Crown consistently argued that its military actions were both reasonable and necessary to protect the colony from potential threats. The Crown acknowledged that it set aside its Treaty commitments to the peoples of Te Urewera but argued that this was necessary in order to ‘deprive Te Kooti of a safe haven’ (Waitangi Tribunal, 2009: 260).

However, the titbits of historical evidence from this period demonstrate that different Tūhoe leaders were desperately trying to end an annihilating war, without sacrificing Te Kooti (Binney, 2009: 197). The fourth expedition ultimately failed to apprehend the unyielding prophet, but at the prospect of falling further into poverty, Tūhoe leaders relinquished Kereopa to the Crown. He was executed soon thereafter (Binney, 2009: 202-3; Miles, 1999: 155). “In the treacherous ‘middle ground’ that has to be negotiated between indigenous tribes and governments at war”, writes Binney, “compromises could be forced upon local tribal leaders that moved close to self-betrayal” (2009: 192). That chiefs were torn between giving up Te Kooti, sacrificing Kereopa, or surrendering their ancestral home, accentuates this predicament. From here, Tūhoe were forced into a compact with the government that would determine the future of their peoples up until the present day. I turn to this shortly.

The story of ‘Hāmua bang-bang’

One often-told story of Tūhoe’s reluctant (but demanded) support of the Crown is the assault on Te Kooti at Pukehinau on 17 October 1871, by the Ruatoki hapū, Hāmua (Binney, 2009:
The majority of the whānau I spent time with in Ruatoki are of Hāmua descent, and some shared this account with me. Binney summarises the key points of the story from Tūhoe oral history, which describes the attack as an assassination attempt on Te Kooti. A Hāmua man fired a shot which struck Te Kooti on the cartridge box of his belt, tearing it but not delivering a fatal wound. This was the manifestation of Te Kooti’s earlier prediction, made in Ruatāhuna in 1869, that he would be betrayed by Tūhoe (ibid. 200, 149). On a drive home to Ruatoki in early 2017, an Aunty explained to me that Hāmua is colloquially known as ‘Hāmua bang-bang’, referencing the deaths that would eventually befall Hāmua by the gun, as reprise for their complicity in the attempted assassination. As Binney writes,

...[there are] many narratives about the unhappy fate of the Ruatoki family... Several family members died by gunshot – accidental and otherwise – until Te Kooti’s curse on the whānau was removed by Ringatū elders in a ceremony in 1950 (2009: 200).59

Elsewhere, other whānau have explained to me that ‘Hāmua bang-bang’ refers to the rapidity of procreation that has become characteristic of the Ruatoki hapū, and its expeditiously expanding base of descendants. Both tales, one solemn and stoic, the other colourful and vibrant, are unique articulations of tribal history and identity.

**Tūhoe’s compact with the government**

The fundamental strand woven throughout these episodes of encounter has been Tūhoe’s desire to maintain regional autonomy of their own affairs, even in the face of their surrender in the 1870s. During this time, Tūhoe negotiated with McLean the terms of their capitulation (Miles, 1999: 188). In return for the government guaranteeing “…regional autonomy, with each chief recognized as having the authority within his own district”, Tūhoe agreed to provide active support in the pursuit of Te Kooti (even though this was to no avail) (Binney, 1997: 117;

---

59 While Binney stipulates that Te Kooti’s curse was lifted in 1950, an Aunty I spoke with refuted this, explaining that gunshot deaths have since befallen Hāmua.
Each chief presided over the management of their own hapū affairs, echoing the systems of self-governance long in place before the Crown invasions. With this agreement made, government forces were gradually withdrawn from Te Urewera in 1872, and those Tūhoe living in exile were allowed to return home. The assumption chiefs now operated with was that the Crown recognised Tūhoe’s autonomy, and the right to control and manage the affairs of their region. In honouring their accord with McLean, and, by extension, the Crown, Tūhoe openly cooperated with the government. However, anxiety weighed in the minds of many rangatira, as they suspected deception and duplicity in their counterpart (Binney, 2009: 213). Legislative enshrinement of Tūhoe’s autonomy was ostensibly written into the 1896 Urewera District Native Reserve Act, passed into law at the close of the nineteenth century. The devastating irony, however, was that the implementation of the Act would fuel, rather than circumscribe, the erosion of Tūhoe autonomy. The apprehension about future betrayal would eventually come to fruition (Binney, 1997).

**TE ROHE PŌTAE O TŪHOE: THE ENCIRCLED BOUNDARIES OF TŪHOE**

*The Union of Mataatua: Te Whitu Tekau*

Te Whitu Tekau, or the Union of Mataatua, was the political manifestation of Tūhoe’s autonomy. As a governing body, the Union of Mataatua emerged in response to the Crown’s recognition of Tūhoe’s want of independence in their rohe (Binney, 1997: 118; Miles, 1999: 194-5). It was a union of seventy chiefs bestowed with the task of collectively governing the affairs of Te Urewera, and was “…an attempt to reverse the ravages of war and heal divisions fomented by the fighting” (Binney, 2009: 216). As Miles describes, Te Whitu Tekau was “established … to protect the tribal estate, which was explicitly defined in correspondence to

---

60 There is much more detail surrounding the creation of the pact, but for the purposes of brevity I am only focussing on the elements salient to this discussion. The specifics of context are comprehensively discussed by Binney (1997; 2009: 203-213) and Miles (1999: 187-90).
The immediate discussions that took place concerned the reach of Tūhoe’s autonomy, in the demarcation of Te Urewera’s boundaries. This became encapsulated as Te Rohe Pōtae o Tūhoe, the encircled boundaries of Tūhoe. This references the emplacement of a pōtae, or top hat, atop a map of the landscape, thus creating an encircled boundary. As a “sacred covering for the head”, pōtae was a fitting expression to parallel the nature and intention of Tūhoe’s boundaries (Binney, 2009: 5). The term was also used for Ngāti Maniapoto’s land which fell under Crown invasion in 1863, and for both peoples, ‘Te Rohe Pōtae’ asserts Māori – and not Crown – authority (ibid. 5). The boundaries, of course, were not linear in nature but were identified by markers of ancestral significance (Binney, 1997: 118). In the late 1880s, Tūhoe’s boundaries diminished to those they were capable of actively defending, due to constant antagonism from the government (and neighbouring tribes) through tactics such as surveying, leasing, contesting title through the Native Land Court, and compulsory acquisition. Such strategies are why Binney describes this situation as a “ring of fire burning on the frontiers” that ‘permanently reduced’ Te Rohe Pōtae (Binney, 2009: 268, 317).

*De facto autonomy: Tūhoe’s ‘sovereign enclave’*

During the latter half of the 1870s, the interactions between Te Whitu Tekau and the government indicated that Te Rohe Pōtae was considered a “‘sovereign’ enclave” outside of British legal jurisdiction, but fully capable of co-operating with external entities (Binney, 2009: 256; Miles, 1999: 194). This was the desired articulation of the 1871 compact; regional independence and self-government within the framework of a colonial state. Up until the passing of the 1896 Act, therefore, Tūhoe’s sovereign control over Te Urewera was recognised in practice: Te Whitu Tekau “possessed *de facto* power” (Binney, 2009: 256-9, 268; 1997: 122).

---

This is reinforced by mainstream media editorials of the time that applauded Tūhoe self-government (Binney, 1997: 122). In 1891, the *New Zealand Herald* reflected upon this:

> But through the Urewera Country the Queen’s writ has never run, and New Zealand has gone on for twenty years without anybody caring much about the matter … there is nothing whatever to be gained by shaking the aforesaid writ in the face of the Maoris, when all they want to do is to be allowed to live in peace on the lands of their fathers … As for the Queen’s writ, [Tūhoe] carry out a better system of self-government than we could give them. There is no need for the policeman crossing the boundary line of the confiscated land (Binney, 2009: 321).

Binney notes that the tone of this, echoed in another editorial in the *Auckland Star*, suggests Tūhoe’s autonomy was not threatening, but positioned in a “practical relationship with the state” (Binney, 2009: 321; see also Brooking, 2014: 212). Indeed, as she goes on to explain, “[Tūhoe] wanted an internal autonomy, under the Crown, based on customary law with regard to their land” (ibid. 358), but it was “neither separatist nor disloyal” (ibid. 388). Tūhoe’s de facto autonomy, however, began to slip from their hands following the ascension of the 1896 Act. The enshrining of Tūhoe’s aspiration for autonomy in law would be its undoing, in which Te Urewera was dragged “…into the realm of Pākehā legal, political, social, and economic life” (Keenan, 2008: 92).

**PAVING THE PATH TO SURVEILLANCE: ROADS INTO TE UREWERA**

As an assertion of Tūhoe’s autonomy in their Rohe Pōtae, the Hokowhitu (‘the Seventy’, another name for Te Whitu Tekau) carefully controlled movement into and out of Te Urewera (Waitangi Tribunal, 2010: 252). To this end, they “[denied] access to the land without consent” (Binney, 1997: 118), and “…looked grimly upon the acceptance of gifts from the Government” (Miles, 1999: 196). A principal policy of the Hokowhitu was explicit opposition to the construction of roads and the disposal of land (leasing or selling), to guard against further encroachment upon Te Urewera. However, the opportunities roads offered, as forms of
communication and conduits of trade, did not elude Te Whitu Tekau. This was symbolically reiterated in a purpose-built road encircling a meeting house at Ruatāhuna, where a great hui (gathering; meeting) was held to discuss the concerns of Crown intrusion – with government emissaries in attendance (Binney, 2009: 241).

Unanimity rarely prevailed amongst the chiefs of Te Whitu Tekau, because of the numerous tensions they faced. The desire for autonomy was tempered with the realities of needing to maintain a sustainable economy, a situation entirely exacerbated by Crown practices of acquiring land in multiple ways (ibid: 243). The construction of roads in settler colonies was a method of strategic access and communication, in ‘making known’ isolated areas for surveillance and weakening local control (ibid: 213, 222-5). Indeed, there was significant pressure from the Crown for roads to be built in Tūhoe’s rohe. As Captain George Preece noted in 1871, building a road into Tūhoe’s rohe would “…be a good stroke in weakening the Urewera and [would] strengthen ourselves in case of war at any time” (ibid. 222). This would form another dimension in the Crown’s strategy for subjugating Tūhoe in pursuit of its liberal agenda, as Binney meditates upon:

The governor, Sir George Bowen, touring the centre of the North Island early in 1872, pointedly observed: ‘the policy pursued for the pacification of the Highlands of New Zealand is … the same as that adopted in the last century for the pacification of the Highlands of Scotland. The true weapons of conquest have been in both cases the spade and the pickaxe’. Government policy looked to breaking open the Urewera ‘fastness’ by stealthy penetration: surveyors and roadmen led this new form of assault (2009: 222).

Binney’s gesture to the ‘Highlands’ is particularly noteworthy, as foreign cultural geographies were transplanted to New Zealand (for comparable discussion on the Pacific context, see Jolly 2007 and 2009). Nevertheless, such ‘pacification’ would be forced if necessary. At Ruatoki in 1893, an intentionally non-violent protest objecting to the surveying of land was effected through “…women taking away the surveying instruments” (ibid. 340). In response, an
increased military presence was deployed, culminating in the “small war” of 1895 which erupted due to the erection of trigonometry stations upon the landscape (Binney 1997: 120). These actions reflect a people trying to circumscribe the tidal surge of settler expansion, in refusing to allow what remained of their sovereign territory to be penetrated by Western knowledge and practices.

*Tactics of usurpation through law*

As my discussion here has highlighted, the government’s principal interest was always the acquisition of Tūhoe land, the effects of which have directly shaped the lived realities of Te Urewera today (Waitangi Tribunal, 2009: 8). A central component in the Crown’s strategy for this was to effect division amongst Tūhoe leadership. In some instances, Te Whitu Tekau was forced to go to the Native Land Court to resolve boundary disputes with other tribes, leading to a situation where Tūhoe chiefs would be fighting for their claims amongst themselves as well as other tribes. In one instance, the government stipulated that resolving these issues would be best achieved by selling disputed land to the Crown (Binney, 2009: 228; see also Miles, 1999: 235). Where Tūhoe acquiescence was too cumbersome to achieve, the Crown was able to circumvent claims to the Native Land Court by sequestering contested land from those deemed ‘rebels’. From here, it was placed within the purview of the 1871 Immigration and Public Works Amendment Act, “…allowing [the land in question] to be taken by the government – with or without payment. The Act prevented private transactions, and allowed the government to claim the land prior to any court award of title” (Binney, 2009: 234). This was inflamed by other claims to contested lands, from within Tūhoe itself, and other tribes in the region.

Other government tactics for acquiring Tūhoe land included the leasing of land at the margins of Te Urewera, triggering its eventual sale. This process was designed to exclude private purchasing, creating a monopoly for the Crown, where land was sold at a fraction of its market
value (Binney, 2009: 238-9; see also Miles, 1999: 235). To be clear, Tūhoe were not averse to the concept of leasing, from whence they saw economic potential, but were opposed to government strategy and practice that fuelled division amongst their hapū and leaders (Binney, 2009: 252). The government’s approach of “conquest by purchase”, however, saw things differently (ibid. 240). Throughout the 1880s, the continued resolve to gain Tūhoe land endured. The functions of law and bureaucracy operated as mechanisms of alienation, in which

... survey debts [were used] as liens over the land to acquire it ... Both the Native Department and the Survey Department used every lever they could find to acquire land, rather than negotiating solutions which could have helped to sustain Māori communities ... There is evidence of an underlying, co-ordinated government strategy to isolate and confine – piece by piece – 'the remaining zones of resistance' (Binney, 2009: 273).

The multipronged attack of the logic of elimination, effected as much through overt as structural and legal violence (Wolfe, 2006: 388), is underscored in this narrative.

*The loss of Waiohau 1B through fraud*

Elsewhere, outright deceit and deception were used in acquiring land. The procurement of Waiohau 1B in 1886 by the duplicitous Harry Burt (a private individual), was found by the Crown Solicitor to have been a case of outright fraud (Binney, 2009: 289, 279-94, 2010: 199-215; Arapere, 2002: 39-44; Waitangi Tribunal, 2010: 843-6). Despite this, and amidst a trail of bureaucratic ineptitude, the government failed to intervene or support the claim brought by Tūhoe (Binney, 2009: 289-91; Arapere, 2002: 43). They were otherwise concerned about the possibility of counter claims by the fraudulent owners, which if effected, would likely result in costly compensation that the government would have to provide (Binney 2009: 292-3, 485).

---

62 I shall leave Binney to recount the specific details of this (2009: 273-317), as the salient point I am reiterating is how the law was deployed as a way to simultaneously alienate Tūhoe from their land and subjugate its people.
A tension of values becomes tangibly obvious here, between providing support for Tūhoe (now the government’s legal responsibility in light of their own finding of fraud), and incurring expensive litigation at the inconvenience both of the Crown and Burt (who was, it must be remembered, a settler). The Crown’s sustained silence hereinafter demonstrates the operation of law in the pursuit of particular interests. In the case of Waiohau 1B, this resulted in the legally unfounded eviction of the Te Houhi community in 1907 (ibid. 294, 471-495). These examples underscore how the law was instrumental in the usurpation of Tūhoe land, and the subsequent subjugation of its inhabitants. Binney echoes this sentiment in relation to Te Houhi: “It was the law itself that became the instrument of oppression” (2009: 491). She goes on to suggest that the tragedy of Te Houhi exemplifies how colonial laws of the time endorsed a “European-owned, private freehold [form of] property … at the expense of Māori communally owned land” (ibid. 493), epitomising Wolfe’s stipulation that “[s]ettler colonialism destroys to replace” (Wolfe, 2006: 388). As we shall soon see, the partisan operation of law would continue in earnest after the ascension of the 1896 Act.

**Te Kooti’s return and his prophetic forewarning**

In 1883, the ever-elusive Te Kooti was pardoned, and more than a decade after his departure from Tūhoe’s rohe, he returned to Te Urewera. Through a prophetic waiata (*song*), he warned of the power of local colonial authorities in prising land from Tūhoe control. It is accepted that this referred to councils, courts, and the establishment of the Māori Land boards in 1905. For Binney, the boards were “[p]owerful and bureaucratic, [and] took away land through partition, vestments, and piecemeal purchase” (2009: 270), “…as they nibbled away at the land with public works, and opened up adjoining blocks to lease, debts, and sale” (Binney 2010: 169).

---

63 There are a number of interpretations of Te Kooti’s waiata, but all reiterate a tone of concern regarding the power of local authorities to effect continued alienation of Tūhoe land. See Binney (2009: 268-72) for more detail.
Here again, amongst the manoeuvres of law and bureaucracy, the logic of elimination is accentuated. The prophecy implored Tūhoe not to sell their land, and warned of the penetration of their rohe by roads (Binney, 2009: 268-272, 2010: 168-9). However, Te Kooti’s forewarning unfolded as predicted.

**THE LIBERAL GOVERNMENT AND ITS WANT OF LAND**

It is important, at this juncture, to contextualise the broader political climate of the time. In 1891, the new Liberal government, headed by Premier Richard Seddon, rose to power. A driving force behind the Seddon government was the vigorous acquisition of Māori land, leading to the sale of “over 2 million acres… at artificially low prices” (Binney, 2009: 328; Brooking 2014: 136). A later tactic was to wrestle “‘idle’ Māori land” from Māori control through the *1893 Native Land Purchase and Acquisition Act*, “…the explicit purpose of which was to make Māori ‘waste and unproductive’ land available for settlement” (Binney, 2009: 345; see also Banivanua Mar, 2013). Land had to be used productively (in capitalist terms), or else it would be taken (Brooking, 1992, 1996, 2014: 198-9; Binney, 1997: 123). These policies, and their iterations thereafter, would be devastatingly implemented by Native Minister James Carroll and Member of Parliament Apirana Ngata, resulting in the further loss of Tūhoe land from 1905 to 1910 (Binney, 2009: 328).

**THE 1896 UREWERA DISTRICT NATIVE RESERVE ACT**

Prior to this, in 1886, then Minister of Native Affairs John Ballance assured Tūhoe that a “separate district” would be created in fulfilling the desire for autonomy in their region, and chiefs pushed the government to honour this promise (Binney, 2010: 169). However, Ballance’s requirement that Tūhoe’s rohe be surveyed, part and parcel of creating a separate “native district”, was more concerned with expediting the ‘opening up’ of Te Urewera, in priming it for mineral extraction (Binney, 2009: 265). The government initially refused to establish a
separate district for Tūhoe because of Te Kooti’s significant influence amongst their leadership, which they saw as an impediment to their objectives (Binney, 2010: 169). The ‘small war’ of 1895 changed this situation. The government was attempting to survey the lands outside Te Rohe Pōtæe for the construction of a “strategic road” to Waikaremoana, based exactly on the logic of infiltration I discussed earlier (Binney, 2009: 367-83). There was a heavy paramilitary presence to protect and enforce the survey, where “[w]ar was only just averted” after significant and protracted negotiations (Binney, 2010: 170; see also Brooking 2014: 208-9). The upshot from this was Tūhoe’s consent for surveying to continue, on the proviso that Te Rohe Pōtæe be enshrined in law as a separate reserve as had been agreed to in principal with McLean in 1871. So arose the 1896 Urewera District Native Reserve Act, but it proved to be “a betrayal of Tūhoe aspirations for an internal, local autonomy” (Binney, 2009: 404).

The Urewera Commissions

The 1896 Act removed the Native Land Court’s jurisdiction over Tūhoe land, and appointed seven commissioners – five Tūhoe, two Pākehā – “with authority to establish land titles and block divisions”, to become known as the Urewera Commission. This was part of a wider goal in Seddon’s government to establish title to all Māori land – their logic being that only once this was achieved could “…progress be made in devising more ‘just’ methods of selling and leasing” (Brooking, 2014: 199). Autonomous districts of self-government through local committees would also be established through the Act, to allow for hapū control over their own affairs (Binney, 2010: 170, 2009: 399). However, this continued to be mediated via the Crown, who retained the discretion to modify the ambit of these powers (Keenan, 2008: 91). Section 21 of the Act introduced Tūhoe’s General Committee, bestowed with the power to consent to both the sale of land, and rights to mining. Without the General Committee’s consent, neither of these deliberations could proceed. This came with a severe circumscription: the Crown was the
only body to whom Tūhoe could sell their land. Although the sale of land was decidedly against Tūhoe wishes, this further tethered them to the Crown because they were denied the ability to negotiate with private individuals for leasing (Binney, 2009: 399-401, 499). In forcing a monopoly of unbalanced favour toward the government, this process “…would strangle [Tūhoe] and, ultimately, disinherit them” (ibid. 401).

It was (erroneously) believed that significant deposits of precious metals lay hidden within Tūhoe’s homeland, which drew significant attention from private and government interests (Binney, 2009: 498-518). The Crown saw the General Committee as a hindrance to these interests, and refused to allow its implementation until 1909, by which time it had been stripped of its ability to deliberate on mining issues. The Crown furthered this limitation in 1907 by making Te Urewera subject to the 1905 Mining Act, “allow[ing] the government to grant prospecting licences within the reserve” (Binney, 2009: 499 her emphasis, 510). It is of no surprise, then, that then Leader of the Opposition Captain W.R. Russell urged that the pretext of providing Tūhoe legal autonomy through the 1896 Act was a fallacy, explaining that “…this Bill has no meaning, and in that case I say the Tuhoe people have been deluded” (Binney, 2010: 171). Apirana Ngata voiced similar opinions as the Bill was being drafted, suggesting the legislation was an illusion devised to pacify Tūhoe (Binney, 2009: 521).

This was exemplified in the decade following 1896. In 1906 and 1908, Tūhoe made attempts at self-government in line with the stipulations of the 1896 Act. Each of these were rejected by the Crown, because they afforded Tūhoe too much authority at the expense of government interests (Binney, 2009: 511). Brooking (2014) is more cynical in his appraisal of the Act and its intentions. He postulates that despite the promise of autonomy, there is no way a settler colonial government of the time would have conceded what the Act guaranteed. This is why he
contains that Binney’s account of the government’s response is “utopian” and “ahistorical” (ibid. 212). Regardless, as he adjudges, “[t]his position certainly proved tragic for Tūhoe” (ibid. 212). Although I am drawn to Brooking’s argument because of its acknowledgement of the destructive logic of settler colonialism, I feel it is premature to dismiss Binney’s position. Although there were some particularly zealous practitioners of settler colonialism, I think it unbecoming to describe all Pākehā of the time as such. There was – and remains! – nuance and diversity among Pākehā, and, as I explain below, we should not overlook Seddon’s apparently genuine intentions to provide Tūhoe with legislative autonomy.

A point of clarification is important here. The 1896 Act, in and of itself, did not accelerate settler colonial expansion into Tūhoe’s rohe; the actions of successive administrations achieved this through reinterpretations of the Act commensurate with their ideologies of capitalist expansion. Thus, Binney asserts that historian Danny Keenan’s contention, that the Act’s principal purpose was to expedite colonisation (Keenan, 2008: 90-2), is too simplistic (Binney, 2009: 398, 404). It ignores not only the nuance of context in which Tūhoe representatives were involved in the negotiations surrounding the Bill, but more importantly disregards that Tūhoe wanted their local autonomy recognised in law (ibid. 402-4). The historical evidence also indicates that “…Seddon seemed genuinely concerned about the plight of Tūhoe” (Brooking 2014: 215). For example, he stated that should mineral wealth exist in Te Urewera, “‘the hapus owning the land’ should participate in the benefits and should derive revenue from the proceeds”, a position for which he received much scrutiny in Parliament (Binney, 2009: 515). The complexity this adds to context should not be overlooked. This is not to discount the eventuality of devastation wrought on Tūhoe after 1896, but rather acknowledges their concerted attempts to shape the contours of their future for themselves and their descendants.
The first Urewera Commission spanned 1898-1903, and although Tūhoe were the majority on the board, its trajectory was principally informed by Pākehā interests. This was reflected in the appointees to the commission: the initial chairman (Percy Smith), for example, was both Surveyor-General and Secretary for Lands and Mines (Binney, 2009: 417). Charting of title to land preoccupied the commission during its tenure, but was fraught with difficulty from the outset because of the incommensurability between Indigenous and colonial understandings of land: *guardianship in perpetuity* (the former) and *ownership* (the latter) (ibid. 418). What unfolded was the superimposition of colonial modes of land ownership and registration upon Te Rohe Pōtae, leading Binney to assert that all the First Commission did was to introduce a land court-type system – the opposite of what Tūhoe wanted (ibid. 421). Brooking describes this as a “…veritable tenurial revolution [forced] upon Māori by establishing precise individual title to particular blocks” (2014: 199). He goes on to clarify that neither Seddon nor Carroll intended for individualisation to lead to the usurpation of Māori land, but both saw this process as necessary to enable Māori to derive economic benefit therein. Yet, informed by the logic of elimination, the upshot of continued alienation endured (ibid. 199). No protection from this would be forthcoming, and the commissions were flooded with hearings over land, where title was often disputed. Furthermore, no overarching system for self-government was initiated. In the second Urewera Commission (1906 to 1907), Native Minister Carroll blocked the appointment of any Tūhoe to the commission. In the end, the actions of both commissions cemented the government’s ability to “purchase individual shares [in light of rendering] Tūhoe’s political representation … ineffectual” (Binney, 2009: 424).

**Famine and disease ravages Te Urewera**

In the throes of the Commissions, as hearings preoccupied chiefs and commissioners alike, Tūhoe’s economy was floundering – a direct result of the 1866 raupatu. The decade up until
1907 was fraught with massive crop failure, exacerbated by continued patterns of severe weather (Binney, 2009: 433). Disease and abject famine inevitably followed, as Tūhoe’s remaining agricultural infrastructure crumbled (Brooking, 2014: 214; Binney, 2009: 433, 452-61). Native Schools, pushed by Seddon’s perspective that European education was the path to prosperity for Māori, were established in Te Urewera, the explicit purpose of which were to “...bring Maori ‘into line’ with European ‘civilisation’” (Timutimu, Simon, and Matthews, 1998: 111; Smith and Simon, 1998; Simon and Smith, 2001). To this end, te reo Māori was outlawed as a language of communication, enforced through corporal punishment (Timutimu et. al. 1998: 113). The Schools in Te Urewera also acted – in a limited capacity – as a conduit to deliver communities with medical supplies. The accumulation of epidemics (such as influenza and measles), little to no food supplies, and meagre government assistance, courses through the narrative of Native Schools in Te Urewera as a tragedy of epic proportion (Binney, 2009: 433-52). The great chief Tūtakangahau of Maungapōhatu lamented his heartache at the loss of one of his mokopuna:

This dying of our young people is a new thing. In former times our people did not die so – they scarce knew disease; they died on the battlefield or of old age, they knew no other death. These diseases which slay our people were brought by the white man. They brought the epidemics which raged in the days of our fathers, the rewharewha [(influenza)] and the kurawaka [(measles)]... (Binney, 2009: 443).

Tūtakangahau’s despair is made more agonising by the continued loss triggered by the widespread famine in 1898, where a quarter of Te Urewera’s population was lost. Nevertheless, Tūhoe’s resolve to survive continued, as they fought hard to sustain themselves and their way of life (Binney, 2009: 467).
The erosion of Tūhoe autonomy and the encroaching reach of state authority

That Tūhoe’s autonomy, which had existed in practice until 1896, was being eroded, is evidenced by events just before the turn of the century. In 1898, two men from Waimana were forced into court proceedings at Ōpōtiki for not paying dog registration. The “dog tax”, as it was called, was despised by Māori, and a Tūhoe deputation sent to Wellington that year asked that the law not apply in Te Rohe Pōtae (Brooking, 2014: 213). Although Tūhoe assumed the court’s jurisdiction did not operate in their rohe, the Justice Department adamantly stated that the 1896 Act “did not exempt Tūhoe” (Binney, 2009: 425). The deputation also requested a flag be created for Te Rohe Pōtae, with the words ‘Te Mana Motuhake o te rohe o Tūhoe’ (‘The Separate Authority of the District of Tūhoe’) emblazoned upon it. However, the government-approved flag held the words ‘Te Ture Motuhake mo Tuhoe’ (‘The Separate Law for Tūhoe’). The distinction in semantics is pivotal: ‘words matter’. Whereas the former recognises Tūhoe’s “territorial autonomy”, the latter reinscribes that Tūhoe independence is subject to Crown law (Binney, 2009: 427; Brooking, 2014: 213). This was underscored in the case of Makurata Himiona, who was charged for assaulting Ngawati Puru at Te Whāiti (in the western Urewera) in 1897 over a land dispute (Binney, 2009: 427-432). Contention arose because of the jaundiced nature of both the hearing and the attending constable, where neither followed proper procedure. Although Makurata’s sentence was eventually rescinded, a police presence in Te Urewera had been initiated, and materialised in the arrest of a man at Ruatāhuna three years later (ibid. 432). These examples, provided by Binney and Brooking, reflect the gradual extension of the state’s authority into Tūhoe’s rohe. The purported intentions of the 1896 Act had not come to fruition.
It is from within this setting that Rua Kēnana Hepetipa (‘Rua the Prophet’) arose as a prominent leader within Tūhoe, who vocally challenged Crown intrusion (Binney, Chaplin, and Wallace, 1996: 15; Derby, 2009; Binney, 2009: 496). Born in 1869, Rua entered a time of significant Crown encroachment into Te Urewera, where the impacts of land alienation were being sharply felt. Raupatu, famine, and widespread death lead “…many Maori leaders [of the time to turn] to the story of the Israelites, desolate and lost in their land” (Binney et. al. 1996: 17). Rua’s ascendancy through “Scriptural promises” exemplifies this (ibid. 18). Rua was not of the Tūhoe aristocracy, a point of frustration for numerous older aristocratic leaders, but from 1906 claimed his right to leadership as Te Kooti’s spiritual heir – a prophetic mantle foretold of by Te Kooti himself that Rua then assumed (Binney, 2009: 496-7; Binney et. al. 1996: 16-8).

This was not without difficulty, as Rua was a heavily divisive figure both among Tūhoe, and in New Zealand in general. Although he had a strong cohort of supporters within Tūhoe, others saw him as the embodiment of Te Kooti’s 1885 prophecy, that forewarned of division:

…his claims to be the One foreseen by [Te Kooti] Te Turuki were not wholly accepted either by the Tuhoe or by the Ringatu generally … To others in the Ringatu faith, the advent of Rua was the beginning of a disastrous major schism (Binney et. al. 1996: 18).

Rua was vocally opposed to Tūhoe’s “entrenched tribal aristocracy” (Binney, 2009: 496), and to this end, sparred for the right to lead with the senior chief of Ruatoki, Numia Kereru. This, describes Binney, was a “contest [of] … almost Byzantine proportions” (ibid. 510). The ‘disastrous schism’ that emerged divided Tūhoe into supporters of Rua, and supporters of Numia (Binney et. al. 1996: 188). Their struggle for leadership endured for a decade from 1906,

---

64 Much has been written about Rua the Prophet, his teachings, achievements, and clashes with the Crown. Consult Binney, Chaplin, and Wallace, 1996; Binney, 2009 and 1995; and Derby, 2009 for more information.
and although some of their views were compatible, such as using Tūhoe land to benefit its people, others, such as the nature of land development, were not. Numia believed Tūhoe land should be leased, but Rua wanted to sell some to “raise working capital” for his community at Maungapōhatu, Hiruharama Hou (New Jerusalem) (Binney, 2009: 497). Numia despised Rua, did not consider him the “Māori Messiah”, and thought that he had “…defrauded the people, and taken their money – for his bank, and for himself and his family” (ibid. 549). Derby (2009) has otherwise written on the “less attractive features of Rua’s ministry” Numia is here referring to, including a predisposition for “…fashionable clothing, expensive vehicles and other extravagances for which his hard-pressed congregation was encouraged to make regular cash offerings” (ibid. 128). Elsewhere, contempt for Rua was manifest. Circa 1907, he convinced a Ruatoki whānau to join his congregation at Maungapōhatu, stating that the rising tides of the ocean would sweep away Tāneatua and the Ruatoki Valley. This, however, did not occur, rendering futile a literal interpretation of the prophecy:

Some three years later [the whānau] learned that their land had not been swept away and they returned home, only to discover that others of their kin were living on it and claimed shares by right of occupation. Rua they now cursed – ‘pokokohuā’ – the worst possible curse (Binney et. al. 1996: 33).

Other Tūhoe leaders, opposed to Rua and his pietistic style of leadership, actively sought for the government to circumscribe his authority. By 1907, “…nearly all the Maoris of the Urewera and Bay of Plenty were followers of Rua”, and in the same year, the Tohunga Suppression Act was passed, drafted specifically to target Rua and the alleged “harmful … influence [he had] upon his followers” (Binney et. al. 1996: 35; Binney, 2009: 517).

65 Although in this statement, Derby is comparing these attributes to the comparably divisive present-day Brian Tamaki of the Destiny Church.
Figure 25: Rua addressing his followers outside the Commercial Hotel in Waktatâne, 1908. Sir George Grey Special Collections, Auckland Libraries, H. Fortune, 7-A3312.
In their struggle for leadership, Numia urged Carroll, as Native Minister, to use the 1907 Act against Rua, but this did not eventuate (Binney et. al. 1996: 36). Although the Act was never used, it demonstrates the threatening nature of Rua’s ministry in the eyes of the government, and the efforts expended to curtail his influence.

Amongst many whānau I spoke with, respect for Rua and his convictions was palpable. My discussion here seeks not to detract from that, but rather to recognise some of the critiques of him as a leader that are often overlooked in contemporary understandings of the Tūhoe prophet. As Derby points out, this is epitomised in Vincent Ward’s (2008) *Rain of the Children*, a film “wholly uncritical of Rua” (2009: 128). To gloss over these reservations is to disregard the divisive nature of Rua (and, principally, his protracted duel with Numia), a fact not insignificant in the prophet’s history. Nevertheless, Rua’s proclivities tend to be eclipsed by the causes he championed, chief amongst them his desire to improve the wellbeing of his people, amidst the very real crises of survival facing Tūhoe.

His charismatic messianic style of leadership became a hallmark of his character, and in his ascendancy, he “visibly energised Tūhoe” (Binney, 2009: 517). Although he may have been willing to sell some parcels of land, he wanted to “assert Tūhoe control” over the mineral wealth contained within Te Urewera, and redirect its profits to benefit its people (ibid. 512, 512-5). In 1907, Maungapōhatu arose as a community built both on Rua’s teachings and the collective (but humble) wealth of his followers, emerging as a “centre of industry and cultivation”. Rua negotiated with mining companies for Te Urewera’s wealth, and even developed a mining company of his own (ibid. 512, 514). However, the division amongst Tūhoe leadership, and

---

66 Binney postulates it is likely Rua made an agreement with Carroll (the only person authorised to deploy the *Tohunga Suppression Act*) to convince hesitant Tūhoe leaders to sell their land, in exchange for not invoking the 1907 Act against him (2009: 532).
Rua’s struggle with Numia, remained. For Binney, this reflected the on-going debates about “meaningful self-government”, tempered with various external competing interests in Te Urewera’s bounty (2009: 515).

The usurpation of Rua and Tūhoe by government interests

The Liberal government’s policies of Māori land acquisition continued apace, and Carroll and Apirana Ngata sought to exploit Rua’s position – and his economic aspirations for Tūhoe – to satisfy this objective (Binney, 2009: 518). By this time, the government had extended the jurisdiction of the 1905 Mining Act to include Te Urewera, which firmly circumvented the authority of the General Committee. This preceded a “formidable … body of interconnected legislation about Māori land” designed to “undercut the Rohe Pōtae” and “erode [its] separate legal status” (ibid. 520). Given that the government was the only authorised body to purchase Tūhoe land, coupled with the circumvention of the General Committee, Ngata’s economic goals became realised at the ultimate expense of Tūhoe sovereignty. For Binney, the Crown’s monopoly interest in Tūhoe land, enabling purchase at inordinately low prices, “contributed directly to Māori impoverishment” (ibid. 543). Elsewhere, Prime Minister Joseph Ward reinforced the supremacy of the Crown to Rua. Speaking in 1908 in Whakatāne, Ward explained: “I told Rua… that in New Zealand King Edward is King, and is represented here by his Government. There can be no other Government or king … there can’t be two suns shining in the sky at one time”. This was a categorical response to Rua’s wish for independence and a “separate Maori government” (Binney et. al. 1996: 38). This further undermined the independence Tūhoe thought – correctly – was enshrined in the 1896 Act. Despite Rua’s eventual acquiescent acknowledgement of Ward’s stipulation, he maintained that the law benefitted Pākehā more than Māori (ibid. 38).
The first iteration of the General Committee was elected by Tūhoe in March 1908, and entirely excluded Rua, his followers, and his manifesto. This was specifically engineered by Rua’s adversaries among Tūhoe (spearheaded by Numia), and was a “…statement of authority and mana: the committee rejected Rua’s claim to govern” (Binney, 2009: 526). The 1908-elected Committee stipulated the nature of land use and development, as it pertained to external entities interested in Te Urewera. Here, the Committee was acting in the sovereign capacity they believed – again, correctly – the 1896 Act had endowed them with. To this, however, the government was quick to respond. They labelled the Committee and its deliberations a “misunderstanding”, and through subsequent legislation disembowelled it of its authority (ibid. 529). Despite this, Ngata and Carroll remained pressured to acquire more Māori (and Tūhoe) land, and both vigorously went about trying to achieve this within the ambit of the law; Ngata proved himself Machiavellian in this pursuit.

Although Ngata detested Rua, “…whose style of leadership was anathema to him”, Rua’s flexible attitude to the sale of land appealed to Ngata’s objectives. In 1909, through “one bold gesture”, Ngata added Rua to the General Committee, thereby – in his appraisal – “bring[ing] the two Sections of Tuhoe together” (Binney, 2009: 536). Rua and Numia’s marked differences, however, were no less virulent within the Committee. Adding Rua to the Committee was only done to exploit his inclination towards the sale of Tūhoe land, in lieu of leasing, which is precisely what the government wanted. The consequence is that far more land was obtained by the government than what Rua had ever envisaged. His position on the General Committee directly precipitated the initial government purchase of land in Te Urewera, and by 1924 it had acquired more than half of Tūhoe’s homeland (ibid. 533). This was done incrementally, but
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67 In his disgust for Rua, Ngata was known for ‘spitting at the mention of his name’ (Binney, 2009: 567).
68 There is significantly more detail to these encounters than what I have provided here, but I leave Binney for the minutiae (2009: 496-569).
unquestionably undermined Tūhoe’s sovereignty in the process. Let me be clear: this is not at all what Rua had intended. His position had been manipulated by Carroll and Ngata to achieve the Liberal government’s ambitions for Māori land. Rua had always been, as Binney, Chaplin and Wallace point out, “…deeply concerned about the law and about concepts of legitimate autonomy, under the Crown” (Binney et. al. 1996: 61). In the end, as Binney observes, “…instead of acting as the autonomous voice of Tūhoe, [the General Committee] had become the voice of government demands” (2009: 545). She summarises:

Rua’s presence on the General Committee had been orchestrated by Ngata as the means to persuade the committee to agree to sales … The government had thereby circumvented the processes of the Urewera’s protective legislation … It was the beginning of direct and illegal purchasing in the Urewera … The policies which the Liberal government imposed upon Tūhoe from 1906 could be described as ‘legal imperialism’: the use of law to conquer others, and make them conform. In this case, the advocates of one economic system imposed that system by a series of manipulative legal changes … In this way, the 1896 Act was subverted. Any possibility of group control by Tūhoe over decisions to sell their own land had been snuffed out (Binney 2009: 557, 567, 569; see also Binney et. al. 1996: 22).

At the turn of the century, Rua emerged at a time of significant disillusionment amongst Tūhoe. It was at this crucial juncture that Brooking stipulates, “From this point on, any notion of limited self-governance and tribal authority completely unravelled” (2014: 214).

BACKGROUND TO THE 1916 POLICE ASSAULT ON MAUNGAPŌHATU

The Crown’s unchecked practice of the purchase of Tūhoe land was an integral component in the context of the April 1916 invasion of Maungapōhatu, a Police raid that was “…the worst clash between the Crown and a Māori community [in the early twentieth century]” (Binney, 2009: 572). I turn to describe this soon, but first examine the background in which the 1916

---

Sir Apirana Ngata is considered a hero within much of Māoridom today; Binney’s assessment is less forgiving. Given his role in dismantling Tūhoe’s homeland, she is critical of both him and Carroll, whose actions “…manipulated the laws to break down the boundaries of the Rohe Pōtae” (2009: 565). To this, they proved successful. Moreover, in his capacity as a Parliamentarian, while Ngata protected his own ancestral lands, he actively oversaw the break-up of others’ (such as Tūhoe’s) (p. 328).
raid was situated. By 1915, Rua was openly vocal in his opposition to the Crown’s purchase of Tūhoe land, which had been energetically continued by the Reform government of William Massey. This was initialised through the sanctioning of the acquisition of individual interests in Te Urewera, despite the illegality of this practice. Rua’s frank and outspoken objections actively stalled this process, and at one point he instigated a petition to the government reiterating Tūhoe’s autonomous self-rule, and their right of deliberation upon the sale of their land. This, however, was met with bureaucratic and political inertia. Artificially capping the price of land, a right the government keenly exercised, was done “without proper valuations”. The reverse of this was poignantly demonstrated in the private purchase of a parcel of Tūhoe land, which was sold at “more than twice the government’s valuation” (Binney, 2009: 576–9). This is a pivotal reason why Binney emphasises that the obliteration of Te Rohe Pōtæ, both in terms of Crown land acquisition, and the extinguishing of Tūhoe sovereignty more generally, was an explicit intent of the Reform government (ibid. 572). Throughout, Rua’s position increasingly frustrated the government, so much so that he was described as “the main obstacle” to the Crown’s purchase of land in the Rohe Pōtæ (ibid. 579).

Two other principal components of the context surrounding the 1916 invasion concern Rua’s illegal sale of alcohol (‘slygrogging’), and his alleged pro-German sympathies during World War I (Binney et. al. 1996: 81–90). The sale of alcohol to Māori men had been circumscribed by the 1910 Licensing Amendment Act, and in 1911 Rua was arrested for this, receiving the maximum penalty of three months’ imprisonment (Binney, 2009: 576). In early 1916, Rua was summoned to court in Whakatāne to answer for other charges made under the 1910 Act. However, he sent word to the Police that as his community was in the middle of a harvest – from which he was unable to leave, as it could not be postponed lest it perish – he would attend the next sitting of the court. Further, Rua thought his imprisonment in 1911 satisfied the
charges now being laid, which had been retroactively resuscitated in his 1916 summons (“legal leapfrog”, as Derby describes (2009: 77)). Constable Andy Grant and another sergeant met Rua at Te Whaiti to issue his arrest warrant; Rua refused to accompany them, given his understanding of the situation, but had prepared breakfast for them in a common display of manaaki (Binney et al. 1996: 91; Derby, 2009: 77). Grant’s superiors had explicitly ordered both officers to “…take careful notes of this meeting with a view to laying a possible further … charge of sedition” (Derby, 2009: 77).

Rua was quickly found to be in contempt of court, because of his failure to appear before the magistrate in 1916. His arrest was ordered (ibid. 579-80; Derby, 2009: 76-7). Thus began the groundwork for the raid in April of that year. The hysteria surrounding Rua’s rumoured – and sensationalised – ‘treasonous’ support for a German victory in World War I, significantly informed these preparations. Numia actively fanned these flames (Binney, 1996). Rua’s opposition to Tūhoe enlistment in the war effort, which fuelled reports of his “disloyalty”, pointed out the illogic of sacrificing in the name of a physically and spiritually remote monarch, who mattered little in the affairs of everyday Māori lives of the early twentieth century. His strength and determination here is immortalised in David Grace’s famous song, Rua Kēnana.70

Nevertheless, “Rua’s opposition to enlistment was distorted by popular rumour into an active support for the Germans” (Binney et al. 1996: 83). Frenzied gossip of Rua arming his community to this end were rife throughout New Zealand, which even claimed that he had a machine gun in his possession. The charge under the 1910 Act was therefore “only a pretext” to the 1916 invasion (ibid. 84), and masked the true rationales of silencing Rua’s dissent to the sale of Tūhoe land, and reprimanding his ‘disloyalty to Empire’ as coloured by unfettered war-

70 See https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=t8iCGzt94pA.
time hysteria. The panic of a potentially armed Tūhoe community at Maungapōhatu directly influenced government thinking:

[In] 1916, the Coalition government looked for conspiracy. The men who actually planned the police expedition … were those who believed most strongly that armed resistance would be awaiting them (Binney et al. 1996: 90).

The similarities with the 2007 police raids in Ruatoki are striking, and although each of these events occurred within their own nuanced contexts, they are revealing in terms of police thinking. Furthermore, they reiterate a constant remark made by whānau of Ruatoki: “This has happened to us before.”

Figure 26: The Police expedition to Maungapōhatu in 1916, to apprehend Rua. Sir George Grey Special Collections, Auckland Libraries, 7-A3797.
The catastrophe engendered by this broader context, as Binney, Chaplin and Wallace explain, is that the “…government acted on [these] assumptions” without undertaking any serious, objective investigation of their own, and yet “[n]either armed defence nor armed attack was part of Rua’s intentions” (1996: 90, 96). This reached its zenith on April 2, 1916.

**Sunday, April 2, 1916**

From the morning of April 2, 1916, three contingents of police descended upon Maungapōhatu, comprising a total of 57 armed officers, to arrest Rua for contempt of court.71 The regiment was led by John Cullen, the Commissioner of Police, who actively indulged in the fantasy of ‘Rua the seditious outlaw’ (Binney *et. al.* 1996: 90). The contingent of officers “…were a body of men who yearned to prove themselves in action and were not, in general, bent on peace-keeping” (Derby, 2009: 79). This zeal would lead to the death of two of Maungapōhatu’s men; the police met negligible armed resistance, but proceeded to plunder the village. The invasion adhered to strict military protocol, and the sequestering of an army surgeon to join the party was done in an anticipation of bloody conflict. Significant resources were deployed for the expedition, including “…bell tents, camping equipment and back saddles from Defence stores”, “twenty .303 carbines” and a cache of revolvers (Derby, 2009: 79; Binney *et. al.* 1996: 93). Given New Zealand’s substantial war effort at the time (King, 1981: 86-168), where national supplies were generally stretched, that such a vast detachment of resources was commandeered is alarming.

More crucially, this demonstrates the degree of threat that Rua and his convictions posed – in the eyes of government – and the force deemed necessary to respond to that threat, however
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71 There is significantly more detail in the narrative of the 1916 Police raid on Maungapōhatu than what I provide here. My depiction is a precis of that story; Binney, Chaplin and Wallace (1996), Binney (2009: 572-595) and Derby (2009) should be consulted for exhaustive and in-depth descriptions of the event itself.
fantastic it may have been. The police party outflanked the settlement to impede escape should Rua attempt, but when they arrived into the village itself, Rua had again prepared hospitality for them. Binney, Chaplin and Wallace narrate part of that encounter:

Rua invited them to have a cup of tea. He inquired of Jimmy Johnston [(one of the officers)] if ten sheep would be sufficient to feed all the police who were coming. To Gerald Maloney [(another officer)] … he said ‘You come too soon for the Kai, Kai not on till 1 o’clock’ (1996: 97).

Further, before they arrived, Rua enquired how many Police were coming, to determine how large a feast to prepare. This was the embodiment of the practice of manaaki amongst Tūhoe, captured in the phrase “If your enemy hunger[s], feed him” (Binney et al. 1996: 91). This is also an fitting reflection of how hospitality, so generously offered to armed enemies, became a form of humiliation for the aggressors.

When Cullen arrived, however, he remained ardently indifferent to custom or etiquette, and “aggressively” rode on horseback directly onto the marae to apprehend Rua, an action that transgresses a litany of marae-based protocols. The following sequence of events demonstrates that Cullen more than likely provided false evidence during Rua’s trial. He stipulated that Rua “bolted towards the gully” as he approached, but both witness statements from Rua’s followers, and photographic evidence from the day, summarily refute this (Binney, 2009: 584-7). Rua was knocked and pinned to the ground, and his son, Toko, who had been on the marae as well, retreated, returning armed with a gun and fired at the regiment of constables. As Derby describes, “…Māori screamed and ran and police scattered. In the testimony of Constable Rushton, ‘No-one waited for orders. Everyone sailed for anyone he could get’” (2009: 85).

John Cassells, one of the commanding officers, ‘lost control’ of the battalion as the raid intensified, a contingent who were already keen to ‘prove themselves’ on the battlefront. In the
throes of the attack, Toko was subsequently shot in the wrist by police, and his mother, Pinepine, bandaged the wound. Pinepine explained that Toko then sought refuge beneath the washtubs; he was unable to continue fighting (nor grip his weapon) given the state of his arm, and two other wounds in his chest. Nevertheless, the police seized Toko, “…hauled [him] out by his boots and shot [him] at close range, in the back, 'like a bloody dog’”, killing him (Binney, 2009: 587). Cassells testified that he came upon Toko’s lifeless body. Binney refutes this, implicating Cassells as Toko’s murderer by highlighting major inconsistencies in his deposition, asserting that “…it is probable that Cassells shot Toko in the back” and killed him (ibid. 588-9). Given Toko’s incapacity and inability to resist, his death, as Binney points out, “was murder”.

In the immediate aftermath, Cassells actively manipulated evidence to support the police narrative, which included “…dictating individual police statements collected at Maungapohatu before the expedition left” (ibid. 589). Furthermore, Cullen’s stipulation that the police were inundated with weapon fire was “wildly exaggerated”. Despite the gunfire lasting only minutes, Cullen’s obituary in 1939 made the brazen assertion that it had lasted for an hour and a half (Derby, 2009: 85-6). During the raid, a group of officers stormed Rua’s house, “…where they expected to find more gunmen. They broke down the door but found only Rua’s nine wives and several children inside, all terrified and unarmed.” Thirty of the forty men on the marae, also unarmed, were arrested: “Rua’s army of a hundred or more [armed] warriors proved as mythical as his machine gun” (ibid. 85-6). Derby describes the scene after the cessation of weapons fire:

The women and children were rounded up and held in the open for the rest of the day, guarded by armed police. Other policemen searched the buildings for weapons and found a total of thirty shotguns, small-bore rifles and revolvers, many unusable and the rest intended for hunting game. At least one member of the search party took the
opportunity to pilfer money and personal possessions from the houses he entered (2009: 86).

Toko and his friend, Te Maipi, who was also killed by police, were hastily buried without any coffins nor appropriate rituals of farewell (at Cullen’s orders), and six men from Maungapōhatu, held prisoner by police, were forced to dig their graves (Binney, 2009: 587). It is no exaggeration to describe Toko and Te Maipi’s corporeal departure, and subsequent burial, as wholly undignified. Derby asserts that Cullen’s refusal to allow tangi for Toko and Te Maipi, thereby expediting their burial, was to prevent the coroner, located a day’s trek away in Ruatāhuna, from conducting his examination into the causes of death (2009: 87). The expedition itself stayed at Maungapōhatu until the morning of April 6. This allowed them time to document the raid through collecting police statements, and taking “triumphal photographs” of their victory. This included a posed photograph with the officers and their weapons in front of Hiona (Zion), Rua’s circularly-constructed meeting house, where part of the gunfight was artificially reproduced as evidence for Rua’s trial (Derby, 2009: 87; Binney, 1996). Rua and five other prisoners (including his son, Whatu) were roped together and marched under guard back to Ruatāhuna. As he departed, Cullen addressed the remaining members of the Maungapōhatu community, giving them “some good advice”, an attendant reporter noted.
A final photograph shows Rua being led away with the victorious Cullen, on which Derby adjudges: “[The photograph] is an atavistic, even feudal, image of conquest” (2009: 87). A caricature of this scene circulated in national media depicts the triumph over Rua as a threat now safely managed and circumscribed, who is wreathed with the labels “…sly-grog seller, prophet and Kaiser” (ibid. 88). Now arrested, Rua’s subsequent trial was the longest in New Zealand history (Binney, 2009: 590-95). He was charged with sedition, and promptly imprisoned for 18 months. For the government, this was an unqualified success: the largest obstacle to the sale of Tūhoe land had now been removed. To retrospectively ratify illegal Crown purchases of land, Binney describes, “…the Reform government introduced the legislation it required to validate its previous purchasing procedure in the Urewera” – “on the
precise day that Rua was sentenced” (2009: 594). Tūhoe autonomy lay in pieces beneath the spectre of a triumphant Crown.

15 February 2017

Spent the afternoon in Tāneatua, chatting with one of the Aunties. We sat outside one of the cafes on the main street, trucks whipping up clouds of dust as they drove by. An orchestra of cicadas serenaded the afternoon’s puncturing heat. The blazing sun bore down upon us, the road weeping in places as the tar gave in to its fierce outstretched rays. Aunty and I sipped on cool, feijoa smoothies, each sip a combatant rejoinder to the sun’s determination. Our kōrero had been about Tūhoe’s relationship with the Police, and the numerous raids that have since befallen Tūhoe whānau over the last decade. “This has happened to us so much”, she sighed. As our conversation drew to a close, and I strolled back to the car, I looked across the road to an old shopfront with ‘Te Whitu Tekau’ emblazoned upon its brow. Given I had also been immersing myself in nineteenth and early twentieth century Tūhoe history, I reflected on the on-going legacies of colonisation, and the very real and material impacts this continues to have upon Tūhoe today.

Figure 28: The shopfront on an overcast day earlier in 2016. Tāneatua, October 2016. Photograph by Tatsiana Chypsanava.
COMPETING SOVEREIGNTIES: A REPRISE?

As the most violent encounter between Māori and the Crown in the twentieth century, the raid on Maungapōhatu was a watershed moment in the solidification of the New Zealand settler colonial state. In the battle of competing sovereignties, the Crown, armed equally with force and the word of law, aggressively inscribed its authority over Te Urewera and its people, riding roughshod over legal and bureaucratic procedure at its pleasure. From the punitive raupatu of 1866, to the tactics of scorched earth, invasions, and raids, Tūhoe history during this time exemplifies both Watson’s deliberations on originary violence and Wolfe’s description of the logic of elimination. For Tūhoe, it felt like they were being ‘hounded to extinction’ (Binney, 2009: 177). Through a multiplicity of violent means, the most fertile and abundant of Tūhoe’s ancestral estates were seized by the Crown, in their wanton and untrammelled desire to ‘prise open Te Urewera’ and exploit its bounty for settler colonial expansion. Throughout, however, Tūhoe had always insisted that “…self-government in the Urewera was compatible with acceptance of the Queen’s authority”, and at every possible step, had strived to work within the restrictive parameters determined by the colonial administration. When the conditions proved suffocating, however, only one alternative was left, and Tūhoe defended their lands with vehement determination and vigour. The histories I have explored in this chapter offer a broader narrative within which the more recent paramilitary raids must be read, as colonial violence against Tūhoe is a structural, on-going phenomenon.

Despite all of this, Tūhoe survived, and their sovereignty was not extinguished – that is, while it was displaced, it was not ceded. The colonial project did not reach ‘full and final settlement’ in Te Urewera, a testament to the tenacity of Tūhoe whānau and hapū to challenge the violence and injustice they were subject to. By the same token, however, this rationalises the acute levels of state violence inflicted upon Tūhoe in contemporary New Zealand society. As bearers of a
superior claim to sovereign legitimacy, emergent from within the very earth itself, Tūhoe remain an existential threat to the settler colonial state. As we shall see, the negation of Indigenous sovereignty is a perpetual process. Yet, in the quotidian texture of Ruatoki life, life continues. The photographs from my fieldwork offer a window into this, which is as much a counternarrative to prevailing discourses as it is a tribute to Tūhoe survival. In bringing this chapter to a close, I return to Rua Kēnana. On the exact day I wrote this, 101 years after the 1916 raid, Rua was given a statutory pardon at Maungapōhatu. Tūhoe and the Crown met once again in a ritual of encounter, although now to acknowledge one of the many injustices of the past. The heavens opened as the weeping tears of a thousand ancestors cascaded upon the ceremony at Maungapōhatu marae. For Koro Richard Tumarae, one of the kaumatua in attendance, “Our older people are showing their delight – albeit in tears from heaven” (Radio New Zealand, 2017).
CHAPTER V: THE INVENTION OF ‘TŪHOE’

Figure 29: The now infamous photograph of the Armed Offenders Squad blockading the road into Ruatoki, inspecting vehicles and photographing drivers, during Operation Eight on October 15, 2007. © Copyright purchased by Department of Anthropology and Archaeology, University of Otago.

INTRODUCTION

Having explored the theme of place, in describing Tūhoe’s relationship with the land and Crown violence in Te Urewera, we now turn more rigorously to focus upon that of representation. From a Foucauldian perspective, as we have seen, history is not a linear forward progression, but rather an on-going series of subjugations operationalised through discourse and power-knowledge. When employing the term ‘invention of Tūhoe’, I am specifically speaking of how the discourse of Tūhoe as ‘savage’ and ‘primitive’ beings emerged from within a particular socio-political and economic context, as a system of representation that proclaimed to be the ‘true’ way of knowing and understanding Tūhoe. This is to underscore that knowledge
(and discourse) is neither preordained nor naturally occurring, but a distinct product of ‘accidental’ circumstances. To be clear, I am not speaking of Tūhoe identity, cosmology, epistemology, or narratives of creation, but rather the way in which the discourses surrounding Tūhoe were invented in European consciousness, with manifold devastating material consequences over the last two centuries.

In what follows, I demonstrate how the discourses of ‘race’ and ‘Tūhoe the savage’ are unstable ontological constructions, by archaeologically revealing their situatedness within historical circumstances. In doing so, I outline the discursive formation of Tūhoe as creatures of violence, aggression, immaturity, savagery, and simplicity. This involves a close examination of early and recent literature, including diary entries, interview transcripts, travelogues, news reports, commentaries, and so forth. This discursive framework, I argue, was the historical milieu in which allegations of ‘terrorism’ could be so easily grafted onto the Tūhoe body. More importantly, this continues to rationalise the acute level of violence inflicted upon the whānau of Ruatoki. I also explore the visualisation of ‘Tūhoe terrorism’ through television and print media broadcasts, both from the week of October 15, 2007, and the years that followed. This builds upon Sue Abel’s similar and insightful analysis of media reporting on Ruatoki and Operation Eight (2008). I also critically examine the evidence police gathered for Operation Eight, by interrogating the racialised signifiers of difference police drew on to base their allegations. Let us begin with an archaeological investigation of ‘race’.

THE INVENTION OF RACE

Like any form of knowledge, ‘race’ is not a natural, preordained category, but rather is a discourse that was invented half a millennium ago through and by European expansion (Mills, 2011, 2008, 2007; Sharma, 2015; Wynter, 2003). Race is not a biological fact or inevitability that
rests inherently within the body (Sullivan, 2006: 18), but as a discourse, it fervently remains a “social fact” that structures and divides society according to the impetus of white supremacy (Mirzoeff, 2009: 147; Calmore, 1995: 318; Hall, 2002: 40; Mills, 2011; see also Bailey and Zita, 2007; Buck, 2012; Crenshaw, 1995; Dua, 2008; Elder, Wolch & Emel, 1998; Filax, 2008; Green, 2008; Lund, 2008; Mane, 2012; Ortega, 2006; Oyewumi, 2000; Rodriquez, 2006; Smith, 2008a, 2008b; Sullivan and Tuana, 2007; Thompson and Thompson, 2008; Essed and Goldberg, 2002).

That is, race – as a discursive formation – continues to inform material practice in everyday life. In order to understand the far-reaching implications of ‘race’, and, by extension, the structures of inequality engendered therein, we must first contextualise it by examining the religious stratification that defined Europe five hundred years ago.

*The invention of ‘man’*

Early Latin-Christian Europe was demarcated by what renowned Jamaican critic and philosopher Sylvia Wynter describes as a “…theocentric, ‘sinful by nature’ conception / ‘descriptive statement’ of the human”. In other words, the Church and its battalion of clergy enforced a religious definition of what it meant to ‘be human’. Those that fell outside of this description – ‘heathens’, ‘nonbelievers’, and anyone not of the Christian faith – were relegated to the realm of “subhumanness”, to be treated according to their ecclesiastical status. This “master code”, as Wynter describes, framed how people lived, existed and interacted with – or rather, were subjugated by – the world (2003: 263-4). “[T]o escape their subordination to the world of the Church”, suggests Wynter, the Renaissance saw a reimagination of ‘Man’ according to a secularised, quasi-biological scientific explanation, ostensibly evidenced by phenotypical, genealogical and cultural variation (2003: 263; Mills, 2011: 11). To break free of this religious hegemony, a new ‘master code’ – a ‘new form of subjugation’, as Foucault would
describe – emerged in which epidermis, stature, hair, and facial formation became the essential signifiers of difference.

Race rests on the linchpin binary of ‘ir/rationality’, which posits a unidirectional trajectory of human evolution, whereby ‘European Man’ had arisen from a ‘state of nature’ (characterised by “animallike … instinct” (Mills, 2011: 12)), to become ‘Rational, Thinking Man’ while non-European peoples remained existentially doomed to wither in irrationality (Wynter, 2003: 300). This echoes Hall’s earlier statement that the Enlightenment hierarchically organised the peopled world into a classificatory system premised on an evolutionary progression from barbarism to civilisation (Hall, 1997b: 239). Similarly, the term ‘barbarian’ itself emerged from the demarcation of insider and outsider by ancient Greek society, in which the “speech [of outsiders], to Greek ears, sounded like gibberish (‘bar-bar-bar’)” (Cole, Symes, Coffin and Stacey 2012: 58). Elsewhere, Jolly has observed how the ‘grand narrative’ postulated by late-eighteenth and nineteenth century theories of human society paralleled the ontogeny of an individual’s life from infancy through childhood to maturity (and on occasion civilised senility!)… “[O]thers” were relegated to the infancy of savagery or the childhood of barbarism, an anterior time, a more primitive place, and, increasingly, a more bestial race, which Europeans had progressed beyond and eclipsed (2009: 74).

This “Enlightenment gaze” (ibid. 73), so she describes, is how European voyagers such as Louis Antoine de Bougainville and James Cook ‘came to know’ Pacific peoples, and, following Foucault’s thinking, concreted that understanding in discursive history. Continuing the logic of social evolutionism, it was thought that the ‘primitive’ peoples voyagers encountered offered a “living museum” of the West, to be probed and studied as contemporary remnants of an…

72 The development of this idea is often traced to the Enlightenment thinker, Jean-Jacques Rosseau.
existence Europeans had long ago departed (Weir, 2008: 283; see also Jolly, 2009: 38-9, 76). To this end, in the Australian context, burial sites were plundered by European scientists seeking to answer questions of origin as informed by Darwin’s theory of evolution (Turnbull, 2008: 205). This collectively represented the epistemological detaching of Europeans vis-à-vis the ‘savage peoples’ they encountered, existentially separated by a gulf of evolutionary distance. More broadly, this meant that only ‘Rational (White) Man’ was the signatory to what is described as the ‘social contract’ – a description of how ‘modern’ society was formed – transforming “‘natural’ man to ‘civil/political’ man”. [Note also here that ‘reason’ was the instrument giving rise to the man/woman binary]. This, so Western political theory postulates, fostered the formation of civil society, modern government, and its associated institutions (Mills, 2011: 12).

Accordingly, in the throes of European expansion in the Americas and Caribbean, “…the European settlers classified [themselves] as by nature a people of reason (gente de razón) and the non-European population groups ‘Indians’ and ‘Negroes,’ [were] classified as brute peoples without ‘reason’ who were no less naturally determined to do so” (Wynter, 2003: 304, my emphasis). Wynter designates this hierarchy a

…Chain of Being comprised of differential/hierarchical degrees of rationality …[,] between different populations, their religions, cultures [and] forms of life …[, and] while the West placed itself at the apex …[,] [i]t was to be the figure of the Negro … that [was] on the rung of the ladder lower than that of all humans (ibid. 300-1).

For the innumerable distinct (non-European) peoples living across the far reaches of the planet, this was to be a fait(ful) accompli to which they were constructed as being unable to reply, and who, in turn, now occupied a subordinate link in the Chain of Being – its meridian exclusively inhabited by Europeans, and its nadir, by Negroes. In the Pacific context, this ‘lowest rung’ was
also the residence of Aboriginal Australians, nineteenth century French anthropologists deeming this their “epistemological ‘slot’” (Anderson, 2008: 229). As Anderson explains, “The prevailing view about Aborigines … was of a people barely human who at worst showed many simian characteristics and at best were living fossils, contemporary manifestations of Stone Age people” (ibid. 229). Similarly, Bougainville characterised the ni-Vanuatu he encountered on Ambae as “ugly and unhealthy savages” (Jolly, 2009: 78). Thus, this “organizing code” inaugurated a new characterisation of human existence, bestowing upon certain members of the Homo sapiens species the status of ‘fully human’, while dismissing the rest to some declension of ‘subhumanness’ (Mills, 2011). French biologist Jean-Baptiste-Geneviève-Marcellin Bory de Saint-Vincent articulated this through dividing human society into different species (espèces), again resigning different Pacific peoples to the lowest of that hierarchy:

The Papous [(Papuans)] were ‘the most truly savage of all Men’ along with Bory’s eighth espèce, named ‘Australasian’ and mostly comprising mainland Aborigines. Australasians were ‘the most brutish of Men’, ‘totally foreign to the social state’, ‘misshapen’, and with ‘the most deplorable facial resemblance’ to mandrills. Bory’s penultimate espèce reconfigured the Negroes of Oceanica as Mélaniens, a term derived from Greek melas, ‘black’, referring explicitly to skin colour. This species included the inhabitants of Van Diemen’s Land (‘timid, stupid, idle’), most of what is now Melanesia (‘warlike and anthropophagous to the highest degree’), and remote areas of the larger islands of the Malay Archipelago (‘hideous Men’) (Douglas, 2008a: 9).

Thus arose the human sciences to seek out and quantitatively codify, describe, and analyse ‘racial difference’. In this process, Europeans were rendered “racially ‘pure’” – as they had jettisoned their vestiges of irrationality and ‘savagery’ – and the “…Black population … as the new ne plus ultra marker of barely human status” (Wynter, 2003: 309; Goldberg, 2002: 289-90). Bronwen Douglas (2008b) has explored the materialisation of this in the Pacific, detailing how eighteenth century voyagers and naturalists subjected the region and its peoples to racial taxonomisation. In one disturbing example, she explains how two skulls of Papuan peoples
were “plundered from indigenous graves” and used to highlight their inferior pedigree of “dispositions to theft” … [,] ‘destructive instinct’ … [,] ‘penchant for murder’ and the presumption of cannibalism” (2008b: 117, see also 109-14).

The racialisation of the Pacific, however, is more abruptly obvious in the legacy of naming left by French voyagers. Racial taxonomies were central to this, with “skin colour and physical organization the key differentiae” in the classification of Pacific peoples (Douglas 2008a: 8-10). Thus arose the “Polynesian [(‘many islands’)] race”, a “very beautiful [and] copper-coloured” people, who, while inferior to Europeans, were distinct from Bory’s Mélaniens (ibid. 8). The French voyager Jules Dumont d’Urville popularised this racial classification through an adaptation of Bory’s term, ‘Melanesia’, alongside the use of Polynesia – all of which drew from the racialised undertones described above (ibid. 9-10). Along with the term ‘Micronesia’ (‘many islands’), this created the tripartite cartographical outlay of the Pacific in currency today, the names of which have become discursively authoritative for the region.

Race: a discursive mechanism of domination

To return to Wynter and her contemporary, Jamaican philosopher Charles Mills, the discourse of race (and its attendant Chain of Being) buoyed and facilitated European expansionism, rendering millions of the world’s peoples as less-than-human (see also da Silva, 2014). In turn, this justified the mass dispossession and exploitation of Indigenous lands and wealth, exemplified in the Pacific, without the intervention of European moral reprehension (Mills, 2011: 32-3, 2008: 1388-94; Wynter, 2003: 264). This echoes Mignolo’s earlier observation that expropriation first relies on the dehumanisation of the ‘other’ (2012). Race, therefore, emerged as a discursive “mechanism of domination” that replaced earlier modes of religious division and subjugation, and became a “new notion of the world and ‘idea of order’” (ibid. 296). Why
all of this is crucial to understand, in the context of the New Zealand settler colonial state, is because this system of beliefs underpinned, facilitated, and justified the

...large-scale accumulation of unpaid land, unpaid labor, and overall wealth expropriated by Western Europe from non-European peoples, which was to lay the basis of its global expansion from the fifteenth century onwards, ... carried out within the order of truth and the self-evident order of consciousness, of a creed-specific conception of what it was to be human (ibid. 291).

This is foundational to what Mills terms the ‘Racial Contract’, an explanation of the “intrawhite agreement that [has] – through European expansionism, colonialism, white settlement, slavery, apartheid, and jim crow – shape[d] the modern world” (2008: 1386).

The Racial Contract

“White supremacy is the unnamed political system that has made the modern world what it is today”, claims Mills in the introductory line of his seminal work The Racial Contract (2011: 3; see also Dyer, 1997). For him, the fundamental pillars of Western political philosophy rest on the notion of racial superiority and inferiority – white supremacy – but this unassailable fact eludes acknowledgement in the political thought of the West. He challenges such innate Eurocentric attitudes by situating race at the centre of his analysis, critiquing the social contract and its presupposition that ‘society’ could not have existed but for the creation of it by white men. Such a society is built upon wealth exploited from non-European and Indigenous peoples, economic motivations being an intrinsic component of the Racial Contract (Mills, 2011: 32; see also Sullivan, 2006: 4). As Hall has similarly noted, “…race relations are directly linked with economic processes: historically, with the epochs of conquest, colonization, and mercantilist domination, and currently, with [the unequal global distribution of wealth]” (2002: 42). Moreover, in the process of imperial expansion, non-European peoples were “deemed childlike, incapable of self-rule and handling their own affairs, and thus appropriately wards of
the state”, justifying the administration of ‘native’ societies for the benefit of ‘natives’ themselves (Mills, 2011: 13). Such ‘infantile’ societies were liquidated both of their wealth and prospects of future prosperity (Wolfe, 2016, 2011, 2006), a story mirrored throughout Tūhoe history over the last two centuries (Binney, 2009).

The Racial Contract institutes and continues to preserve a white-privileging society, dividing white from non-white, to “…maintain and reproduce this racial order, securing the privileges and advantages of the full white citizens and maintaining the subordination of nonwhites” (ibid. 14). As a system of domination, white supremacy was not achieved overnight. Rather, the past five hundred years have consolidated this process so that race *appears* like an ontological reality, when in fact, it is not (Mills, 2011: 53; see also West, 2002). More importantly, and in accord with Foucault’s conceptualisation of power, what Mills painstakingly calls attention to is that “…*Whiteness is not really a color at all, but a set of power relations*” (Mills, 2011: 127, his emphasis). It is this set of power relations that structures everyday life across the planet (‘produces reality’, as Foucault would describe), and is what my autoethnographic reflection highlighted in the Introduction.

Although I have found these meditations on race compelling, I feel their foundation in binary oppositions – that is, between white and non-white – while important, tend to eclipse the experiences of those who exist in the liminal spaces between such modalities of existence.73 I am speaking here particularly of my own experiences, which I struggled to reconcile alongside this literature – especially of being too brown in a white world, and too white in a brown world. For peoples of mixed ancestry, there is far greater nuance and complexity here than what this

73 See also Luker 2008, who explores select histories of descendants of mixed heritage across the Pacific. In early twentieth century New Zealand, she observes, some believed that descendants of mixed Māori and Pākehā heritage would display an enhanced vigour and strength. Indeed, for the famous ethnologist Te Rangi Hiroa, the “future [of Māori lay in such] intermixture and absorption” (pp. 316-8).
literature, at first instance, suggests. For me, such a racialised reality has and continues to intersect with my class positionality in quite painful ways, often making me question the worthiness of pursuits I endeavour towards as a young Māori male (particularly in academia). My story, and the comparable stories of others I have spoken with, reveal the strictures of what counts as a ‘real’ Māori, beckoning again to Jolly’s fitting observations on the ‘spectres of inauthenticity’ (1992). Such hauntings of inauthenticity loom large for people of mixed heritage, and especially for those whose education or wealth are seen as inappropriate for Indigenous peoples. As I have said, there is no right or wrong way to ‘be Māori’, and to capitulate to such expectations – that fluency in te reo, physical prowess, or even the ability to play the guitar (!) is the ultimate barometric measure of ‘Māoriness’ – is as destructive as racial stereotyping itself.

At the 2019 Te Matatini ki Te Ao,74 I sat enthralled by the spectacular display of performances, cheering exceptionally loud for the unmatched talent of Tainui. While there, I reflected on how I relish watching kapa haka, yet do not share the acumen nor inclination to perform on stage. I became fluent in te reo at university, have long been irritated by expectations of Māori masculinity, and have dedicated myself to the pursuit of knowledge (much of which is epistemologically European!). And yet my point here is this – this in no way disqualifies my being Māori. Once again, this, rather, is an observation of the messy, (ostensibly) contradictory, and unexpected nature of our existences.

74 Literally, ‘the multitude of faces of the world’; an illustrious biannual Māori performing arts competition, showcasing the talents of the various hapū from across New Zealand. See https://www.tematatini.co.nz/ for more information.
RELEGATION INTO SUBPERSONHOOD

To return to and summarise my discussion thus far, race is not inherent to the human body, but rather a discursive construct the result of “…process[es] of historically situated projects in which human bodies and social structures are represented and organized” (Omi and Winant, 2002: 124, their emphasis). This exemplifies Foucault’s insight that history is not a linear march toward equality, but rather “the current [episode]” in a series of discursive subjugations (1984: 83). What becomes the “somatic norm”, then, is the white male body – to which everyone else is positioned as *persona non grata* to more or lesser degrees (Mills, 2011: 53). “To be white is to be human, and to be human is to be white” echoes comparative literature scholar Warren Montag (1997: 285).

This process is the relegation of certain ‘bodies’ into subpersonhood, bodies who are “…not fully human and therefore have a different and inferior schedule of rights and liberties applying to them. In other words, it is possible to get away with doing things to subpersons that one could not do to persons, because they do not have the same rights as persons” (Mills, 2011: 56).

‘Otherness’ is illustrated by reference to this somatic benchmark, and drawing on Said, Mills identifies how whiteness is opposingly defined by what it is not – ‘savage’, irrational, and so forth (ibid. 58). Yet as Said sagely observed, “…this secondariness [(that is, the “relegating and confining the non-European to a secondary racial, cultural ontological status”)] is, paradoxically, essential to the primariness of the European” (Said, 1994: 59). In other words, while Europeans imprinted ‘savagery’ and ‘irrationality’ onto the bodies of the peoples they encountered, their action was more about superimposing their own ‘primitive’ pasts upon such bodies. They gazed upon the non-European world through distinctly European eyes.\(^{25}\)

---

\(^{25}\) See, for example, Jolly’s (2016) discussion on the historically-contingent masculinities produced in and through colonial contexts in the Pacific.
For New Zealand, the Racial Contract underscores the fundamental role racism plays in the operation of the settler colonial state. In the following, I outline how the discursive formation of race unfolded in the New Zealand context, rendering Māori – and more pointedly, Tūhoe – subhuman, savage, and barbarous. Race is operationalised by inscribing these traits onto the bodies of Tūhoe and Māori people. As Mills elaborates,

...there is the microspace of the body itself (which in a sense is the foundation of all the other levels), the fact ... that the persons and subpersons, the citizens and noncitizens, who inhabit these polities do so embodied in envelopes of skin, flesh, hair. The non-white body carries a halo of blackness around it which may actually make some whites physically uncomfortable (2011: 51).

In a conversation one day with my friend, Tuari, a man of over six feet, of Sāmoan and Māori descent, and of solid, muscular build, he mentioned how in many spaces, “If I get up too fast, that’s [considered] a threat”. This is an exemplification of the inscription of race onto the non-white body, literally embodying Mills’ image of ‘carrying around a halo of blackness’. My discussion here explores this ‘halo’ through early and recent written and visual texts, first of Māori in general, and then more specifically of Tūhoe. The discursive framing of Tūhoe before and after Operation Eight is crucial for this analysis, because it demonstrates how the earlier discourses of ‘Tūhoe the savage’ informed the execution of the raids themselves. Allow me to first turn to the work of Angela Ballara, who carefully traces the discourse of race in Proud to be White? A Survey of Pakeha Prejudice in New Zealand (1986). The perspectives she collected exemplify Mills’ explanation of race:

[T]he inhabitants of these islands ... appear to me to be descended from a once powerful people, who ... gradually degenerate[ed] into barbarism, from a high state of civilization ... [T]he spirit of enterprise led them in successive migrations to ... the southern ocean, where they ultimately passed the last stage of moral degradation (Ballara, 1986: 9).

John Nicholas, “an early visitor to New Zealand”, 1817.
[The object of our endeavour is] that of civilizing a barbarous people by means of a deliberate plan and systemic efforts. This indeed, will be an experiment; for though professions of a desire to civilize barbarians have often been used as pretexts for oppressing and exterminating them, no attempt to improve a savage people, by means of colonization, was ever made deliberately and systematically. The success of such an experiment must in a great measure depend on the natural capacity of the inferior race for improvement. It will be seen that, in this present respect, the native inhabitants of New Zealand, are superior to most, if not all thoroughly savage people. [But the] New Zealanders are a thoroughly savage people (ibid. 16).


As a rule civilised nations do not recognise the right of scattered handfuls of barbarians to the ownership of immense tracts of soil, only a fraction of which they cultivate or use. However from the noblest and most philanthropic motives an exception to this rule was made in the case of New Zealand, and by treaty some seventy thousand Maoris were given a title guaranteed by England – the best title in the world – to some sixty-six million acres of valuable land (ibid. 39).

William Pember Reeves, politician, 1898.

The discursive framing of ‘Māori the savage’ becomes immediately clear through these nineteenth century accounts. Employing the Christian notion of the irrevocable ‘fall from grace’, Nicholas presumes Māori to be doomed to the savageness of their ways, having ‘ultimately passed’ the existential point of no return. For Wakefield, Ward, and Reeves, the uncivilised and barbarous nature of Māori is taken for granted, and while the ‘inferior race’ may demonstrate capacity for improvement, their ‘thorough savageness’ circumscribes their development. This depiction of Māori as ‘savage’ extended to all realms of social and political life, and, as Findlay’s comment below exemplifies in the context of child raising, presupposed that Māori were inherently incapable of ‘proper’ parenthood:

It is not sufficient that the Maori women should themselves be good-hearted people, but we should look to the interests of the child … these children, owing to the condition

---
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some of the Māori people live in, are not living in a way we should consider proper for European children (Ballara, 1986: 98).


Further, as Reeves claims, Māori were incapable of exploiting land according to the directives capital, highlighting the exploitative capitalism that drove the machine of early New Zealand colonial governments (Brooking, 1996, 1992). The virtue extolled by Reeves (a politician, no less) upon his predecessors’ ‘benevolent’ gesture of awarding Māori title to their land, is what Mills describes as the “rewrit[ing of] the past so as to deny or minimize the obvious face of global white domination” (Mills, 2011). As we have seen, this amounts to a gross distortion of Tūhoe history, which is saturated with Crown tactics of invasion, dispossession, duplicity, and confiscation.

As we continue into the twentieth century, the ‘uncivilised’ nature of Māori has become ‘common sense knowledge’:

The white man will not go back to the grass skirt, it is the Māori that has to put on the suit. Māori culture is a simple tribal illiterate culture. White men got out of tribalism years ago. Māori culture can offer nothing but some carvings and some legends … Māori culture has nothing to offer. After seeing Westminster Abbey, Paris or Rome it is very difficult to get excited by an illiterate culture… (Ballara, 1986: 140).


When the pioneers came to New Zealand years ago they civilised the Māoris and gave them clothes, weapons, tools and schools (ibid. 140).

11 year-old Pākehā boy, 1980.

I am so pleased to be working in this area. It is so nice to see all the little children, so beautifully dressed, on their way to school. Where I live there are a lot of Māoris (ibid. 3).

The first two excerpts reinforce Mills’ explanation that Māori had to be guided “at least partway to civilisation” (2011: 57), in which an ‘illiterate’ pedigree, and the absence of ‘technology’ and ‘scholarship’ until the arrival of Europeans, were unassailable signifiers of inferiority. The implicit assumption of European superiority is emphasised throughout, defining Māori in binary terms against what is considered the benchmark of a canonical civilisation. The statement, ‘Where I live there are a lot of Maoris’ is an insidious contrast to ‘beautifully dressed children’ – children who are, by virtue of the former remark, Pākehā – suggesting Māori do not take pride in their appearance, or are unaccustomed with ‘proper’ dress etiquette.

Although a relatively small collection of statements, to which I wish to pay no more attention to than is required, these attitudes discursively depict Māori as inferior, uncivilised, devoid of higher learning, and in general, “stupid, naïve, primitive, lazy and dishonest” (Ballara, 1986: 119). Although she employs a different analytical frame, Ballara echoes Wynter and Mills’ observation about the dehumanisation of the (non-European) Other, whereby Pākehā discourse framed Māori in terms of their inherent irrationality, and desperate need of governance from white men. As she explains, “…[a]t the turn of the century, Anglo-Saxons in New Zealand did not question their assumption that theirs was a race born to rule, and that the Maori belonged to a race which was bound to require that rule” (ibid. 111). European peoples claimed to occupy the apex of the Chain of Being, contrasted with the penchants considered innate to Māori, such as their “warlike tendencies” (ibid. 29).77 Stereotypes such as these, however, ignore the underlying causal links between the arrival of Europeans – defined particularly by the dispossession of Māori land, knowledge, and ways of life – and the massive social, political and economic upheavals engendered therein. The European optic, however,

---

77 Consider here the ‘warlike tendencies’ of the colonial machine in its outward expansion from Europe!
saw only ‘bloodthirsty savages’ bent on perpetual war, which obscures from view the fundamental role European contact has had in this situation, and simultaneously occludes the violent savagery of invasion (Ballara 1986: 30, see also 2003, 1998). Furthermore, the representation of Māori as incapable of appropriately exploiting the capital value of their land (Brooking, 1996, 1992), was propagandised to justify the dispossession of Māori land, in the same way it was in the Americas (Ballara, 1986: 32-3; Mills, 2011; Sharma, 2015; Wynter, 2003).

The glaring contradiction that persists, and that has remained at the forefront of public discourse well into the 1990s, however, is that New Zealand has been the epitome of harmonious race relations over the last 200 years (in particular contrast to Australia). British colonists frequently laboured beneath the delusion that “never had a civilised power treated a native race as kindly as they had treated the Maori” (Wanganui Herald, 1894), and in the 1980s the trope of ‘enviable’ race relations in New Zealand was still in circulation. Pragmatics say otherwise, suggests Ballara (1986), as evidenced by the de facto colour bar that existed in mid-twentieth century New Zealand: “[In the Taranaki region,] Maori were not welcome in any Pakeha social institutions. Maori women were discouraged from entering the only public restroom; the community centre was regarded as a facility for Europeans only” (ibid. 61, 99). Māori children were punished for speaking te reo throughout the nineteenth and mid-twentieth centuries, and a strictly “non-academic syllabus” was taught to Māori children, with a focus on domestic and labour work (Ballara, 1986: 99; Simon and Smith, 2001; Smith and Simon, 1998; Timutimu, Simon and Matthews, 1998). This channelled generations of Māori into those lines of work – denying them entry into other professional endeavours – which is precisely what my Mum, Grandma, Nan and Pop all experienced. For Mills, this is the deployment of an ideological apparatus to reinforce the Racial Contract, specifying what ‘subject races’ could and could not be taught (2011: 78-9).
The corollary of this process is that it devalues, or at worst, erases, Indigenous knowledges and histories, the long-term effects of which have been devastating. This is particularly manifest in the devaluation of Māori knowledge in the eyes of Māori ourselves, no less amongst my own whānau. One of my Nan’s mantras, for example, was “…that Treaty stuff is water under the bridge. You need to focus on English and the way white people do things”. Another Nan used to say “I don’t know why you’re doing all the Māori stuff at university”. While these perspectives may be generationally-specific, both of these reflections underscore Mills’ comment, “…the Racial Contract prescribes non-white self-loathing and racial deference to white citizens” (2011: 88-9), and Cuban American scholar Alfred J. López’s observation that “…history as a discipline emerges as a crucial tool for the domination of the colonized” (López, 2005: 22). It is challenging when these microaggressions of colonisation are reproduced within our own whānau, but this openly demonstrates the power of the discourse of race to do just that.

**April 2017**

“Karekau he radio,” but it goes just fine!”, said Dad of his truck as I jumped aboard and drove Mum and the tamariki into town for their swimming and kickboxing lessons. The evenings were becoming cooler, and as the sun disappeared beyond the farthest ridgeline, the chill swept in. With the tamariki in the back, we were townward-bound, and Mum and I started to chat. As we drove past Awahou Road, from whence the 1866 confiscation line intersects, she spoke more generally of being stopped by the Police. “If it’s just us in the car”, she explained, “they don’t listen to us, and are rude. If there’s a Pākehā person in the car, it’s different – we get treated better.” I nodded, silently reflecting on this as I continued driving into town.

**THE INVENTION OF 'TŪHOE’**

If Māori were ‘uncivilised savages’, then “…the Urewera natives were … the most hostile and intractable of any of the Maori tribes” wrote the *Wanganui Herald* in 1894, and “so wild and

---

78 “There’s no radio…” Translation mine.
fierce was the appearance of these people … [t]he effect was ferocious in the extreme” (ibid. 2).

Motifs of wilderness, savagery, and primitivism saturate early texts concerning Tūhoe, and their deployment therein is by no means accidental. As Mills notes, the term ‘savage’ explicitly denotes disqualification from ‘civilised’ existence:

[T]he etymology of ‘savage’ … derives from the Latin silva, ‘wood,’ so that the savage is the wild man of the wood, silvaticus, homo sylvestris, the man whose being wildness, wilderness, has so deeply penetrated that the door to civilization, to the political, is barred. (You can take the Wild Man out of the wilderness, but you can’t take the wilderness out of the Wild Man.) (2011: 42-3).

The term ‘primitive’ likewise shares this orientation, by drawing on an evolutionary logic that posits a unidirectional progression of human development. Employing the same thinking as Wynter, certain cultures occupy the uppermost tiers of this scale, while others inevitably languish in the levels below, ‘chained’ by the essence of their being. Late nineteenth and early twentieth century newspaper articles and diary entries concerning Tūhoe, or journeys within Te Urewera, are festooned with these claims, exemplified throughout the work of ethnologist Elsdon Best (1925, 1897). In a commentary he wrote for the Press in 1897, for example, he opened by reinforcing the binary of ‘our civilisation versus their savagery’:

There would seem to be a lurking desire implanted in the human mind, or at least in the Anglo-Saxon mind, to discover and be interested in a primitive people, their country, habits, customs and language. For many years here in New Zealand, it was fondly imagined by many that a section of the Maori people was still living in a state of barbaric simplicty …[Tūhoe] were said to still dress in the old Native costume, still retain the ancient customs, and woe betide the luckless pakeha who should venture to enter the dominion of Tuhoe (Best, 1897: 5).

The ‘human’ mind is the European mind, and the European mind is the civilised mind. Tūhoe were the inverse of this, so Best claimed, who belonged to a state of primitivism and barbarism, and whose predilection for violence did not bode well for the eternally ill-fated (‘luckless’
Pākehā visitor. Elsewhere, he similarly described his work on Tūhoe as an account of the “history of barbaric man” (1925: 24). Earlier, in 1871, Captain Gilbert Mair had proffered that

…[m]any of the Urewera have never seen the sea and hardly ever a white man. The Maungapohatu Natives are a wild, restless set, with large shaggy heads of hair, and clad in mats made from the coarse fibres of the Toii (Cordyline Indivisa) – they bore but small resemblance to civilised beings (Webster, 1979: 82).

As Binney explains, “…to [Mair], they were ‘sauvages’ or ‘wild men’, part-fiction, part-factual” (2009: 194). A remark from a Captain Porter, also in 1871, echoes Mair’s sentiments, depicting Tūhoe as “…one of the fiercest tribes in appearance I have met; they are true savages” (Webster, 1979: 82). Two years later, an Auckland Star column wrote of Ruatāhuna as a locale of

…primitive villages of the main portion of the Urewera or Tūhoe tribe. Here these war-like and hardy mountain people have dwelt for hundreds of years past, recking [sic] little of the outside world, except when they organised war-parties to go on a man-eating excursion into the plains below (1899: 1).

Alongside this predisposition for unfiltered aggression, Tūhoe are here characterised by a conscious isolationism, a theme scattered throughout early writings. “To settlement and all contact with Europeans [Tūhoe] were opposed”, the Auckland Star claimed in 1898 (ibid. 4). The Wanganui Herald, however, noted that the by the end of the nineteenth century, after the devastating impacts of invasion and land confiscation had become obvious, Tūhoe were resigned to “abandon the policy of isolation which they have stubbornly maintained for so many years” (1894: 2). As we have seen, however, such claims of seclusion are irreconcilable with early histories of Tūhoe-Pākehā interaction.

Tūhoe ‘seclusion’ remained until their homeland was ‘made known’ by the advent of colonial cartography. The Otago Witness describes the ancestral mountain Huiarau as the “terra incognita of Tuhoe land” (1896: 50), that is, land that is unmapped and yet-to-be-known to the colonial machine. Cartography was – and remains – a fundamental instrument of statecraft, in
making legible physical landscapes for the state to facilitate both the apparatus of taxation and surveillance (Scott, 1998). For anthropologist and scholar of anarchism James Scott, these “state maps of legibility”, operationalised through the standardisation of measurement, consolidated state power by ‘making known’ outer areas to central authorities (ibid. 2-3). The development of land title, for example, offered an intelligible language through which distant bureaucrats could ‘read’ relatively alien landscapes, calculate their wealth to a degree of specificity, and tax it accordingly. So revolutionary was this system in consolidating state control, Scott explains, that “[f]reehold title and standard land measurement were to central taxation and the real-estate market what central bank currency was to the marketplace” (ibid. 48).

In its nascent stages in Te Urewera, this process of colonial expansion, guided by the impulse to seek out and extract wealth, was led by ‘pioneers’ of the colonial dream. The Otago Witness writes of this as a

…faint white line on the far hills … – a line which looks like a white thread hung round the cliffs of Okahu … It is the ubiquitous pakeha – the restless white man – who is everywhere and does everything; for it is the road formed by the expedition from old Fort Galatea. And it crawls on swiftly, that thin white line – creeps round the huge cliffs and across great ranges, and through the dense forest and down the darkling gulches. They never rest, these white men. Day by day they dig and hew and blast and tear away into the wilderness… Day by day the signal fires creep up the great ranges nearer to Huiarau. In a year or two, when the white lines are united, the scattering pioneers will emerge into the world of light at Te Wairoa… (1896: 50).

The Orientalist motifs of descent and darkness here are unmistakable. Through the industriousness of white men, the light of civilisation is valiantly brought to a dark and wild underworld. The ‘thin white line’ penetrates into the heart of terra incognita, resolute in its

79 This is particularly true in an era of satellite surveillance technologies like Google Maps.
ambition of taming – and making legible – a wild landscape, violently and penetratingly reshaping the environment to do so. The zenith of their exploits is to emerge into a ‘world of light’, galvanised by the tirelessness and virility of white men, upon whose shoulders rests the responsibility of spreading the word of civilisation. This is triumphantly marked by the construction of a road – a form of communication, surveillance, and control – into the heart of Te Urewera.

Nevertheless, in the Pākehā imaginary, Tūhoe country remained wild country. The Otago Witness entitled their article ‘In the Land of Tuhoe’, a narrative of a journey to “The Summit of Tarapounamu, in the Wilderness of the Uriwera Country” (ibid. 50), and a similar story from the Star two decades later describes the Maungapōhatu area as the “wildest part of this savage country” (1916: 4). Here, the ‘savagery’ of the landscape is matched by that of its inhabitants, a function of the Racial Contract that Mills terms a “circular indictment” and a “mutually supporting characterization”. As he explains, both the landscape and those that dwell within it imply one another: “You are what you are in part because you originate from a certain kind of space, and that space has those properties in part because it is inhabited by creatures like yourself” (2011: 42). To continue with this line of thinking, the savagery of the landscape renders it uninhabitable for Pākehā settlement. “Probably only one-tenth of the Urewera Country is fit for man’s settlement in any form”, suggests journalist James Cowan in 1917, as “[n]ature has set an insuperable barrier against the subjection of this savage highland country to the needs of the farmer”. “The simple truth”, he writes, continuing his homily,

…is that there is not more arable land in its borders than is required for the subsistence of the Native tribespeople themselves, and that so far as sheep and cattle raising is concerned it would be wiser policy to encourage the Maoris to clear and stock the fit portions rather than to rush European settlers into an essentially stubborn and formidable land (Cowan 1917: 13).
The title of Cowan’s article, ‘The Maori Highlands’ (likely linking to English anti-Scottish sentiment), similarly exposes the binary of civil/savage, in which Tūhoe are perceived as uncivilised – and *uncivilisable* – creatures. In the context of upland Southeast Asia, Scott has explored how the notion of ‘highlands’ is denotative of savagery and backwardness, in which

…the thinner the air you breathe, the less civilized you are. It is no exaggeration to say that the presumptive level of civilization can, from a valley perspective, be often read as a function of altitude. Those on the mountaintops are the most backward and uncivilized … ‘Hilliness’ per se is disqualifying (2009: 100).80

Reifying Scott’s analysis, Cowan continues to describe Te Urewera as

…an independent home for the little highland tribes that have dwelt there for untold generations, a place where they can live on the foods of the fern and bush – wild pigs and birds – as they do now; a place, moreover, which should be preserved largely in its natural state as a great forest park, one of the great travel tracks of the future (1917: 13).81

The patronising use of the qualifier ‘little’, in conjunction with the objectification of Tūhoe as a ‘primitive’ society – mirrored by the savagery of their landscape – to be treated as a ‘natural’ museum exhibit for the convenience of settler enjoyment, lays bare Cowan’s prejudices. At the time, however, his work was read as authoritative in Pākehā society, in the production of ‘common sense’ knowledge about Tūhoe.

Both representation and knowledge of Tūhoe comes into being through the quills and ink of writers such as Cowan and Best. As white men, their proclamations of ‘truth’ about Tūhoe are read as accurate, without need of further validation. Best, for the Press, is “of Tūhoeland” (Best, 1897: 5), and for the Auckland Star, is the “white ‘tohunga’ [(expert)] of Tuhoe land” (1899: 1).

More recently, anthropologist Jeffrey Sissons describes Best’s *Tuhoe: Children of the Mist*
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80 Consider also here the Highlands of Papua New Guinea.
81 Note also here how ‘wilderness’, for Europeans, is premised on the evacuation of Indigenous peoples from their homelands.
(1925) as a “now classic work” (1991: 1), and while my criticisms of _Tuhoe_ are not at all directed at kōrero from Tūhoe elders therein, they are at its author. _Tuhoe_, like any text, is a product of its time, and as Sissons describes, it “…objectified, judged and alienated [Tuhoe knowledge] at a time when the Crown was preparing to further alienate Tuhoe land” (1991: 20). This knowledge was “…removed from its social context … and contributed to a wider Maori and New Zealand history as interpreted through the discourse of the coloniser” (ibid. 21).

Equally problematic is the title Best chose for his 1925 work. At this juncture, allow me to remind the reader that a Foucauldian methodology is not concerned with examining intent, but rather the overall effect of text and statements, and the strategic use of knowledge. Thus, the discursive effect of using the phrase ‘Children of the Mist’ is one of infantilisation, depicting Tūhoe as simple, immature, and incapable of writing their own destinies (or histories!). As a Tūhoe kaumātua from the mid-1960s noted, emphasising Mill’s earlier point, in the early twentieth century “We were treated more as children than as men” (Webster, 1979: 60). Let me be clear. My comment here is not to trample on the mana of Tūhoe knowledge systems and creation narratives, as, indeed, many whānau I spoke with identified themselves as ‘Ngā Tamariki o Te Kohu’. Rather, it is a reflection on colonial modes of thinking that infantilised Indigenous peoples and rationalised the expropriation and exploitation of their lands. Here, Indigenous peoples (and Tūhoe specifically) are rendered naïve, immature, incapable of adequately utilising their land for capitalist development (Brooking, 1996, 1992), and in need of “paternalist guidance” to teach them of the ways of civilised life (Mills, 2011: 57). This, then, is the discursive effect (unintended or otherwise) of employing ‘Children of the Mist’ as a title.
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82 ‘The Children of the Mist’.
Consider, as a final comment here, the effect of describing Tūhoe as the ‘People’ or ‘Descendants of the Mist’.

In his 1897 *Press* article, Best’s account of Tūhoe people marvelling at different technologies acquires the same infantilising tone:

One hears amusing remarks made by these people. When I described the electric light and the X rays to Tutaka he said, ‘Te Pakeha e-e! Te atua tonu ra.’ ‘O, the white man! He is a god in himself.’ When old Whatu looked into the view finder of the camera he said, ‘No wonder the pakeha has conquered New Zealand’ (Best, 1897: 5).

The existential distance implied by deploying the phrase ‘these people’ signifies the irreconcilable difference between Best, as an ambassador of white civilisation, and Tūhoe, as immature, savage beings. The tired cliché of ‘natives admiring strange technology’ positions European technology as the superior benchmark from which everything (and everyone) else is measured. Moreover, this blindly ignores the vast repositories of Tūhoe knowledge and technology, such as intimate knowledge of the heavens and earth (see also Dening 1997). My point here is that everything is contextual – our ancestors’ knowledge of oceanic voyaging remains unsurpassed today (remembering that Cook himself was guided across the Pacific’s oceans by the “immensely intelligent” priest Tupaia of Ra’iatea (Jolly, 2007: 508)), and at the time of first contact and the early stages of colonisation, European vessels and sailing technology hardly rivalled Oceanic canoes. By the same token, however, the abundance of wheat and iron in continental Europe saw distinct technological developments in terms of agriculture and metallurgy (Mills, 2011: 68), leading, eventually, to the discovery and utilisation of electromagnetic radiation (to which Best was referring to in his statement about x-rays above).
The discursive framing of Tūhoe as simple, primitive, aggressive and immature, continued throughout twentieth and twenty-first century writings. American Anthropologist Steven Webster published *Rua and the Maori Millenium* in the late 1970s (1979), based on fieldwork he conducted in Waimana in the mid-1960s. Parallel to my critique of Best, my comments here are not aimed at the kōrero of whānau Webster spoke with, but rather the way he positioned himself as an outside researcher. Although he begins by urging his is a “partisan stance towards the Maori” (ibid. 10), his ontological and epistemological postures belie this outlook. I am not interested here in intent, but effect. In the early pages of his book, for example, he expresses some dismay at the “extraordinary lack of any personal documentary material amongst the Maori [around whom he conducted his research] … none of them had managed to retain anything of the past in the way of letters, diaries, notes, and so forth” (ibid. 12). This overtly privileges the written word, and pays no attention to the importance of oral traditions within Indigenous epistemologies, that continue to act as bridges of communication between past and present.83

Etched on the same page, a familiar infantilising tone emerges. “During my fieldwork amongst Tuhoe in the Urewera,” Webster writes, “I met a number of people who greatly impressed me” (ibid. 12). He continues overleaf: “Of all my informants over the years, none impressed me in quite the same way as Pemia [one of Rua’s wives]” (ibid. 13). Later, in discussing his attendance at a tangi, he writes of being “greatly impressed by the ritual of the whole event, the way in which it had been organised, [and] the confidence with which the elders spoke…” (ibid. 25). Like a teacher commenting on pupils’ work, Webster’s tone is one of moralistic superiority, and reveals the predispositions – shaped through discourses of Tūhoe inferiority – that
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83 See also Chris Ballard’s discussion on Oceanic historicities (2014).
characterised his understanding of Tūhoe before he had set foot in Te Urewera. This treats Tūhoe as ‘natives’ to be objectified and studied, whose ways of life are then subject to a presumptuous standard of measurement informed by Eurocentric notions of morality and evolutionism. He describes the ancestors of present-day Tūhoe as a “people with … simple technology”, who were “primarily hunters and gatherers” (ibid. 87-8). Echoing my earlier reflection on technology, these phrases are tied to notions of primitivism and savagery, reified by Webster’s remark immediately thereafter: “It seems likely then that some of the Tuhoe hapu lived a primitive marginal existence” (ibid. 88).

Nowhere is his positionality more clearly revealed than his epitaphic farewell to Nanny Pemia, one of the kuia he spent much of his time with, who sadly passed not long after his research began: “Although she was in some ways uniquely Tūhoe”, he writes, “at the same time she represented to me and to many others the very essence of human kindness, of warmth, of vitality” (ibid. 26). The grammatically negative framing of this sentence, through the conjunctive use of ‘although’, posits that virtues such as ‘human kindness’, ‘warmth’ and ‘vitality’ are ethics foreign to Tūhoe and Tūhoe ways of life. Moreover, the qualifier ‘human’ emphasises the discursive rendering of Tūhoe as primitive and savage, and not warm or hospitable. Despite his political proclamations, Webster’s predispositions are here laid bare.

**DISCOURSES OF TERROR AND ‘OPERATION EIGHT’**

Outlining the discursive framing of Tūhoe as ‘savage’, violent, immature, inferior, and simple allows me to explicate how the contemporaneous construction of Tūhoe as terrorists forms part of a long racist and racialised discursive genealogy that circulates knowledge about Tūhoe. In this section, I demonstrate how these discourses formed the discursive foundations upon which police allegations of ‘terrorist activity’ were based. Our focus now therefore shifts to the
heavily mediated ‘anti-terror’ raids in 2007, codenamed ‘Operation Eight’. Here, I draw on the evidence supporting the application for Search Warrants – the prerequisite legal mechanism required to initiate the raids – submitted to the Manukau District Court on October 10, 2007 (New Zealand Police, 2007). The police alleged that there were “quasi military training camp[s]” being held in the forests surrounding Ruatoki, and that this group “intend[ed] to use … firearms to take control of … the Tuhoe area of New Zealand”. The search warrant, in turn, was to enable police to “locate evidence of Participating in a Terrorist Group, Unlawful Possession of Firearms and Unlawful Possession of Restricted Weapons” (New Zealand Police, 2007: 155).

In the weeks that followed, however, then Solicitor-General David Collins announced that the evidence gathered by police did not meet the high threshold required by the Terrorism Suppression Act (‘TSA’), the law under which the charges that were laid (Sunday, 2007). Later, the evidence itself was deemed inadmissible in court, and the TSA was “branded … incoherent and unworkable” (Dominion Post, 2009). Both of these were pivotal and watershed events in the post-raids saga, and led to charges against 13 (of the 17 accused) being dropped in 2011 (New Zealand Herald, 2011b). The protracted nature of the legal proceedings that followed, including the story of the 17 who were charged, the impact this has had on families concerned, and the tactics employed by the Crown to achieve its ends, are points discussed and examined in a number of prominent documentaries and books (Keenan, 2008a; King-Jones and Wright, 2011; Morse, 2010; Slater, 2007; Webby, 2015). My focus, by comparison, is to highlight the racialised signifiers of difference that contributed to the discursive weight of portraying Tūhoe as ‘terrorists’. We must remember, of course, that the evidence collated by the police was
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84 The entire 156-page document was leaked on Wikileaks in December 2007; see New Zealand Police, 2007.
comprised of carefully selected items of information they considered of relevance in support of charges of terrorism. In this light, let us turn to the way in which Tame Iti, a prominent and vocal Tūhoe activist, was characterised in the early pages of the police evidence:

13. ITI is a Maori sovereignty activist and a member of Tuhoe – a Maori tribe from the Urewera Region of the Bay of Plenty.

13.1 In an article profiling ITI written for ‘Mana Magazine’ in 1995, ITI is described as serious about his mission to build a “Tuhoe nation”. In this article ITI is quoted as saying “I came back here to Ruatoki because this is where I belong; for me it’s where everything begins and finishes. This is Tuhoe land and should be run according to our tikanga [(protocols)]”.

13.2 In an article in the New Zealand Herald on the 13th of September 2006, ITI describes one of his painting as “a remembrance of land confiscation and murder of Tuhoe and the invasion of the Tuhoe nation”. The exhibition of Tame ITI’s art works was being held at the Te Karanga Gallery at 208 Karangahape Road, Auckland, until the 26th of September 2006 (New Zealand Police, 2007: 4, emphasis in original).

The characterisation of Iti as a ‘Māori sovereignty activist’ immediately positions him as exterior from the norms of white society, which, beyond that of the settler state itself, cannot be reconciled with notions of self-determination. His identification as a ‘member of Tūhoe’ might be circumstantial elsewhere, but here it acquires gravity because of the discursive context in which it is located. The remainder of the excerpt highlights Iti’s political and artistic ambitions surrounding Tūhoe sovereignty, a ‘serious mission’, so the excerpt emphasises, which qualifies the notation ‘member of Tūhoe’ by drawing on the prevailing, established discourses of Tūhoe as dissident, reclusive, and isolationist. Alone, ‘member of Tūhoe’ may be read as incidental, but when contextualised in this manner, it attains particular salience. By virtue of their inclusion, Iti’s hopes for ‘building a Tūhoe nation’, galvanised by a ‘remembrance of land confiscation’, are here rendered as signifiers of a potential for criminality (if not outright criminality itself).
Despite this, Iti is well known for his artistic endeavours and theatrical protests, which complicates such attempts to subjectify him as isolationist and dissident. His creative endorsement of the East Bay Breast Cancer Support Network in 2014, his role in *Tempest II* in 2008, his 2007 Wellington-based art exhibition in response to the raids, and his permanent gallery in Tāneatua that features his artwork (see Figures 30-3), together contribute to the disruption of this discursive formation. As Rawiri Taonui commented in the *Sunday Star Times* soon after the raids, “Tame Iti is a master of theatre, not a terrorist” (Taonui, 2007: C3).

Figure 30: 'Iti in tutu goes viral' (*Whakatane Beacon*, 2014: 1).
Figure 31: ‘Iti the artist launches ‘terror raid’ exhibition’ (Whakatane Beacon, 2009: 6).

Figure 32: ‘Iti’s Tempest II a smash hit in Europe’ (Whakatane Beacon, 2008a: 1).
Taneatua to become Bay’s hot spot for art

Kaha Mokaiatea
Staff reporter

GRAPHIC depiction of intimate female sanctuary in the Taneatua Gallery isn’t the only interesting discussion point emerging from the once-dilapidated house.

On a dreary winter’s day, Tane III sits at his desk in a room that was once the kitchen in a house believed to be the Taneatua Gallery. The house, bought by Mr. III’s cousins Laurence Hugo, has been somewhat restored. There are now windows, new timbers to replace rotting beams on the deck, and the weeds have been cleared away.

But inside, holes and graffiti remain. “This house, now the Taneatua Gallery, was being used to exhibit artwork created by six polytechnic students studying at Waikato, in Hamilton. One has incorporated a vagina into each of her works. Their exhibition is named Kiore.”

Mr. III said he wanted exhibitions to work around the holes and graffiti because they were part of the house’s story. He said this approach was inspired by exhibitions he had seen in Europe.

“When I was in Germany I went to a gallery in Berlin. It was in a black bigger than Whakatane town centre and a group of artists took over and held exhibitions in it.”

“I was really impressed how they took it over and did it.”

Mr. III said he wanted to give young artists a chance to be exhibited and, hopefully, they could inspire others in the community.

“I had a whole bunch of ideas come in here yesterday and they were asking me questions and I asked them questions.

“What I told them is it doesn’t have to be nice and beautiful images. Art is a depiction of what they are thinking.”

“I would like to see a lot of Tuhoe artists exhibit. I want them to use these kind of works and realize it is not just full of drawing little pieces. They have to be more confident. We come from a long line of artists.”

-Mr. III

Mr. III said the next showing would be some of the IIi exhibition, which involved photos of him. Tuhoe people and Te Greenes, taken by Wellington-based photographer Krieg Krieg. It was shown at the Harvey Milk FInal Center in San Francisco during April. The exhibition would take place at the Taneatua Gallery from June 18, once Kiore finished.

Mr. III said plans were afoot to host work created by Michael Tuffery, a New Zealand artist with Samoan, Rarotongan and Tuhoe heritage, who had spent a lot of time working with young people.

That exhibition would be followed by a showing of Tuhoe artist Ali Tapa’s work. He lived in Wellington and worked at Te Papa. Mr. III said he was working with Shibui House, who managed the Gallery, and will continue the Taneatua Gallery this summer.

In July and August he wanted to exhibit his own paintings, including some of the art he created while in prison after being found guilty of firearms charges.

“I will be bringing all of my old works and some new works over to people to see,” he said. “It will be called The Whakapapa, which means bringing together because I will be bringing together all of my work.”

He said his ultimate goal was to make Taneatua the Bay of Plenty art capital.  

Figure 33: ‘Taneatua to become Bay’s hot spot for art’ (Whakatane Beacon, 2015: 3).
While the evidence brief identified other individuals, Iti’s is the only description that explores his whakapapa and political ambitions, reiterating that the police saw this as pertinent information for their case. Overall, this scaffolds the allegations of terrorism against Iti by suturing together the discursive framing of Tūhoe as predisposed to separatism and violence, with the characteristics of terrorism. Terrorism is here defined by the police as “[action] … carried out for the purpose of advancing ideological, political, or religious cause[s] … to induce terror in a civilian population” (New Zealand Police, 2007: 70). The desire for an independent homeland, therefore, is rendered incompatible with the operation of the contemporary settler colonial state, where even its mere suggestion can be considered threatening. Desires for autonomy and self-determination for Tūhoe, which may elsewhere be described as legitimate political aspirations (see also Sluka, 2010), have in this context been recoded as racialised signifiers of terrorism.

This logic similarly informed then Prime Minister John Key’s vetoing of the cession of the Urewera National Park back to Tūhoe in 2010, which up until then had been a central component of Tūhoe’s Treaty of Waitangi negotiations with the Crown. Key postulated that this would set a “dangerous precedent” for other claimant iwi (Morning Report, 2010a), and that it was “a step too far for most New Zealanders” (Radio New Zealand, 2010). The exnominative function of ‘most New Zealanders’ construes Tūhoe as abnormal in relation to Pākehā society, a constituency Key was communicating with via this statement. More importantly, however, as Judith Binney’s work has demonstrated, such a course of action would by no means be ‘precedent setting’, as the Urewera District Native Reserve Act attests (Binney 2010: 167). Although legal autonomy did not eventuate, the Act illustrates the possibility of having a ‘state within a state’ situation for Tūhoe. As Binney noted elsewhere, “I think it is
reasonable that [Tūhoe] could develop a form of self-government in negotiation which would not threaten any of us” (Radio New Zealand, 2009).

What I have been discussing here might be described as the resignification of legitimate expressions of resistance to instead convey separatism and terrorism. This is similarly demonstrated in the police evidence through the identification of the tino rangatiratanga flag (see Figure 34), a symbol associated with Māori struggles for autonomy and self-determination. Police ‘observations’ of select persons or vehicles have been characterised and identified by reference to the tino rangatiranga flag, whether wearing it on clothing, flying it on a flagpole, or having it emblazoned as a sticker on the exterior of a vehicle (New Zealand Police, 2007: 4, 6). The police describe it as the “Maori sovereignty flag”, a definition that emphasises the themes of independence and self-determination. This is crucial because it adds cumulative weight to the wider charges of terrorism, discursively framing those identified as persons with penchants for ‘separatist thinking’, from where it is a relatively small step of logic to claim this equals terrorism. What police practice has here demonstrated is that symbols of legitimate, everyday resistance such as this – long used in land hikoi (walk; march), protests and the like (see, for example, Harris (2004)) – have the potential to signify criminality, and even terrorism. This was reinforced during the 6 o’clock One News bulletin on October 15 2007, with reporter Francesca Mold observing that “it [was] suggested those involved in the military training are into self-determination, the right of Māori to full independence”. As she speaks, stock footage of protests outside Parliament is shown, but with a specific focus on the tino rangatiratanga flag being flown (Television New Zealand, 2007a).
This serves as another reminder of Hall’s insistence that meaning is free floating and cannot be fixed in perpetuity, and indeed, can be manipulated to support multiple and contesting agendas. This process is particularly dangerous because it suggests that other, more innocuous expressions, are open to ‘reinterpretation’ or resignification in this manner.

This was also the case for police phone analyses of intercepted communications concerning the term ‘rama’, an allegedly coded phrase that was used to refer to the ‘quasi military training camps’ (New Zealand Police, 2007: 15-6; Radio New Zealand, 2012). ‘Rama’ literally refers to fishing by torchlight, and the root phrase of ‘light’ (rama) is shared by words such as ‘mārama’ (to be clear) and ‘māramatanga’ (enlightenment). It is possible this was the meaning they intended to evoke, similar to that of ‘wānanga’ (esoteric knowledge), but was dismissed and read otherwise by the police (Radio New Zealand, 2012). Conversely, while I was in Ruatoki, the expanded term ‘whakarama tuna’ referred to the common practice of hunting for tuna.
(eels) by torchlight. On a few occasions, I was fortunate to be taken on such adventures by some of the Teepa whānau, who valiantly charged on despite my rather hopeless presence encumbering upon their eeling prowess. (At one point, à la Winnie the Pooh (Reitherman, 1966), I got stuck in a tunnel beneath the roadway – much to the chagrin of the rather poor souls aft). Thus, ordinary practices of everyday Ruatoki life, such as whakarama tuna, have the potential to be tarred with the brush of criminality. Should onlookers unfamiliar with local context – such as the surveillance arm of the police – rely on these misunderstandings of everyday practice, they risk reifying these misconceptions and reinforcing discourses of Tūhoe as predisposed to violence and criminal behaviour. So, concerning the police evidence, the established colonial discourses of Tūhoe as aggressive, savage, and isolationist, provided the discursive milieu in which it was possible to so easily allege acts of terrorism had occurred in and by Tūhoe whānau of Ruatoki.

More broadly, this denotes the production of specific knowledge about Tūhoe by the police, in attempting to describe Tūhoe activities as criminal or terrorist behaviour. Another example similarly highlights this. Following her arrest during Operation Eight in Palmerston North, Tia Winitana reflected on the police interrogation she was subject to. At one point, the interrogating officer paused an audio recording, in which Tia was speaking, after hearing the word ‘hāngi’. “The cop pauses the tape and he says, ‘What’s that code for?’ I said, ‘What?’ he said, ‘HANGEY. What’s that code for?’ I said, ‘A bloody good feed!’” (Morse, 2010: 113). Although a nefarious meaning for ‘code-word hāngi’ was expected, as none existed, none could be produced. Upon corroborating – with little required effort – the translation of hāngi, the officer was likely left red-faced and humiliated, rendering the enquiry – and sinister insinuation – ridiculous. Again, an everyday Māori (and Tūhoe) expression has been subjected to the criminal gaze, attaching stigma to an innocuous and commonplace phrase.
This ludicrous but tragic moment is a helpful illustration of Foucault’s notion of power and subjectification. The process of being subject to power (that is, subjectification) is a two-step process, first requiring a discourse in circulation to then be taken up by individuals (subjects). The officer, convinced of Winitana’s complicity, demanded – and expected – a translation that would confirm such collusion, and should one have been provided, she would have been subjectified as a ‘Tūhoe terrorist’ (to be treated and prosecuted as such). Instead, she delivered a humorous retort, interrupting the attempt at subjectification by refusing to be defined in such a way. More importantly, the officer was forcing Winitana to take up a subjectivity she could never have occupied in the first place, reducing the legitimacy of both the interrogating officers, and the encounter in general. As she continued, “[t]he questions were getting dumber by the minute” (ibid. 113). This was ostensibly a moment of domination, but emerged instead as an opportunity for resistance, Winitana ‘speaking back’ to the discursive framing of ‘Tūhoe terrorists’.

“We know how many times you have gone through Rūātoki”, the police stated elsewhere during Winitana’s interrogation (ibid. 112), and in question form, this was posed to many located outside of Ruatoki caught up in Operation Eight. The broader implication here, which has continued in the decade following the Tūhoe raids, is that proximity to Ruatoki is considered dangerous or threatening. On numerous occasions, whānau of the Valley spoke of how people outside of the area (including many of their own relations from other iwi) would comment on Ruatoki as being ‘a place of terrorists’. As Aunty Waicy explains [see twice overleaf]:


2007 - 2013 (movie), 2014, car chase, etc.

The tube theory is reimagined as always already poised for violence and revenge. This is why I'm combing these theories into types of my thesis.
I muri tonu mai ra e hoki nei au, ko te pāmamae i tērā wā, haere mātou ki hea, haere koe ki hea, mena koe nō Ruatoki, ka haere koe ki hea … o te motu, kautaina mai tēnā kōrero i runga i a koe, he ‘terrorist’ koe … Ahakoa … he kōrero noīho, he whakatoi noīho, he whakateka noīho, kua kia mai mātou ko ōku mokopuna, ‘A, kua tae mai ngā terrorists o Ruatoki.’ Ahakoa tō whakakatakata… (Waka Huia, 2016). 85

He wā tino mamae, tino pouri, nā te mea, ka puta te rongo ki te ao, ka titiro mai ngā iwi o waho kē, ki tōku whānau, ki taku iwi, pēnei nā, he … arā te kupu a te Pākehā, he ‘terrorist’ mātou (Marae Investigates, 2013). 86

As she also described to me during one of our kōrero sessions, this brush tars both Ruatoki and Tūhoe as a whole. I suggest this process is reflective of the dovetailing of discourses of terror onto the earlier discourses of ‘Tūhoe the reclusive savage’. The grafting of this onto the Tūhoe body has remained in place, and Aunty Waicy’s reflections highlight the long term effects this power/knowledge has had.

There is one final remark I would like to make in relation to the police dossier of evidence and allegations. Police alleged there was a ‘plot to kill John Key’, then Leader of the Opposition. However, Key and a small entourage travelled to Ōwhakatoro marae in Te Urewera two months prior to the raids, but made the trip without a diplomatic protection unit. Indeed, as One News reported on November 15 2007, the “…alleged assassination plot against John Key was something the diplomatic protection squad knew about, but they didn’t tell [the National Party], and in fact provided advice to him in writing that it was safe for him to travel there.” Upon his arrival at Ōwhakatoro, Key was greeted by Iti. This event does beg the question: if the threat against Key was of such gravity, but the Diplomatic Protection Service felt he was safe to

85 ‘Since that day, the sad thing is that no matter where you go, if you are from Ruatoki, everyone says: ‘You’re a terrorist’, even though it’s said in jest. When people referred to myself and my grandchildren, they’d say, ‘Oh, the Ruatoki terrorists have arrived’. You laugh, but…’ Translation of Waka Huia, 2016.

86 ‘To rub salt in the wound, the whole world saw it. Outsiders looked at me, my family, and my people as ‘terrorists’.’ Translation of Marae Investigates, 2013.
travel there, “How real was the plot to kill John Key?” (Television New Zealand, 2007b). Then parliamentarian for the Māori Party Hone Harawira summarised this as follows: “It seems a contradiction … because on the one hand they’re concerned about [Key’s] safety to believe that there’s an assassination attempt going on; on the other hand, no protection when he actually goes into the heart of the Tūhoe nation” (Television New Zealand, 2007b).

**THE MYTH OF ‘TŪHOE TERRORISTS’**

I now turn to explore the mediatisation of Operation Eight, and, invoking Barthes, examine the way in which print and television broadcasts produced the myth of ‘Tūhoe terrorists’. This expands upon Abel’s cognate work, *Tūhoe and ‘Terrorism’ on Television News* (2008). Echoing Hall and Barthes, Abel’s argument insisted that “…news is not a ‘window on the world’, but rather a particular selection and construction of some of the events that have happened that day as told by some people” (2008: 115). On October 15, the evening newscasts of the two principal television networks in New Zealand, Television New Zealand and the TV3 Network, flashed with reports of anti-terror raids conducted up and down the country. “First tonight,” begins *One News* anchor Bernadine Oliver-Kerby, “the antiterror raids on our home patch.” “There’s been a huge police operation around the country and is centred on the discovery in remote mountain ranges of what police say are guerrilla style training camps”, describes her co-host, Simon Dallow. Later in the bulletin, another reporter described how police were “hunting for suspected terrorists based in this remote community” (Television New Zealand, 2007a).
Suspected paramilitary group operating in Urewera ranges

DANA KINLA

The eastern bay town of Rurutau was sealed off yesterday as part of a major anti-terrorism operation, with hundreds of heavily armed police flooding the area, hunting for people allegedly involved in a guerrilla warfare training camp.
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As we have seen, altitude and distance from political and commercial centres signifies ‘backwardness’ and an absence of civilisation, in which “Hilliness’ per se is disqualifying” (Scott, 2009: 100). Emphasising the ‘remoteness’ of Te Urewera and Ruatoki – and we must remember here that distance is a culturally relative term – the ‘camps’ are qualified with reference to this discursive context of isolation (‘remote mountain ranges’), priming the viewer to read the remainder of the bulletin in this manner. On TV3, 3 News anchor Alistair Wilkinson similarly draws on this rhetoric, explaining that “…the focus of this plot, according to police, is deep [in] Tūhoe country, the Ureweras. That’s where they say this training camp was hidden” (TV3 Network Services, 2007a). Reporter-in-the-field Kate Lynch continues: “Behind me are the Urewera ranges that, until today, have been hiding a secret that most New Zealanders will find hard to believe … This property deep in the remote Urewera mountain ranges outside Ruatoki is where police believe the guerrilla style training camps were held” (TV3 Network Services, 2007a). By linking the allegations to Orientalist tropes of deceitfulness and untrustworthiness through describing the camp as ‘hidden’, suspicion of Tūhoe is publicly warranted. Moreover, by echoing themes of isolation – invoking the cliché that outer areas harbour nefarious, antisocial attitudes, and society’s unwanted subjects in general – viewers are enticed to believe that terrorism was indeed afoot in ‘Tūhoe country’.

The myth of ‘Tūhoe terrorists’ is similarly produced through the selection of footage used in the television broadcasts. As 3 News stipulated, “the best known face to be taken into custody was Tūhoe activist Tame Iti” (TV3 Network Services, 2007a), and although just four of the ‘Urewera 17’ were actually from Tūhoe, Iti’s became the immediate ‘face’ of news about the raids. The opening report for 3 News that evening began with the caption “The ‘Terror’ Plot”, with footage of Iti firing a shotgun into the New Zealand flag, surrounded by men performing wero (ritual of challenge). This video is unrelated to the raids, and was filmed during the final
Waitangi Tribunal hearings in Ruatoki in February 2005. As Binney explains, this was part of a broader theatrical performance delivered in front of Tribunal members to evoke the devastation wrought by Crown wars, invasions, and confiscations of land:

At Ruatoki, Tūhoe had demonstrated the impact of the nineteenth-century wars by setting a ring of fire to burn, while the Tribunal members, in an old dray drawn by huge carthorses, crossed the 1866 confiscation line into Tūhoe’s land. The Tribunal encountered the vociferous wero (challenge) of near-naked men, their skins smeared with dried mud, while circling around the wagon – and the judge, when he descended from the dray – were bare-back riders, their horses streaked blood-red. Tame Iti, dressed in the bushfighter’s plaid kilt and military cap of the nineteenth century, fired a shotgun into a flag thrown on the ground … This was the theatre of protest (2009: 2).

To ‘everyday’ New Zealanders, however, this imagery is invariably interpreted as the visualisation of Māori ‘savagery’, and when unaccompanied by specific historical and cultural context – in this case, the Tūhoe ‘theatre of protest’ – such an unbridled reading is left unchecked and unchallenged. As Abel observes, “Mass media … have consistently failed to convey both the cultural and the historical context within which Iti’s ceremonial performance of shooting the flag should be read” (2008: 122). This choice of footage showing Iti damaging a New Zealand flag, a highly charged symbol of patriotism for many New Zealanders, assuredly provoked outrage. This was evidenced by a complaint to the Commissioner of Police by Stephen Franks – a member of ultra-right wing political party ACT, unfamiliar with this nuanced context, and not physically present at the event itself – resulting in a firearms conviction against Iti (Binney, 2009: 2), which was later overturned by the Court of Appeal (Pollock, 2012).

“But the Tūhoe leader has a softer side”, Lynch later says of Iti, mentioning his community oriented work through public radio and artistry. However, this segment appears at the very end of the report, and is more of an afterthought than a substantive reflection on the raids themselves. There are two points I would like to raise here. Firstly, since 3 News had stock
footage of Iti’s ‘softer side’, they selectively chose video of him shooting the flag to produce the myth of ‘Tūhoe terrorists’, exemplifying Barthe’s argument that mythic signification is “never arbitrary [but] always in part motivated” (Barthes, 1972: 126). I doubt footage of Iti preparing his artwork, or fielding calls in the studio room of the public radio station, would have quite the same effect in the creation of this myth, compared with his shooting the New Zealand flag. As Abel notes: “[Iti] is also an unpaid social worker, dealing with issues related to substance abuser and domestic violence. This is not the way that many, probably most, New Zealanders think of him” (2008: 120).

My second point is that the positioning of this section at the end of Lynch’s report – rather than at the beginning – is reflective of its overall newsworthiness in the eyes of the 3 News producers, rendered incidental in contrast to ‘Tūhoe terrorism’. That is, his community and art work is not what is news-salient about Iti. This primes audiences, via the news media’s role in the circulation of knowledge, to accept the dominant discursive framing of Iti supplied by the police. Deploying these visuals builds off the earlier discourses of ‘Tūhoe savagery’ to propose a discursively legitimate link between Tūhoe and a predisposition for guerrilla and terrorist activity. This, then, is the resignification of commonplace expressions of identity and protest – albeit theatrical protest – to this end, exemplifying what Barthes meant by the creation of myth. News broadcasts constantly recycled this footage when referencing either Tame Iti or the raids saga, often appearing during the opening credits, and often played multiple times within the same bulletin (Māori Television, 2007; Television New Zealand, 2007a, 2007b, 2007c, 2007d; TV3 Network Services, 2007a, 2007b). Here, the myth of ‘Tūhoe terrorists’ is produced and sustained.
The propensity to use unrelated stock footage in the production of myth is prominently displayed in another instance concerning the televised newscasts of Operation Eight. Amongst the allegations of terrorism, the One News broadcast from October 15 explained that there was “a suggestion napalm was being used in [the] terror training camps” (Television New Zealand, 2007a). During this segment of the narration, video is aired of mountainous scrub ablaze with a helicopter flying overhead is shown, with the caption ‘ANTI-TERROR RAIDS’ in the headline textbox beneath. This footage is indeed of a napalm-induced fire, but rather is demonstrating its use in the New Zealand forestry industry. In One News’ broadcast the following evening, reporter Rawdon Christie’s investigation into the explosive substance revealed it “[had] been used before in this country for forestry clearance”, showing an extended version of the same clip aired on October 15 to demonstrate this capacity (Television New Zealand, 2007d). Completely uprooted from its actual historical and practical context, the fiery footage of scrub burning has been co-opted from its original form and context to instead suggest terrorism and terrorist activity.

Having already explored the colonial discourses of Tūhoe, let me clarify my earlier analysis of the headline page of the Whakatane Beacon from October 16 (Figure 35). The emboldened phrases, ‘TERRORISM ALERT’, ‘Urewera ranges’, and Ruatoki’, flanked by photographs of soldierlike police and their paramilitary equipment, created the myth of ‘Tūhoe terrorism’. These geographic areas were thus imbued with violence, separatism, and potential for rebellion, as in earlier Crown-Tūhoe histories. This was a threat that needed to be neutralised by the state for the safety and security of ordinary New Zealanders, articulated by then Police Commissioner Howard Broad’s statement (and justification) that the raids were executed “in the interests of public safety” (Kinita, 2007; TV3 Network Services, 2007a). By using an unrelated image of Tame Iti in a camouflage outfit, from outside the Whakatāne District Court
in 2005, the ‘paramilitary’ tone of the article is reinforced by implying Tūhoe are predisposed to violent behaviours (and ‘wear it on their skin’, to borrow an apposite phrase). Echoing Barthes’ wording, this naturalises and attempts to fix in place these discourses of Tūhoe, to the extent they appear ‘true’ and ‘common sense’ to the newspaper’s readership. The image of Te Weeti, with his arms restrained and surrounded by AOS officers, anchored by the capitalised use of ‘ARREST’, similarly produces this discursive effect, characterising Tūhoe as criminals from whom ‘good New Zealanders’ need protection.

Two final examples serve to illustrate the suturing of discourses of terror onto the Tūhoe body. The first is a 2008 article describing the trial of those initially accused during Operation Eight, entitled ‘‘Te Qaeda’ trial set to be one of country’s longest’ (Whakatane Beacon, 2008: 3) (see Figure 36). A combination of ‘Te Urewera’ and ‘Al Qaeda’, to imply both are one and the same, the headline is fastened above a photograph captioned ‘MOST PROMINENT: Tame Iti’. The proximity between the photograph and the double meaning contained in the title, reinforces the discourse of ‘Tūhoe terrorists’, and particularly emphasises that Tame Iti, with full facial tā moko, is a ‘prominent’ signifier of terrorism and criminality.
‘Te Qaeda’ trial set to be one of country’s longest

IT may not rate as the “Trial of the Century,” but the hearing for the 19 people accused of firearms offences relating to last October’s so-called anti-terror raids is set to become possibly the biggest and longest this country has ever seen.

In a hearing in the Auckland District Court earlier this week, Judge Graham Hubble set aside the entire month of September for a depositions hearing.

The court also heard a request from lawyer Annette Sykes, acting for Tuhoe activist Tame Iti – the most prominent of those accused – for evidence to be taken in Maori and be translated. There are concerns that with 19 lawyers representing the 19 accused and up to 300 witnesses likely to be called, the hearing could drag on much longer than the four weeks already set aside.

All of the accused were excused from attending the next pre-depositions hearing next month, before the main hearing in September.

Given the general election is likely to be held in November, the September trial will take place amidst the election campaign – meaning it could become a means of propaganda for political parties.

The New Zealand Herald reported a big crowd of protesters gathered outside and in the court’s public gallery during Wednesday’s hearing.

The arrests in Ruatoki, Whakatane and other parts of the country on October 15, in response to a police investigation into alleged weapons-training camps made national and international headlines.

Images of heavily-armed police manning roadblocks and allegedly boarding a kohanga reo bus to search for evidence sparked claims of heavy-handed treatment which had irreparably damaged race relations.

The Urewera 19, or “Te Qaeda”, as the accused have jokingly come to be known, have raised the profile and been supported by many activist groups in this country and beyond.

Charges were originally set to be laid under the Terrorism Suppression Act, but Solicitor-General David Collins ruled against the charges continuing under that legislation.

Figure 36: “Te Qaeda’ trial set to be one of country’s longest’ (Whakatane Beacon, 2008b: 3). Whakatāne Beacon.
Figure 37: `Osama Iti `an insult” (Mercer, 2012: 1). Whakatāne Beacon.
Later, in 2012, a digitally manipulated photograph of Iti’s moko was superimposed upon Osama bin Laden’s face, and as an entry in the Miromoda Māori fashion design competition, was awarded runner-up (Mercer, 2012: 1) (see Figure 37). Here, form is collapsed onto essence to produce the myth that Iti, his moko, and Tūhoe more generally, are signifiers of terrorism, concretised by using the most ‘villainous’ symbol of terrorism then known to the West, bin Laden. Iti himself was “not happy” about this representation, and as then local Member of Parliament Te Ururoa Flavell commented soon after, “I think Tame had every right to be a bit hoha [(annoyed)] with this. While there may well be multiple interpretations behind the portrayal of Tame as a terrorist, the T-shirt did nothing to dispel the myths and misinformation around this case” (Flavell, 2012: 6).

In the weeks after the raids, following calls for Police Commissioner Howard Broad to resign, kuia and kaumātua of Ruatoki organised a ‘fun day’ for the Valley’s tamariki on the rugby field police used during October 15, in refusing to be intimidated by police violence. Angie explains:

[B]ecause it had been so traumatic, and all ‘doom, gloom and mamae [(pain; suffering)]’, we called a peace hikoi, and we had a huge fun day … ‘No – they’re not going to own our community. They’re not going to make us scared of using that field.’ So we got all of our Kura and our Kōhanga [(schools and preschools)], and we had a big huge fun day. Everyone contributed with kai, games, and rides, and we just had this huge, huge fun day for all of our whānau. They came with all their flags, all our babies. We brought laughter and aroha [(love; compassion)] back into our community. And then because it was nearing Christmas, Mum called for karakia at Hāmua, at our marae, and our social services and our marae koha’d [(gifted)] to all of our whānau. Because we all knew they were going to find it difficult; they were all facing travelling costs and legal costs.87

Reclaiming the rugby field from its use as a platform of police operations sought to break the hold the trauma of recent events had over whānau, through a community celebration of Ruatoki and Tūhoe life. Soon after, a sports day for Ruatoki tamariki was held with a similar

---

87 Kōrero with Angie and Aunty Waicy, Tāneatua, 5 December 2016.
purpose, where schools competed against each other through various athletic events. The 3 News report on the event, however, discursively framed it by reference to aggression and ‘savagery’, the headline title reading “Tuhoe Seek Revenge” as footage of the athletic race is shown. The reporter goes on to describe that “…children of Tuhoe were chasing victory at their sports day this morning, but their parents won hands down last night. The trophy they now really want is the Police commissioner’s head” (TV3 Network Services, 2007c). The graphic language employed here, articulating ‘revenge’ through ‘wanting the Commissioner’s head’, recycles discourses of Tuhoe as violent and aggressive. Compare this to Patrick McGarvey’s statement, speaking on behalf of Ruatoki whānau, in the very same report: “[Broad staked] his reputation on this, obviously when you make that sort of statement and the magnitude of his actions [and] the police that day … In my view, and in Tuhoe’s view, he should resign. That’s the only honourable thing he could do” (TV3 Network Services, 2007c). McGarvey’s statement in no way matches the incendiary tone of the 3 News reporter, instead considering it ‘honourable’ for Broad to step down, in seeking retribution – and not revenge – for police action in the Ruatoki Valley.

THE DISCURSIVE FRAMING OF TUHOE POST-2007

In this final section, I briefly examine other stereotypes and representations of Tuhoe perpetuated in the decade following the paramilitary raids. In the days immediately following October 15, during a live, national television interview, a Whakatāne district councillor Russell Orr (a former police officer) “applauded” police action in Te Urewera, believing the “…latest police action [to be] good … and long overdue”. This justificatory tone implies that the police were keeping safe ‘ordinary’ New Zealanders, a sentiment repeated by a ‘Sad Nana’ of Whakatāne: “The police were doing their job to help keep New Zealand safe and terror free. Their influence on the children that day would have been minimal” (Whakatane Beacon,
2007a). What we are seeing here is the separation of those deemed worthy of the state’s shelter and protection *vis-à-vis* those not, a theme I explore in more depth in the following chapter (Foucault, 2003).

Reflecting on both the raids and on Tūhoe protestors blockading a road development in the Waimana Valley (a heated issue at the time), and qualifying his ‘long overdue’ sentiment, Orr wrote on his blog “…[n]ow I would like to see council get behind the police and insist that the lazy, greedy, lawless, and ungrateful cheats that infest the outer regions of our district be made to comply with the same rules that you and I abide by” (*Whakatane Beacon*, 2007). This draws from, and perpetuates, the discourses of Māori as good-for-nothing, lethargic, unproductive (in the capitalist sense), with complete disregard for law and order (living as ‘outlaws’), and content with little more than exploiting state welfare.

This latter point was reiterated in a 2008 article concerning the ‘Treelord’ deal, vesting some control of the Kaingaroa Forest in Tūhoe hands (Figure 38). The boldened text, ‘$400m … some birthday present’ and ‘CELEBRATION TIME’, naturalises the myth that Māori are lazy ‘welfare cheats’, demonstrated here by Tūhoe winning the lottery of the unemployment benefit game. Unfortunately – and again, we are focused on *effect, not intent* – this discursive effect is amplified by the wording on the placard held by the young kōtiro (*girl*): “Today is My 4th Birthday; This is the best present ever”: 100% TUHOE & PROUD!”. While Crown compensation for past atrocities is a matter of significant gravity, its portrayal here posits Tūhoe as ‘dole-bludgers’ eagerly awaiting the next government handout.
Figure 38: ’Children of the mist’ become the lords of the trees’ (Mather, 2008: 1). Whakatāne Beacon.
I must also point out that the headline, ‘$400m…’ is misleading, as Ngāi Tūhoe received less than a third of this in the settlement (as the article itself goes on to explain). Finally, Orr’s above gesture to the ‘outer regions’ is particularly interesting. State force is most vehemently deployed at the borders of society, and Te Urewera endures as a contemporary frontier of the New Zealand settler colonial project (Foucault, 2003a; see Chapter VI).

During one of our kōrero, Whaea Kēkē Awhi explained that following the raids, a hikoi was held in central Whakatāne on October 19 to highlight and protest the violent ways in which whānau of Ruatoki were treated by armed police. This was closely followed by a national hikoi to Wellington challenging the legitimacy of the Terrorism Suppression Act, while also underscoring the wake of trauma it had left in its path (Devine, 2007). In an opinion piece to the Whakatane Beacon, a local resident felt concern such as this – expressed through the downtown hikoi – was farcical:

> I am simply amazed at the sensitivity of the Maori people in the Eastern Bay of Plenty. It is my understanding that these people are directly related to other Maori in New Zealand and that they practise the same rituals as other Maori. Those rituals include a haka which is a graphic demonstration of aggression and the attempt to intimidate an enemy and includes the martial arts display of weapon handling, insulting facial gestures, insulting poses and is, in the end, an attempt to intimidate and terrorise the recipient. In addition we have the Maori gangs intimidating people in the main streets in Rotorua and other centres and I don’t hear any apologies from the Maori leadership concerning this intimidation. I understand that in one historical tribal conflict the captive parents were killed and eaten in front of their children. Are we to assume that the children of Ruatoki are not allowed to watch the awful violence on TV nor do they have any violent video games and other such material presented to them? All in all, the whole issue shows absolute contempt for the intelligence of the average New Zealander. We are too shy to remark on this insult, however we are certainly noting the contempt (Whakatane Beacon, 2007b).

Once again, Tūhoe (described here as ‘Maori people in the Eastern Bay of Plenty’) are characterised by aggression and savage-like tendencies (with an unsubstantiated claim of cannibalism). Here, the writer sweeps all Māori together with an homogenising stroke of the
pen by insisting all are ‘directly related’ and ‘practise the same rituals’. Using the same opportunity to vent frustration at another issue of tenuous relevance, Māori are assumed to exist beneath one unified leadership from whom an apology is demanded. What is most striking, however, is the assertion of being ‘simply amazed’ at the ‘sensitivity’ of Tūhoe, implying the responses to the raids – through hikoi – were overreactive and unjustified. The tone of the extract as a whole renders Māori (or rather, Tūhoe) violent and belligerent, suggesting they are undeserving of public sympathy, and should instead be treated according to the barbarism of their culture, as evidenced through various ‘graphic demonstrations of aggression’. The ‘sensitivity’ of Tūhoe is, therefore, an insult to the sensibilities of the ‘average’ New Zealander, and an undeserved farce (Whakatane Beacon, 2007b). This, for another Whakatāne resident, in a rejoinder piece a week later, was tantamount to excusing the police raids: “To think you actively condone violence on three and four-year-old children because they are Maori from Ruatoki – truly tragic” (Whakatane Beacon, 2007c).

FROM ARCHAEOLOGY TO GENEALOGY

Tracing the archaeology of race reveals the historically contingent nature of the discourses that depict Tūhoe as savage, barbaric, primitive, isolated, aggressive, lazy, immature and so on. This discursive formation is a distinct product of circumstance – not predestination. However, the nature of discourse is that it attempts to conflate form with essence so that such systems of representation appear natural, normal, and ‘common sense’. Naturalising the connection between the Tūhoe body and predispositions for aggression and savagery – that is, collapsing together form and meaning – informs material, everyday action (or ‘practice’) directed towards Tūhoe. For present purposes, I suggest that this rationalised the intensity of police violence Ruatoki whānau were subject to in 2007. As I later explore, this is the same underlying logic behind the various other aggressive police raids experienced by Tūhoe whānau in the last
decade. As the quotes above from newspapers have overwhelmingly demonstrated, Tūhoe are understood (and believed) to be less-than-human, as animals in wild surroundings, and as such, are unentitled to express outrage at the inhumane manner in which they were treated in 2007. Tūhoe’s public dismay at their treatment at the hand of the state is, therefore, a farce: one first has to be human in order to be treated inhumanely.

Having now outlined the continuity of negative discourses of Tūhoe, while simultaneously demonstrating their historical contingency, I turn now to offer a counter-archive to these colonial discourses, disrupting knowledge which is considered ‘true’. This is articulated both through the experiences of the raids as voiced from the perspectives of Ruatoki and Tūhoe whānau (Chapter VI), and through the numerous photographic snapshots of Valley life (Chapter VII). Combined, these vignettes of both texts and images interrupt the prevailing knowledges of and about Tūhoe, as subjugated knowledges revealed through the genealogical approach. Augmented by my earlier explorations of Tūhoe-Crown relations, this generates my overall argument, drawn principally from Foucault, that each moment of state violence directed towards Tūhoe – be it the 2007 raids, or the brazen confiscation of Tūhoe lands in the nineteenth century – concerns the negation of Indigenous sovereignty, as the New Zealand settler colonial state relegitimises its exclusive right of sovereign existence (Foucault, 2003a; Moreton-Robinson, 2015a; Watson, 2009). This is the focus of the following chapter.
CHAPTER VI: SUBJECTS OF STATE VIOLENCE

Figure 39: Moko has awoken! One of Uncle Smokey and Whaea Kēkē Awhi’s mokopuna joins us as we chat about life in Ruatoki, and the impact of the 2007 raids. Ruatoki, 2016. Photograph by Tatsiana Chysanava.

INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, I explore whānau experiences of state violence over the last decade, as subjugated knowledges of and about Tūhoe. The purpose of my discussions here are twofold. Firstly, they provide a counterdiscourse to the discursive formations of Tūhoe, using ethnography to disrupt the ‘truth’ they proclaim to propagate. Ethnography is a powerful tool to counter these regimes of truth because it provides an alternative system of representation through Tūhoe’s own perspectives as Tūhoe. The ethnographic voice, therefore, reveals that Tūhoe do not conform to what others say about them (as objects of knowledge), but are instead
individuals with their own desires, perspectives, and ways of life. Secondly, they offer the principal theoretical contribution of my research, drawing from Foucault, to explore how Tūhoe are considered a ‘biological threat’ to the wellbeing of the population, that must be ‘purged’ therein. It is here that I develop the argument that the New Zealand settler colonial state is premised on the perpetual negation of Indigenous sovereignties, articulated through shows of violent ‘existential legitimation’ upon the frontier.

I begin by exploring the theoretical anchors of my discussion, drawing heavily from the works of Foucault, Aileen Moreton-Robinson, Irene Watson, and Patrick Wolfe. I then turn to the stories of the major state paramilitary operations that have befallen Tūhoe over the last ten years, and include in here a reflection on the possibilities for resisting state power. Where possible, I have left the retelling of these stories to the voices of whānau, often appearing as large tracts of transcribed kōrero from my interviews. These are their stories to tell, which offer alternative representations to be put into discursive circulation that contest the plethora of stereotypes and negative literature and imagery of Tūhoe. I conclude by summarising my theoretical contributions, and at that juncture also incorporate the thinking of Italian political philosopher Giorgio Agamben (2005). Finally, as an editorial note, this chapter was published in significantly abridged form in 2017, comparing the theatrical hilarity of Taika Waititi’s *Hunt for the Wilderpeople* (2016) to the paramilitary raids upon Tūhoe over the last century (Aikman, 2017).

**FOUCAULT: MODALITIES OF POWER**

Foucault sought to understand how power worked, and his various meditations upon this informed the breadth of his philosophical oeuvre. In short, he demonstrated how Western liberal democratic states concern themselves with the ‘health’ of their populations, in order to
‘extract the maximum productive potential’ from their citizenry (Devadas, 2008: 139). This helps maintain the cyclic rotation between society’s demand for goods (commodities) and the requisite bodies needed to produce them (labour). For the state, ensuring that this process is sustained in perpetuity means addressing the following essential question: “[H]ow can we foster the health and wellbeing of citizens so they can live and therefore work longer?” (Randell-Moon and Tippet, 2016: v). My above employment of the word ‘citizenry’ is intentional: not all are deserving of the state’s ‘beneficence’ in this manner, and as we know, some bodies, while humanoid, are nonetheless subhuman (Mills, 2011). This logic remains central to the distribution of the state’s resources to promote optimal health, in which, as I go on to explain, ‘biopolitical caesurae’ divide the body politic between those who are ‘made to live’, and those who are ‘let to die’ (Foucault, 2003; Randell-Moon and Tippet, 2016: v-vi). This is what Weheliye describes as a ‘surplus of flesh’ (2014: 2), and is of particular salience in an age of perpetual war and increasing automated mechanisation (repeatedly rendering thousands of workers unemployed or unemployable). Let us begin with some of the specifics of Foucault’s thinking.

**Biopower**

Eighteenth century Europe saw population explosions (Foucault, 1991: 98), and in the state’s enterprise for strengthening its internal capacities, the health and care of the body politic itself became the central focus of this operation. “[A] new regime of power takes hold”, explains Professor of Anthropology Paul Rabinow (responsible for ‘bringing’ Foucauldian thought to
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88 Consider, for example, the vehement securitisation of national borders, the wholesale expulsion of refugees from certain countries, and the repetitive denial of citizenship by host countries to millions of displaced peoples.

89 See Chomsky and Foucault (2006: 193; 193-9) for more detailed information on Foucault’s discussion of raison d’État (the art of government), to which I am here referring.
much of the American academy in the 1980s) (Rabinow, 1984: 17), that Foucault described as 'biopower’. “By this”, Foucault stipulates,

…I mean a number of phenomena that seem to me to be quite significant, namely the set of mechanisms through which the basic biological features of the human species became the object of a political strategy, of a general strategy of power, or, in other words, how, starting from the eighteenth century, modern Western societies took on board the fundamental biological fact that human beings are a species. This is roughly what I have called bio-power (2009: 1).

This modality of power differed from sovereign power (a hallmark of monarchies and kingdoms), which was characterised by the “right to decide life and death”, or, in other words, the “right to take life or let live” (Foucault, 1984: 258-9). This was articulated through the military might at the command of the sovereign, used both to wage war against foreign enemies, and coerce acquiescence from subjects under their rule. This power is not lost to the contemporary state, for it maintains a monopoly on force through the police and military. As we have seen, however, social control and domination in contemporary Western society is effected through the self-manipulation of individuals towards state objectives (Randell-Moon and Tippet, 2016b). This reconfigured the ‘power of death’ to instead exert a “…positive influence on life, that endeavours to administer, optimize, and multiply it, subjecting it to precise controls and comprehensive regulations” (ibid. 259).

POLITICS: THE CONTINUATION OF WAR BY OTHER MEANS

It is here that a common theme within Foucault’s work emerges, in using war as a matrix through which to analyse politics. Inverting the Prussian general Carl von Clausewitz’s famous aphorism, that ‘war is a continuation of politics by other means’, Foucault postulated that “politics is the continuation of war by other means” (Foucault, 2003a: 165). By this, he meant that the throes of war manifest a “disequilibrium of forces”, and in the cessation of state-to-state warfare, political power endures in times of ‘civil peace’ as a “silent war” – directed against
the state’s own subjects – that seeks to “…reinscribe that relationship of force … in institutions, economic inequalities, languages, and even the bodies of individuals” (ibid. 16). In this manner, therefore, contemporary Western liberal democratic states are premised on continual, perpetual war. While the arena of global politics is today inundated with ever-more violent wars, deploying ever-more violent technologies, Foucault’s point here – which does not detract from this reality – is rather that this ‘disequilibrium of forces’ continues to be waged against the state’s own population by the state itself. “Wars are no longer waged in the name of a sovereign”, he explains, but rather, are “…waged on behalf of the existence of everyone; entire populations are mobilized for the purpose of wholesale slaughter in the name of life necessity: massacres have become vital” (Foucault, 1984: 259-260).

Thus, the health of the population remains forever at risk of contamination by a number of undesirable elements (unwanted bodies). In securing the wellbeing of those ‘deserving’ bodies, the expulsion of such impurities is warranted, through any number of means: “One had the right to kill those who represented a kind of biological danger to others” (ibid. 261). This exercise of power over population-as-species is the second half of biopower’s focus, and the element I am more interested in, in making sense of the on-going colonial violence experience by Tūhoe. Foucault’s summary is useful: “One might say that the ancient right to take life or let live was replaced by a power to foster life or disallow it to the point of death … [Biopower] “invest[s] life through and through”” (ibid. 261-2, his emphasis). As I go on to explain, biopower functions around two distinct (but not antithetical) poles: the disciplining of the individual body, and the regulation of the population as a whole.
Anatamo-politics: Disciplinary power

Biopower, then, operates at the macro level of the species body, and on the micro level of the individual body. The latter is what Foucault termed ‘disciplinary power’, an “anatamo-politics of the human body” (1984: 261-2, his emphasis) that emerged in the seventeenth century “…centr[ing] on the body as a machine: its disciplining, the optimization of its capabilities, the extortion of its forces, the parallel increase of its usefulness and its docility, its integration into systems of efficient and economic controls” (ibid. 261). Disciplinary power trains the body to prime it for certain tasks, and concerns “the body and its forces, their utility and their docility, their distribution and their submission” (ibid. 172). Moreover, this modality of power seeks optimisation and efficiency: “What is the best movement for loading one’s rifle, what is the best position to take?”, Foucault ponders, and continues by asking, “What workers are best suited for a particular task? What children are capable of obtaining a particular result?” (2009: 57) Issues such as these were the focus of his 1975 work *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (Foucault, 1982b). As earlier observed, Western liberal democratic subjects actively manipulate their bodies towards ostensibly apolitical goals, in which subjects ‘freely think themselves free’ based on the discourses circulated by governing authorities (Randell-Moon and Tippet, 2016: x). This process is, however, central to state practices of population management, and is what is meant by the phrase, ‘individuals’ bodies are disciplined towards particular objectives’.

(Ab)normal

A central, defining feature of disciplinary power is that it produces and sustains norms, and in Foucault’s succinct summation, “discipline normalizes” (2009: 56). In optimising bodies for
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90 Biopower was “indispensable” in capitalism’s development, in producing a disciplined work force optimised for labour (Foucault, 1984: 263, see also 2003a: 36), but as Rabinow cautions, biopower in and of itself “did not cause the rise of capitalism” (1984: 18).
particular tasks, Foucault’s ‘normalisation’ denotes a “… system of finely gradated and measurable intervals in which individuals can be distributed around a norm” (Rabinow, 1984: 20; Foucault, 2009: 57). The function of biopower, then, is to “distribut[e] the living in the domain of value and utility”, and in comparison to the sovereign right of putting subjects to death, “[s]uch a power has to qualify, measure, appraise, and hierarchize, rather than display itself in its murderous splendour” (Foucault, 1984: 266). Individuals are enticed to gravitate towards particular norms – of body, lifestyle, and so forth – and in this manner, disciplinary power “…measures in quantitative terms and hierarchizes in terms of value[,] the abilities, the level, the ‘nature’ of individuals. It introduces through this ‘value-giving’ measure, the constraint of a conformity that must be achieved.” Most importantly, for our purposes, “[disciplinary power] traces the limit that will define difference in relation to all other differences, the external frontier of the abnormal” (Foucault, 1984: 195). In other words, establishing the norm simultaneously produces its inverse – that is, the abnormal. Consider my earlier example about the ‘5+ a day’ initiative, and the disciplining both of diet and body in contemporary New Zealand society: those considered to exist beyond that norm – individuals deemed unfit in body (and therefore unoptimised for labour) – are chastised or castigated for their status.

My particular interest here concerns the inherent violence imbued within the process of normalisation, in which ‘abnormal’ bodies are aggressively disciplined to conform to what is considered to be the norm. To think about this by way of example, during my lecturing tenure at university, my students’ (the majority of whom were of Pasifika or Māori descent) final marks were required to ‘fit the bell curve’ of ‘normal grade distribution’, much to my chagrin. As a Sāmoan friend of mine aptly commented in response, “Since when do our people belong on a bell curve?” Reflecting more deeply on the topic of abnormality during his lectures at the
Collège de France from 1974 to 1975 (2003b), Foucault stipulates that normalisation precipitates a “…racism against the abnormal, against individuals who, as carriers of a condition, stigmata, or any defect whatsoever, may … transmit to their heirs the unpredictable consequences of the evil, or rather of the non-normal” (ibid. 316-7). Underscoring my friend’s observation, Foucault continues by explaining that normalisation seeks to “reduce the most unfavourable, deviant normalities in relation to the normal, general curve, to bring them in line with this normal, general curve” (2009: 62). What this demonstrates is that normalisation renders nonsensical the notion that law is founded on objectivity and impartiality, tending rather towards what is statistically ‘normal’ instead of the universality of right or wrong (Rabinow, 1984: 20; Foucault, 2003a: 38-9).

NORMALISATION AND ‘PERMANENT WAR’

The war-like functions of the contemporary state similarly hinge on the process of normalisation. Turning to another of his masterworks, Society Must Be Defended, Foucault continues with his matrix of war in analysing politics: “[B]eneath the law, war continues to rage in all the mechanisms of power” (2003a: 50). Here, he explains that society is characterised by a violent division between ‘us’ and ‘them’, a border adverserially patrolled with vehement determination. “We are … at war with one another … We are all inevitably someone’s adversary”, he writes, suggesting that society is, today, defined by this ‘permanent war’, comprised of “two [opposing] groups, two categories of individuals, or two armies” (ibid. 51). From the seventeenth century onwards, this struggle became articulated through what Foucault terms a ‘race war’ – a ‘ceaseless’ war in which the social body is composed not of two discrete ethnic groups, but rather of a single population split into a “superrace and a subrace” (ibid. 59-61). The ensuing ‘battle’, he describes, “…[is] wage[d] not between races, but by a race that is portrayed as the one true race, the race that holds power and is entitled to define the norm, and
against those who deviate from that norm, against those who pose a threat to the biological heritage” (61). As gestured to, it is at this point normalisation enters this discursive fray, where those with the power to define the norm simultaneously demarcate that which is ‘abnormal’, and ‘threatening’ to the body politic. Thus, those of the ‘subrace’ pollute the health and integrity of the ‘superrace’, and as we shall go on to see, the expulsion of such pollutants from the body politic precisely encapsulates the function of the contemporary Western liberal democratic state.

**Biopolitics: Regulatory control**

Without explicit mention, what we have been examining here is the second component of biopower: biopolitics. While anatomo-politics (or disciplinary power) was established in the early eighteenth century, biopolitics emerged closer to the turn of the nineteenth, in continental Europe. In short, whereas the object of disciplinary power was the individual body (“man-as-body”), biopolitics instead concerned the species body as a whole (“man-as-species”). This technology of power viewed the population as a “global mass … affected by overall processes characteristic of birth, death, production, illness, and so on” (Foucault, 2003a: 242-3), demographic matters directly connected to political and economic processes. A country’s productivity, for example, remains tied to these considerations, and is why such information remains fundamental to the operation of the contemporary state.91,92 Maintaining the health of the population, then, becomes a central concern for the state, because every illness (or ‘threat’) that befalls the population has a measurable, quantifiable effect on productivity. Thus, describes Foucault, “Biopolitics deals with the population … as political problem” (2003a: 245). In this
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91 Consider here the lengths Japan’s government is going to in order to address the rapidly falling population, precipitated both by population ageing and declining birth-rates (101 East, 2012).
92 See also Sally Engle Merry’s intriguing discussion on the strategies of power/knowledge generated through numerical representation (2011).
manner, biopolitics quarantines the defects, illnesses, deviations, and “aleatory events” that threaten the health and integrity of the species body, “compensat[ing]” for these “variations” through maintaining an equilibrium (“establish a sort of homeostasis”) between normal and unpredictable processes. “In a word, security mechanisms have to be installed around the random element inherent in a population of living beings so as to optimize a state of life” (ibid. 246). In comparison to disciplinary power, biopolitics is a form of overall regulatory control aimed at enhancing the health of the population, a process that necessitates the isolation and expulsion of contaminant components.

However, both modalities of power are tethered to, and predicated on, the norm, where both body and species are disciplined and regularised respectively to conform to that which is considered the norm. “The normalizing society”, explains Foucault, “is a society in which the norm of discipline and the norm of regulation intersect along orthogonal lines”(ibid. 253), and it is this duality that has become indispensable in effecting social control across the Western world. By stark contrast to sovereign power, which “took life and let live”, biopolitics “consists in making live and letting die” (ibid. 247). This process is necessarily violent – just as the expulsion of cancer from within a host body requires acutely invasive (and physically devastating) medical technology – and manifests itself through the ‘killing’ or ‘elimination’ of rogue elements within a social body (effected as much through outright murder as the under-resourcing of particular communities). It is this function of biopolitics that informs the remainder of this theoretical meditation.
When I first arrived at the ANU in Canberra, I remember walking my bike through campus in the late afternoon, on the way back from a lecture. As I walked through the campus courtyard, the evening’s quiet murmur was suddenly shattered by the roar of a heavy jet aircraft above. Shaken by the piercing nature of the sound, my eyes darted skyward, and saw a behemoth military aircraft dominating the skyline above. I later found out it was one of the Royal Australian Airforce’s C-17A Globemaster III, a strategic airlifting vehicle specialising in transporting and deploying heavy military equipment in warzones. Its thunderous, booming roar is distinctive, and today while I was in Tāneatua, I again heard this signature sound. I was chatting with some whānau inside an office building, and instantly recognised the noise as it shook the ceiling, its engines sending a deafening echo throughout the village. I made my way outside, and glimpsed the same make of aircraft, flying low enough for me to discern the pattern of grooves and rivets in the fuselage, glinting in the sunlight as the plane banked toward the horizon (see Figure 40). After talking with whānau present, they took to Facebook and discovered it had taken a roughly circular flight path around Te Urewera. As a machine designed specifically for the throes of war, the C-17A’s aerial presence tethered Tūhoe’s homeland to the warzones elsewhere in the world, indeed perhaps transforming it into such a space. Whatever the official reason for the aircraft’s journey, the feeling amongst whānau that their homeland was being used for ‘wargames’, was palpable that day.

Figure 40: Artist’s rendition of the C-17A Globemaster III flying above Tāneatua in 2017.
We turn at this critical juncture to the ‘death function’ of biopower in ‘letting die’ and ‘putting to death’ those aleatory elements within the species body. It is, at first glance, paradoxical that a form of power predicated upon ensuring the health of the population is imbued with its inverse – the elimination of those (people) deemed exterior from the norm, and a threat to the species body. To address this apparent inconsistency, Foucault posits that it is here that the discourse of race enters this biopolitical equation, dividing the social body into a hierarchy of races premised upon the Chain of Being and evolutionary notions of inferiority and superiority (Foucault, 2003a: 254-7; Wynter, 2003). Racism fragments the social body by producing “caesuras within the biological continuum addressed by biopower” (Foucault, 2003a: 255), a logic undergirded by the notion of ‘strength through sacrifice’:

If [I] want to live, the other must die … The more inferior species die out, the more abnormal individuals are eliminated, the fewer degenerates there will be in the species as whole, and the more I – as species rather than individual – can live, the stronger I will be, the more vigorous I will be … [It is a matter of] destroying that [sort] of biological threat that those people over there represent to our race … [W]ar will be seen not only as a way of improving one’s own race by eliminating the enemy race (in accordance with the themes of natural selection and the struggle for existence), but also as a way of regenerating one’s own race. As more and more [inferior elements] die, the race to which we belong will become all the purer … [R]acism justifies the death-function in the economy of biopower by appealing to the principle that the death of others makes one biologically stronger … (Foucault, 2003a: 255, 257, 258).

The ‘murderous function’ of letting certain peoples die, in the interests of the overall health of the population, is rationalised through racism itself, a process that is premised on the matrix of war and remains central to the operation of the modern-day state. Driven by the mantra and imperative of “defend[ing] society against all the biological threats posed by the other race” (Foucault, 2003a: 61),

[t]his racism … [is a] struggle in the biological sense: the differentiation of species, natural selection, and the survival of the fittest species. Similarly, the theme of the binary
society which is divided into two races or two groups with different languages, laws and so on will be replaced by that of a society that is, in contrast, biologically monist. Its only problem is this: it is threatened by a certain number of heterogeneous elements [...]. Hence the idea that foreigners have infiltrated this society … [T]he State is no longer an instrument that one race uses against another: the State is, and must be, the protector of the integrity, the superiority, and the purity of the race … State sovereignty thus becomes the imperative to protect the race (ibid. 80-1).

It is this ‘protection of the purity of the race’ that invokes biopower’s ‘death function’, in which ‘contaminant’ elements of the body politic are purged in an on-going process of ‘purification’ (the state here drawing on its sovereign right to kill). In other words, this state-expressed racism weeds out undesirable components of the population, for the survival and betterment of the overall body politic (Stoler, 1995: 62). To clarify, by ‘death function’, Foucault denotes a number of things: “When I say ‘killing,’ I obviously do not mean simply murder as such, but also every form of indirect murder: the fact of exposing someone to death, increasing the risk of death for some people, or quite simply, political death, expulsion, rejection, and so on” (ibid. 256). Thus, his use of racism is distinct (and divergent from ‘ethnic racism’), gesturing to a “racism that society … direct[ed] against itself … [An] internal racism of permanent purification [that is] one of the basic dimensions of social normalization” (Foucault, 2003a: 60-2, see also 2003b: 316-8).

Moreover, Foucault’s notion of racism encompasses those ‘aleatory bodies’ that exist beyond the norm, such as differently abled, homosexual, and gender-diverse peoples. In this manner, his work is helpful for understanding why state sovereignty excludes not only racial minorities, but other ‘biological impurities’ encompassed through his conceptualisation of race. Thus, there are ‘right bodies’ and ‘wrong bodies’, the latter of which are purged from the social body in the interests of the many – or rather, ‘biological purity’. Ellen Feder’s discussion of the demonisation of impoverished, single mothers in 1980s and 1990s America, “notoriously inscribed in the figure of the ‘welfare queen’”, exemplifies these reflections (Feder, 2007: 67). It
is this characteristic trait of biopower – ‘permanent purification’ – that I suggest continues to typify Indigenous existence in settler-colonial worlds.

While Foucault’s thinking has not been widely applied in such contexts (see Hokowhitu, 2013: 226), I find his meditations on power illuminating in making sense of the on-going colonial aggression Tūhoe face in contemporary New Zealand society. In order to do so, I explore the most prominent deployment of Foucault’s thinking in a comparable settler colonial context, through the renowned work of Indigenous feminist, Distinguished Professor Aileen Moreton-Robinson, a Goenpul woman from Minjerribah (Stradbroke Island), Quandamooka First Nation (Moreton Bay) in Queensland, Australia. Moreton-Robinson, and her contemporary, Irene Watson, wrote extensively on the Northern Territory Intervention, an episode that highlighted the ‘death function’ of the contemporary Australian settler-colonial state. It is to this I now turn.

**ORIGINARY VIOLENCE AND THE FRONTIER: THE NORTHERN TERRITORY INTERVENTION**

Led by the Howard Coalition government in 2007, the ‘Intervention’, as it has come to be known, was a military operation that targeted Aboriginal communities in Australia’s Northern Territory, in response to the alleged violence and sexual abuse outlined in the *Little Children Are Sacred* report (Moreton-Robinson, 2015: 153; Watson, 2009: 45; Wild and Anderson, 2007). This crisis was fuelled by sensational media reporting, which helped mobilise a discourse of protection that justified the state’s violent methods of ‘intervention’. During the Intervention, police and army forces were deployed in seventy three communities, and the *Racial Discrimination Act 1975* was suspended “to protect the state from litigation on the basis that the intervention was racist” (Moreton-Robinson, 2015: 161). For Watson (2009), the
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93 Biography uplifted from Queensland University of Technology, 2018.
military affair was a contemporary iteration of the originary violence foundational to the Australian settler colonial state. Such originary violence is periodically re-enacted to reinforce the state’s sovereign right to exist, where such moments are understood not as abnormalities, but instead as routine functions of the settler colonial state (ibid. 46–8). As Neocleous echoes, “A founding violence, and continuous creation by violent means, are the hallmarks of the state” (2003: 412). For Indigenous communities, this manifests in acute bursts of violence exemplified by the 2007 Intervention. As Rebecca Stringer has similarly noted, the Intervention “must be regarded as a neocolonial moment, a moment in which the objectives, relations and effects of the colonial syndrome do not merely reverberate but resurge” (2007: 7).

Reiterations of originary violence tend to occur at the frontiers of society – distant from the urban metropolises – where Indigenous life endures as a threat to white society and the social body. To understand power, therefore, Foucault stressed the need to examine

[power’s] extremities … its outer limits … its most regional forms and institutions, and especially at the points where this power transgresses the rules of right that organize and delineate it, oversteps those rules and is invested in institutions, is embodied in techniques and acquires the material means to intervene, sometimes in violent ways (2003a: 27-8).

In other words, the norm, the way of life of the ‘one true race’, is most ardently threatened at the outer edges of society, at the proverbial boundary between ‘us’ and ‘them’. For American historian Frederick Turner, speaking some 125 years ago, the frontier is a liminal space, “…the outer edge of the wave – the meeting point between savagery and civilization” (Turner, 1893: 200; see also Reynolds, 1996a, 1996b, 1982). This ongoing battle at the ‘outer edge’, of civility over savagery, means the frontier is imbued with significant violence as the border is patrolled, and normalisation is enforced. This is characteristic of the Intervention, and is likewise the case for Tūhoe living in Te Urewera today.
Moreton-Robinson’s (2015) thesis on white possession and the negation of Indigenous sovereignty expands this analysis of originary violence. She adopts Foucault’s approach of using war as a method to analyse politics, in offering an explanation of how Indigenous peoples exist at the behest of the sovereign right “to make live and to let die” (Foucault, 2003: 241; Moreton-Robinson, 2015: 157). Identifying how race violently circumscribed(s) and shaped(s) Indigenous existence across the settler-colonial world, she explains how “It takes a great deal of work to maintain Canada, the United States, Hawai’i, New Zealand, and Australia as white possessions [as] these nation-states [busily reaffirm and reproduce] this possessiveness through a process of perpetual Indigenous dispossession” (ibid. xi). Dovetailing with Watson’s argument, Moreton-Robinson explains how the state exhibits an “excessive desire to invest in reproducing and reaffirming … [its] ownership, control, and domination” (ibid. xii). In other words, state sovereignty, and more specifically, the settler-colonial project, is articulated through on-going acts of violent re legitimation, exemplified through the 2007 Intervention in which Indigenous Australians were biopolitically quarantined by force of the state.

It is helpful at this point to provide a brief recap of Patrick Wolfe’s “logic of elimination” – the “relationship between genocide and the settler-colonial tendency” (Wolfe, 2006: 387) – because it offers insights into how such ‘re legitimation’ is enunciated in contemporary settler society. This logic denotes manifold violent strategies of elimination, all of which are aimed at the “dissolution of native societies”. This refers to the “summary liquidation of Indigenous people” and “frontier homicide” in the initial stages of colonisation, as well as the erosion of native title, assimilation, and the destruction of Indigenous epistemologies, cosmologies, and ways of life. This process is premised upon the wholesale dispossession of Indigenous lands and the negation of Indigenous sovereignty, the “expropriated land base”, as Wolfe describes, forming
the foundation upon which the “new colonial society [is built]” (ibid. 388). As he summarises, “settler colonizers come to stay”, gesturing here to the ineluctable reality that invasion – and colonisation – is a *structure*, not an event (ibid. 388).

**FRONTIER AND ORIGINARY VIOLENCE IN TE UREWERA**

For Tūhoe, this process, of on-going colonisation premised upon originary violence, is exemplified through the seizure, confiscation, and liquidation of the ancestral estate as the colonial frontier burned its way into Te Rohe Pōtae in the mid to late nineteenth century. The second major encounter of this frontier violence, I suggest, was the ransacking of Rua Kēnana’s community at Maungapōhatu in 1916. While situated within its own distinct context, characterised by, among other things, wartime hysteria, the raid served as a stark warning to Tūhoe not to step out of line, and that discussion of ‘independent living’ would be tolerated only so far. As then Prime Minister Joseph Ward firmly put it to Rua on the shores of Whakatāne in 1908, “there can’t be two suns shining in the sky at one time” (Binney, Chaplin and Wallace, 1996: 38). The raid also highlighted the biopolitical rendering of the Tūhoe body as an aleatory one, to be quarantined in the interests of the overall wellbeing of the population. This saga represented a broader competition of sovereignties between Tūhoe and the Crown, the latter being dominated by the Crown’s military and legal out-maneuvering of Tūhoe leadership. Both the Crown invasions and confiscations, and the 1916 raid, were watershed events central to the expansion of the settler colonial state into Tūhoe territory. At the ultimate expense of Tūhoe’s autonomy, the Crown established its sovereign supremacy over Te Urewera through an aggressive originary violence. Moreover, the violent re-enactments of state sovereignty continues to be felt by Tūhoe communities today.
OCTOBER 15, 2007

The most widely known raids upon Tūhoe communities of recent times, Operation Eight, began in the early hours of October 15, 2007:

[S]quads of New Zealand police swept through an undisclosed number of locations throughout New Zealand, for the most part dressed in full riot gear, carrying machine guns, and with handguns and knives strapped to their black garments. They smashed doors, windows, and furniture, arresting people, confiscating computers, cameras electronics, files and papers, searching for materials that might lend weight to the building of charges under the [then] Terrorism Suppression Act 2002 (Keenan, 2008: 18).

The police had alleged that there were terrorist training camps in Te Urewera. The raids disproportionately targeted the Ngāi Tūhoe communities living in and around the Ruatoki Valley, and it was the only location in which the entire community was “locked down”, where “people were forced out of their cars at gunpoint and photographed”, and where “mothers, old people and children were searched and held at gunpoint, sometimes for hours, with no pretence at respect and no potential for arrest” (Jackson, 2008: 6). I spoke with one of the whānau Moana Jackson is here referring to. During a warm Summer’s evening in 2016, at their home in the Ruatoki Valley, Whaea Kēkē Awhi and Uncle Smokey, along with some of their children, recounted the events of October 15. The following exchange of kōrero, between Whaea Kēkē Awhi, Uncle Smokey, and their son Tūtemaungaroa, returned us to that early morning. I had asked them how many AOS officers they had seen:

**Whaea Kēkē Awhi:** We didn’t even know there was that many of them aye! We saw them over there. All around the hills. Early as in the morning.

**Tūtemaungaroa:** We seen one through … the doorway, on the hill. But we thought it was our dog. We could just see this black shadow. And we were looking at it – aye! ‘Is that the dog?’

---

94 Kōrero with Uncle Smokey and Whaea Kēkē Awhi, 23 December 2016 [USAA23112016].
Uncle Smokey: It was the light, it ... reflect[ed] onto their vehicle[,] till they smashed through [the gate].

AOS troopers then swarmed onto the property, there to apprehend Uncle Smokey whom the police alleged to be the 'Sergeant of Arms' of the camps. “It started at daylight, and then we saw them popping around our hills. We didn’t realise they were even there”, explains Whaea Kēkē Awhi. Tūtemaungaroa was seven at the time. “I remember everything aye”, he described; “I will never forget it.” “They smashed the gate, our whole gate, wiped it off,” he continued, explaining how the AOS vehicles cascaded in from the road. “[W]e woke up in the morning, and we seen that shadow on the hill [of the AOS equipment]. And then after that, all these red lights – boom! Covered in red lights.” Tūtemaungaroa is here referring to the tactical infrared weapon-
mounted lights on the firearms wielded by the AOS, used to the same effect upon the Teepa whānau at their homestead in 2014. “There were red lights all over us. All over the whole house. And we were like, ‘Aye?!’” In response to this, Whaea Kēkē Awhi explained that the use of such tactics was denied by officials in the aftermath of the raids: “They deny it to this day … And yet … there were spots all over the house! I go, ‘Well ask the kids!’ All we saw was these bright red lights!” One of her daughters was “the worst affected”, she described: “That bedroom at the end there … they had the gun pointing through the window. At that time, she was a real bad asthmatic, so she had to keep her window open. And so they had [the] gun through the window.” As light dawned on the Valley, the sun revealed a “road … covered with trucks”, Tūtemaungaroa explained. “And police cars all the way down [the road]. And we were like, ‘Aye, what the hell?!’ That’s when they took us out on the road and sat us there for a couply hours.” Whaea Kēkē Awhi continued: “[The AOS] called me out, first, and asked me how many people [were inside], to see if Moko [(Uncle Smokey)] was in there.”

In an earlier interview with documentarian Kim Webby, Whaea Kēkē Awhi spoke of how the AOS then plundered her home:

They went through the kids’ drawers, threw everything around, couches were upside down. Went through the food cupboards, food was all tipped out of containers, on the benches. Don’t know what they were going to find in the kids’ cornflake containers, but they tipped kai all over the place. Went up into our ceiling, broke our ceiling (Webby, 2010).

The AOS seized a cannabis plant and a small collection of .22 calibre bullets95 as evidence in arresting Uncle Smokey under the terrorist charges, the latter being described by the police as ‘explosives’. “They wanted to have a look for some AKs,96 and rocket launchers”, Uncle Smokey

---

95 ‘.22 calibre’ refers to the diameter of the rifle barrel (and therefore the diameter of the bullet), being .22 of an inch (or 5.6mm).
96 Also known as the Kalashnikov assault rifle, or ‘AK-47’, developed in the Soviet Union.
described (Webby, 2010). In a rural farming community like Ruatoki, hunting for kai using .22 bullets (and rifles) is common, and across the New Zealand farming industry, such rifles are considered unremarkable and commonplace farming equipment. The attempt by the police to attach a more nefarious meaning to the bullets served to divorce and decontextualise them from their everyday practical usage. Moreover, for whānau in the Whārua, rifles such as these are considered normal hunting equipment necessary for sustenance and survival – rendering a reading of them as ‘weapons’ obscure, distorted, and inappropriate. As Angie commented to me during another kōrero, “Yeah, of course [our men have] got guns! They’re all hunters! They don’t do it for fun. They’re getting kai.”

In reflecting on this ‘reinterpretation’, Uncle Smokey and Whaea Kēkē Awhi emphasised the irreconcilability between what the Police ‘saw’, and the everyday uses of hunting paraphernalia as defined in practice by whānau in Ruatoki:

**Uncle Smokey:** They called it explosives. And yet it’s only a bullet! They changed it … [T]hey were only .22 bullets! I had about half a dozen. That’s how we are. We live in the bush! We’ve all got guns.”

**Whaea Kēkē Awhi:** Everyone’s got guns! You’re either gonna kill your pig, kill a cow, and you’re going to need .22 bullets. They didn’t find any guns, but they found some bullets. His father’s ones in the peanut butter jar.

**Uncle Smokey:** Took a photo of my [hunting] pouch, [for our] knives!

**Whaea Kēkē Awhi:** They confiscated my knife. My kitchen butcher knife. They call it a ‘weapon’.

**Uncle Smokey:** They call it ‘deadly’.

---

97 Kōrero with Angie and Aunty Waicy, 5 December 2016 [AHAW05122016].
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Figure 42: Upon their front porch, Uncle Smokey and Whaea Kēkē Awhi share with me their experiences of October 2007. Ruatoki, 2016. Photograph by Tatsiana Chypsanava.
The problem, as Whaea Kēkē Awhi saw it, is that the Police “[saw] the guns as weapons”, and as her and Uncle Smokey’s exchange highlights, there is a significant difference between that which is considered a ‘gun’ vis-à-vis a ‘weapon’. This moment, I suggest, was a rejection of subjectification: while the police – and the ‘evidence’ they gathered – purported to subjectify the whānau as terrorists, the whānau themselves denied this potentiality by rejecting the notion that the ammunition and guns were weapons at all. They were, by contrast, everyday paraphernalia of Ruatoki farming life, representing a refusal to take up the subject position being ‘offered’ by the state.

This moment is an interesting point of reflection upon the military-grade arms used by the AOS during the raids themselves. In one of my kōrero with Aunty Waicy, I asked whether the use of the Māori word ‘pū’ (gun) was appropriate to describe the firearms used by the AOS in raids such as October 2007. “They’re semiautomatic weapons”, I had said during one part of our conversation, and she replied, “That’s right, they are too! Now that you think about it. Ki ahau noio, he pū noio [ (to me, it’s just a gun)]. But you’re right, cos that’s what they are! That’s even worse aye!” What this demonstrates is that although the implements used by the police and whānau in Ruatoki may be of a similar order in terms of munitions technology, the purpose imbued into each of them is diametrically distinct: one is an apparatus of state violence, the other, an instrument of everyday farming and hunting life.

---

99 Kōrero with Aunty Waicy, 6 June 2017 [AW06062017].
Figure 43: Whaea Kēkē Awhi and Uncle Smokey in their garage. During the October 15 raid, Whaea Kēkē Awhi and her tamariki were held in here, under armed guard and without provision of food or water, for nine hours. Ruatoki, 2016. Photograph by Tatsiana Chypsanava.
The police then apprehended Uncle Smokey and pulled him out onto the road: “They dragged me all the way through here [onto the road], and lying me down there with my hands locked up to my legs over here” (Webby, 2010). Meanwhile, his then-15 year old daughter was ordered by the police to lift up her shirt to be ‘inspected’, in front of the rest of her whānau. The complete disregard for bodily integrity, cultural appropriateness, and mana wāhine (womanly dignity and integrity) this moment demonstrates, is alarming. I suggest that this highlights what Hortense Spillers has described as the ‘ungendering’ of certain bodies (Spillers, 1987), in which, as Feder explains, “[r]ace and gender now appear to exclude one another” (2007: 70). In other words, the racialisation of the Tūhoe body as inferior, savage, and violent, simultaneously strips from it any dimension of gender – as well as any appropriateness-of-practice as signalled by gender. Here, the whānau are constructed as aleatory bodies that exist outside of these norms, and by virtue of that, appropriate civility is disregarded. In this situation, therefore, dignity and respect are privileges not extended to the Tūhoe body. “There’s no mana. I had no mana to my place, no mana to what to say, you know I had nothing. I was just taken away…”, reflects Uncle Smokey upon the indignities suffered by himself and his whānau (Webby, 2010).

‘THE GARAGE’

Uncle Smokey was then escorted to Rotorua for ‘processing’, while Whaea Kēkē Awhi and her young children remained on the road.100 “They made the kids and me go out there [to the road]”, she began, before another of her tamariki interjected: “– till we were hungry as, and then they put us in the shed for nine hours, and we were still hungry.” “Now that’s the shed, that’s the shed we were locked in”, Whaea Kēkē Awhi explains, pointing to the building adjacent to the main house. We walked over to the garage, and she described the condition it was in during the morning of the raid. “That was way not like that”, she says, pointing to the
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few chairs and carpet inside the garage. “Nothing here [on October 15]”, said Uncle Smokey, Whaea Kēkē Awhi explaining that “Yeah[,] it was just plain concrete.” Without provisions of food or water, māmā and her young children were forced, under armed guard, into the garage for hours on end as the AOS raid proceeded. Whaea Kēkē Awhi continued: “[We] had Armed Offenders on the outside, [and] what were we supposed to do? And they’ve got their guns! We had one on [the side] door, and two at the front. For that whole day … And the Armed Offenders with their big as [guns].”

At one point during the day, the garage door was raised to allow fresh air to circulate, in light of the burgeoning summer heat. Soon thereafter, the interned whānau watched as some of the AOS troopers photographed themselves with the ‘8’ piece from one of the tamariki’s puzzles:101

Our son had all the jigsaw things… and they had this ‘Number 8’, and I’m telling the judge when she came [that] they were taking photos with themselves with this number eight [(in reference to the codename of the police operation)]. My son’s number eight off his jigsaw, [photographing themselves] outside my gate. And they go, ‘Oh nah we didn’t do that.’ Me and my kids go, ‘We were watching you from the shed!’ … And we watched them getting out of their van, taking photos on their mobile shit.

As I listened, I reflected on how the jigsaw piece was emblematic of the intimacy and privacy of the home and domestic life. The appropriation of it by the police in this ostensibly jovial manner not only makes light of a severely violent affair, but also demonstrates that nothing, no matter how sacrosanct or innocent, is shielded from the surveillance and security apparatus of the state. The jigsaw piece is also indicative of the many puzzles of Operation Eight that were violently forced together to subjectify whānau of the Valley as terrorists.

Uncle Smokey continued: “[O]ur baby was e toru rā [three], he was three years old tā māua pépi [our baby]. Ko ia te pēpe [he was the baby], three year[s] old” he remarked. “[Our

101 Ibid.
tamariki] were all starving[!]’ interrupts Whaea Kēkē Awhi. Alongside the police refusal to allow the whānau food, “[The tamariki] weren’t allowed to go to the toilet. I go, ‘What’s the problem?’ ‘Oh, they can just go outside the door’ [the police responded]. I go, ‘That’s not how we do it.’ I go, ‘There’s two toilets in my house! Why would I make my kids go outside that garage and…?’ I go, ‘That’s just not our way.’” When Aunty Waicy spoke with me about this incident, she voiced disgust: “Koirā tētahi o ngā mahi kino ki ahau ki te pērā atu ki te māmā! He pēpē noaiho tērā e hiamimi.”102, 103 This confronting and disturbing treatment of the whānau – and tamariki in particular – outside of norms and etiquette, constructs them as aleatory bodies underserving of the basic needs and provisions of life. They are, in this sense, ‘no-bodies’ to the state.

**Discourses of savagery and terrorism**

These stories, I suggest, reflect the suturing of the discourse of terror onto the already racialised (or rather, ‘racially inferior’) Tūhoe body. The discursive imagining of Tūhoe as ‘savage’, ‘wild’, and predisposed to violence has remained unchecked since their earliest encounters with Europeans, no less so during Operation Eight. In the throes of the raids themselves, this context meant it was not a significant leap of discursive faith to see the whānau as terrorists through and through – for Tūhoe’s ‘naturally savagery’ rationalised their depiction as terrorists.

---

102 ‘I was absolutely disgusted that the Police had treated them in that way. And it was just a baby needing to go to the toilet!’ Translation mine.
103 AW06062017.
Figure 44: Whaea Kēkē Awhi and one of her mokopuna (perched with the majesty of his ancestors) as we thanked and bid goodbye to her and her whānau. Ruatoki, 2016. Photograph by Tatsiana Chypsanava.
Moreover, the treatment of Uncle Smokey and Whaea Kēkē Awhi’s whānau sits in stark contrast to the contemporaneous October 15 raids on the homes of Pākehā activists in Wellington, which were tremendously more restrained than the armed fiasco in Ruatoki. These “[d]ifferential policing techniques” racialised Māori “as dangerous, terrifying, capable of extreme violence, replaying (post) colonial stereotypes”, wrote communication studies researcher Vijay Devadas in 2008 (ibid. 134-7). This, for Mills, is the operationalisation of subpersonhood, which precisely describes the experience of Uncle Smokey and Whaea Kēkē Awhi’s whānau: “[I]t is possible to get away with doing things to subpersons that one could not do to persons, because they do not have the same rights as persons” (2011: 56). Aunty Waicy’s observations are fitting: “Ka uru mai te pouri i tērā wā, me te whakatakariri, pēneihia tō tātou āwi te kararehe nei” (Webby, 2010); “Anō nei he kararehe mātou” she elsewhere remarked to me. These instances highlight how discourses of terror were grafted onto the racialised Tūhoe body, perpetuating the dehumanisation and relegation into subpersonhood thereof. For the police on October 15, that Ruatoki whānau were terrorists was a fait accompli – a status that disqualified them from the enjoyment of basic civil and human rights.

**ACROSS THE VALLEY**

On the other side of the Valley, Aunty Waicy was awoken by the roar of a helicopter overhead. She shared her experience of October 15:

> So I woke up that morning, by the helicopter. [My husband] and I were asleep. And this helicopter flew over. I jumped out of bed, looked out the window, and there was this red helicopter. And I said, ‘Jeez, someone must be hurt! Ko wai rā kua whara? [(Who’s been injured?)’ Cos it flew over and landed in that field, in that rugby field.

---

104 This is not to downplay the experiences of state violence of people in Wellington, but is rather a comparative comment that underscores the racialised nature of the Ruatoki raids.

105 “It fills me with sorrow, frustration and anger [that we were treated] as if we were animals.’ Translation adapted from Webby (2010).

106 ‘As if we were animals.’ Translation mine.

107 AW06062017.
To clarify, the police had used the Tāneatua club rooms as their base of operations, and as Angie later explained, “all the helicopters were landing [on] our rugby field.”

Emphasising the confusion amongst the commotion and flurry of police activity, Aunty Waicy continued:

I got up, and looked out … I looked over and I could see my sister’s car. I thought ‘Shit!’ He aitua, must be a whara māhiti [(It must have been a bad accident)]. So I rang [around]. And I got one of her kids [to] come over … ‘Kei te aha kē? Kei hea tō koutou mā? [(What on earth’s happened? Where’s your Mum?)]; ‘Kei konei. [(We’re here.)]

[My sister] gets on the on the phone, ‘He pai noa mātou [(We’re OK)] … ‘Kei te pai koutou?[(Are you all OK?)’ [I asked]; ‘Āe. [(Yes)]’ ‘…Kei konei ngā pirihimana [(the police are here)]’ [she said] … ‘Kei te aha kē?! [(What the hell happened?!)] [I asked]. ‘Aua, kāre mātou e mōhio, engari kei konei ngā pirihimana me wā rātou pū. [(We don’t know, but the police are here with their guns.)]’ Ka mea mai, ‘E rite ki te ninjas!’ [(She said, ‘They’re like ninjas!’) … Kei te mau ō rātou kaka ka pango, me wā rātou pū … [(They were wearing black-clad clothing, and holding their guns)].

‘THE ROAD BLOCK’

Before Aunty Waicy had arisen, however, the police had already shut down the entire Ruatoki Valley, installing a roadblock at the Valley’s entrance at six o’clock that morning (IPCA, 2013: 41). Saturated in potent symbolism, the blockade was emplaced directly atop the 1866 confiscation line intersecting the main road, which, as I earlier described, was a boundary of seizure inscribed by the Crown to punish Tūhoe for supposed acts of rebellion against the government (Binney, 2009: 100-14). Although Binney’s encyclopaedic research (2009) demonstrates negligible evidence (if any) for such an allegation, this was outweighed by the Crown’s desire to simultaneously subjugate Tūhoe and render futile their economy (Waitangi Tribunal, 2009: 162-3).

---

108 Kōrero with Angie, 15 February 2017 [AH15022017].
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Figure 45: Aunty Waicy chatting to me during one of our kōrero sessions. Tāneatua, 2017. Photograph by Tatsiana Chypsanava.
During my interviews with Ruatoki whānau, many compared the 2007 raids with the 1916 Police assault on Rua’s community at Maungapōhatu (Binney, 2009: 584-91). As we saw, fifty-seven armed officers stormed and ransacked the small community, killing two people, one of whom was Rua’s son, Toko. Binney’s research implicates one of the commanding officers, John Cassells, as Toko’s murderer, based on his inconsistent deposition and his active manipulation of evidence before the Police expedition departed (ibid. 588–9). The raid on Maungapōhatu “…took place in war-time, and was [ostensibly] instigated because Rua was a ‘sly-grogger’ and a leader who urged Tūhoe not to volunteer [for the war effort]” (Binney, 2009: 572; see also Binney et. al., 1996; Derby, 2009). This, in the eyes of the government, warranted such a hostile response.

The 1866 raupatu and the 1916 raid on Maungapōhatu were violently resurrected in October 2007, as reverberant echoes of an originary violence central to the operation of the contemporary New Zealand settler colonial state. At that time, the confiscation line was physically painted on the bitumen itself, and erecting the roadblock on top of it amplified the historical continuity of a colonial violence long experienced by Tūhoe. In other words, the roadblock acted as a tether between earlier encounters of colonial hostility and the present, emphasising the on-going nature of this violence. Whānau on their morning commutes into or out of the Valley were stopped, and met by numerous police vehicles and AOS officers in full-paramilitary attire (Te Kaokao a Takapau, 2014). The police had also blockaded access at the Tāneatua junction into the Whārua, which is where Angie was living and working at the time. “So I didn’t know a thing about it until I walked over from work”, she explained, before continuing.110
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…I just thought, ‘What?’ And as I was coming across, someone stopped me and said, ‘The police are down there.’ And I said, ‘What’s happening?’ And then I came to work and got bombarded with phone calls – ‘We’re not allowed out of the Valley. We’re not allowed to come through, they’ve got road blocks everywhere.’ ‘What?’ So I walked down and they had road block just down there at the corner. And you could hear the choppers, and they were landing in the rugby field. And I thought, ‘Wow – what the hell’s happening?’ So I walked down and we got told we had to move away. I said can we ask what’s happening – no, we weren’t allowed to ask what was happening.

On the Valley-ward side of the roadblock, people were being forced out of their vehicles, and had photographs taken of themselves and their licence plates. In a collection of stories from the October 15 raids, Ruatoki kaumātau matua Te Weeti recounted his treatment by the AOS:

We drove out onto the road. We were going to head to Taneatua to get somethings for the house. When we got halfway down the road to where the confiscation line is, we noticed there were cars pulled up in front of us – a long line of cars. We slowed down and stopped. I was sitting in the back with my granddaughter. I asked my partner ‘What’s going on?’ ‘It looks like some uniformed people wearing helmets walking along the line of cars – stopping along the line of cars,’ she said. I had mixed feelings at the time: Should we back off? … It took us a while to make up our minds about what to do – to back away or to stay there. By the time we looked back, there were other cars behind us so we couldn’t back away. Eventually the police got to us. They were armed. Four of them came over to the van: two on each side of the vehicle with their guns. They ordered my partner out of the car. They took her to the front of the van to photograph her. They looked like soldiers. When they had ‘processed’ her, they started looking in my direction. Two of them came around to the side where the door slides. They came and opened the door. They said to me, ‘I order you to come out of the van.’ I refused to come out of the van. I said, ‘What for?’ They said, ‘Oh, you have to come out of the van.’ I said, ‘No I don’t have to.’ I said, ‘Who are you?’ And they said whatever it was that they were called. I said, ‘How do I know it is you?’ They said, ‘Are you trying to be funny?’ I said, ‘No, I don’t talk to strangers. What have we done? Why are you stopping us?’ They said that if I don’t come out that they were going to come in and drag me out. So I put my granddaughter down, and I thought that I would just wait until the first one comes in … The two of them came in through the door. My granddaughter started to cry when they both came through the door. I told her it was all right, and I put her behind me. I got ready to hit the one coming through the door, but the two of them grabbed me at the same time. They both dragged me out of the van and threw me on the ground. One of them stood on my back, put my hands behind my back, and then they handcuffed me (Morse, 2010: 77-8).
Figure 46: Awahou Road: the boundary marker of the 1866 confiscation line, and the site where the Police erected their roadblock during the October 15 raids. Ruatoki, 2016. Photograph by Tatsiana Chypsanava.
Matua Te Weeti’s, ‘No, I don’t talk to strangers. What have we done?’, denotes a refusal of the discursive command to occupy the subject position of criminal and terrorist espoused by the police. Nevertheless, this aggression characterised other encounters between the police and other whānau at the roadblock, exemplified in Nanny Bubbles’ story. Angie explains:

One of the sad things was [about our] kuia, her name was Bubbles. Our Nanny Bubbles. She was a chronic asthmatic, she had emphysema. She was coming out and got absolutely stressed when she saw the police. And they stopped her, and she needed her [asthma] pump. And she had left it on the other side of the blockade. And they wouldn’t let her go back and get it. So she started having a panic attack, which made it difficult for her to breathe … And our Nan would have been in her 80s then.

In the end, however, as Aunty Waicy explained to me, “…the police wouldn’t let her through. Ka noho rātou i reira tautohe ai kia tukuna te kuia rā, karekau i tuku.” Once again, this reflects the construction of the Tūhoe body as an aleatory and subhuman one, a process that informs the nature of police treatment upon whānau during the raids. Even in the most dire of situations, such as Nanny Bubbles’ health emergency, this discursive rendering remained in place, and police refused to grant whānau requests to retrieve her inhaler.

---

111 Ibid.
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Figure 47: Uncle Peho recounting his experiences of the 2007 raids, as the driver of one of the Kōhanga Reo buses. Uta, 2017. Photograph by Pounamu Jade Aikman.
THE KŌHANGA REO BUS

Of all the incidents in and around Ruatoki on October 15, the Police adamantly refuted that they stopped and boarded Kōhanga Reo buses at the blockades (New Zealand Herald, 2007a, 2007b), and even in 2013, Radio New Zealand remarked that “mystery [remains as to] whether the marked kohanga reo bus was boarded by armed police or not” (2013). This posturing is entirely inconsistent with experiences from the bus drivers on that day. In the days immediately following the raids, for example, matua Isaac Nuku lamented that “They did hop on our bus. They did search our bus” (New Zealand Herald, 2007b). Uncle Peho was another of the Kōhanga bus drivers, and when I visited him at his home in Uta in late 2017, he shared what happened on October 15:

**Me:** Ana … ko koe te kaitaraiwa o te pahi –


**Me:** So, ka puru atu ia ki roto i te waka? 

**Uncle Peho:** Āe. Piki mai ia i runga i te waka. Piki atu ki runga i te waka. Me tana pū kei [te pupuri] tonu. Ana ko ngā tamariki me mātou ki runga i te van. Āe. Ka puta, ka makere mai a ia, ka haere atu mātou, ki te peka rā, ki Te Rewarewa … Ana i reira ka whakatūhia anō mātou. Ana pērā anō te kaupapa. Ka piki mai te pirihimana ki runga i te waka, o te kōhanga, ka tirotiro anō. Engari … ko ērā pirihimana he pirihimana noa atu ēnei. Nē. … [And then we were stopped again]. Koirā te tuatoru. Te tuatoru o ō mātou tūtangatia, i te haere kōtahi. Te hokinga atu ki te kāinga … Matakū kē tērā mea. Ana ko ētahi o ngā pēpē kei te auē me ētahi o ngā tamariki. Ko ētahi kei te whakamomori, kei te noho whakamomori. Kei te matakū engari kāre e auē, kāre e [aha].

---

113 Kōrero with Uncle Peho, 27 October 2017 [UP27102017].
114 **Me:** And you were the driver of the bus –
Uncle Peho’s employment of the word ‘whakamomori’, to describe the reaction by the Kōhanga Reo babies and tamariki, is revealing. While here used to describe the intense fear and anxiety felt by the children, whakamomori also denotes a “profound grief” and depression experienced from the “death of a close relative or friend”, that could, in such situations, lead to suicide in classical Māori society (Moorfield, 2018b). The phrase today continues to convey the meaning of ‘deep depression’ and ‘suicide’, reflected, for example, in the Ministry of Health’s report into social explanations for suicide in New Zealand: *Whakamomori: He Whakaaro, he Kōrero noa; A Collection of Contemporary Views on Māori and Suicide* (Hirini and Collings, 2005). The gravity imbued within the word itself, demonstrated by this broader etymological contextualisation, coupled with Uncle Peho’s selective use of the term, underscores the intensity of the feeling felt by the tamariki that day. These embodied experiences render inconceivable the police refutation that armed officers did not board the Kōhanga bus. In 2013, the Independent Police Conduct Authority (IPCA) deemed the road block at Ruatoki in 2007 “contrary to law, unjustified and unreasonable” (IPCA, 2013: 39-41). As our conversation came to a close, Uncle Peho offered this final remark: “Kua tangohia tō tātou mana. Nē. Kua tangohia tō tātou mana ka riro i te kete karaun.”

Uncle Peho: – for the Kōhanga Reo in Tāneatua. That was in 2007, the first raid. That was me. I was one of the workers [at the Kōhanga], tending the grounds, doing the lawns, sweeping, and looking after the gardens. All those sorts of things. And then we headed out [to drop everyone home, and came across] … all these the police at Tāneatua standing there at the side of the service station. But they didn’t pull us over. We continued on, and arrived at Te Rewarewa, to the first stop at the corner there. And we were stopped there. I wasn’t sure why. And were just stopped there, and then the police officer, with his weapon in hand, boarded the bus.

Me: So he actually got into the bus?

Uncle Peho: Yes. He got on and boarded the bus, still holding his weapon. And it was the children and I in the van. He [then] got off [the bus], and we continued on. [But not long after,] we were stopped again, and the same thing happened. The police boarded the Kōhanga bus and conducted another search. Except this time, they were plain-uniformed officers. [We went on, but soon after we were stopped again]. That was the third time we were stopped on that same journey to take the [children] home. It was absolutely terrifying and frightening. Some of the babies and children were crying and wailing. Others, equally terrified, sat there in silence, overcome with fear and anxiety.

115 ‘All our rights had been taken away. The Crown have trampled on our rights.’ Translation mine.
This feeling of fright and anxiety was widespread amongst whānau throughout the Whārua and Te Rohe Pōtae a Tūhoe following the raids. “They wouldn’t even go in their bedrooms anymore. We all slept in the lounge”, Whaea Kēkē Awhi explained about her and her tamariki. Other children had trouble sleeping, would wake up at night in terror, and in some cases, would wet their beds. As one Ruatoki elder lamented, “I have to keep a light on all night for my mokopuna. They can’t sleep at night in the dark because they’re scared the bad men will come again” (Te Kaokao a Takapau, 2014). This disquiet was shared equally by kaumātua of the Valley, as Angie recounts in relation to the 2007 ‘Kaumātua Ball’:

So we had our Kaumātua Ball planned for about three weeks … after [the raids]. We always have them, we used to hold them every year … Huge Tūhoe event for all our kaumātua. Throughout the Rohe Pōtae of Tūhoe, they would all come back for their annual ball. And they wouldn’t come because they were too frightened. Yeah – that was the message we were getting from our kuia and our koroua. ‘Can’t. It’s too scary. We don’t know what’s going to happen.’…Cos there was still a lot of police around us. So we didn’t get a lot of people that year. They were too frightened to come into our Valley.

In reflecting upon this, and the numerous other impacts of the raids upon Ruatoki, Aunty Waicy offered this sentiment: “Ahakoa pēhea te roa ōku i runga i tēnei whenua, korekore e wareware i ahau te whakamataku, te wetiweti, i te mārō mai o te pū ki te tangata” (Webby, 2010).

Resistance: refusing subjectification

In these moments of terror, fear, and anxiety, possibilities for resistance appear remote. Yet it is amongst these concentrated points of ostensibly unidirectional force, that such resistance finds abundant expression. Allow me to remind the reader of Foucault’s insistence that power is productive to the extent that it stimulates action to occur, and, more importantly, is not

---
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117 ‘For as long as I am on this earth, I will never forget the fear, the disgust, that I felt when the gun was pointed at the people.’ Translation Webby’s.
something wielded by the powerful against the powerless, but rather is exercised between individuals in a web of force relations. In order to be subject to power (subjectification), a discourse must first be in circulation to then be taken up by individuals (subjects), and the refusal to do so short-circuits the operation of power. Without fulfilling both steps of this process, power fails to function. Specific moments in time serve to concentrate power – or rather, force relations – upon particular bodies, but the action stimulated therein is sometimes unexpected, where the body itself can produce a ‘counter-attack’. In other words, power’s productive potential can produce unanticipated results, flipping the coin of power to reveal its inverse of resistance. These instances, by their very nature, are articulations of resistance because they refuse to fulfil the expectations engendered by discourse; they are rejections of subjectification. Numerous examples from whānau in Ruatoki exemplify these theoretical reflections, as I turn now to explore.

‘TURN THAT GUN AWAY FROM ME!’

As Aunty Waicy left her home during the morning of the raid, she quickly came across the road block. With traffic at a forced standstill, she walked in the direction of the blockade and the AOS officers flanking it. She explains:

‘I walked from here to the fence yonder, which wasn’t far. The police cones [were laid out], and the police were all there. How many of them were there, with their guns, I wasn’t sure. I walked towards them – he or she, you couldn’t tell! He tāne he wāhine rānei? [W]alked towards me with the gun. Mea atu au ki a ia, ‘What the f____ are you doing with that gun?! Turn that f____ gun away from me!!’ Ka tū, ka ‘Sorry!’, ka pēnei te pū [(mea atu te pū ki te taha)] … Mea atu au, ‘I have come to pick up my sister, we’re going to Rotorua.’ So ka hikoi atu ahau. I haramai te motukā me taku teina. Ka tiro atu au ki taku Aunty, ‘Kei te pai koe nē Aunty?’ ‘Kei te pai au, I think kei te pai au. Kei te tirotirohia taku motukā, kei te whakahaahuaiahia, ākene ka mutu ana kua tukuna atu ahau kia puta.’ … Rahi tonu ngā motukā [i korā].

---
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119 ‘I walked from here to the fence yonder, which wasn’t far. The police cones [were laid out], and the police were all there. How many of them were there, with their guns, I wasn’t sure. I walked towards them, and one of the AOS
As Aunty Waicy – a white-haired elderly kuia – approached, the AOS officer, with his weapon trained on her, saw only an ‘object of interest’; a potential criminal, if not an outright terrorist. Power here was concentrated upon Aunty Waicy, in the attempt to subjectify her as a ‘Tūhoe terrorist’. The response this stimulated in Aunty Waicy was, however, unexpected for the officer standing yonder. Her reprimand and order, to “Turn that fucking gun away from me!!”, startled him, whereby he quickly turned his weapon away, and apologised. There is no doubt that, with weapons drawn squarely at her, Aunty Waicy's response was one of courage and determination. However, I think the more pertinent issue here is that the AOS officer was attempting to compel Aunty Waicy to take up a subjectivity she was unwilling to occupy. In her admonishment of him, she had turned the discursive tables. His own “Sorry!” acknowledged this, in which the trooper himself was unconvinced of Aunty Waicy’s criminality, or he would have offered a more staunch retort in response to her rebuke.

In this moment, therefore, Aunty Waicy’s refusal to be subjectified was recognised and accepted by the actions of the AOS officer, cancelling out this power dynamic to ultimately replace it with one of an elder reprimanding an out-of-place youngster. As we have seen, ‘power is everywhere, but so is resistance.’ It is also interesting to reflect here upon Aunty Waicy’s observation, ‘[H]e or she, you couldn’t tell! He tāne he wāhine rānei?’, in relation to the AOS officer. This specific example, I suggest, is denotative of the amorphic, disembodied, and ungendering effect of the operation of state violence. As an apparatus of such violence, the AOS officers emerged out of the coned area. And he came out brandishing his weapon! Probably didn’t realise what he was doing. I like to think. And I’m walking towards him – he or she, you couldn’t tell [beneath their military getup] if they were male or female! And he walked towards me [with his gun pointed directly at me], I bellowed out to him, ‘What the fuck are you doing with that gun?! Turn that fucking gun away from me!!’ [Startled and dumbstruck], he quickly said ‘Sorry!’ and pointed the gun [upward and away from me]. I said, ‘I have come to pick up my sister, we’re going to Rotorua.’ So I walked on by and came across the car with my sister. I looked out for my Aunty and said, ‘Are you OK Aunty?’ [She replied], ‘I’m OK, I think I’m OK.’ They’ve been looking over my car and taking photos of it, but hopefully soon they’ll let me through.’ There were so many cars [lined up] there. Translation mine.
officers are stripped of their gender, sexuality, and other identities, hidden beneath the exteriority of their costume and attire, to exist only as machinic extensions of state sovereignty. In an ironic contradiction, they too are ‘no-bodies’; no-bodies that are, however, materialisations of sovereign authority.

THE HELICOPTER RIDE

Back at Uncle Smokey and Whaea Kēkē Awhi’s home, the police were demanding to know where the so-called ‘terror camps’ were located. They detail what happened next, amidst much laughter and chuckling.¹²⁰

**Uncle Smokey:** So I wanted to go for a ride in their helicopter. [They asked,] ‘Oh can you show [us] where the camps are?’ I said, ‘Yeah, I’ll take you.’ Just wanted to go for a ride!

**Whaea Kēkē Awhi:** – he just wanted to go for a ride in a helicopter! He’s never been on a helicopter, and goes, ‘Yeah I’ll take you!’

**Uncle Smokey:** Then [we left, and] I showed them all the DOC sites!¹²¹ All the camps! All the huts! … I just wanted to go for a ride, up that way, into the bush… I just wanted to take them for a ride. ‘I’ll take you for a long ride’.

Similar to Aunty Waicy’s encounter at the roadblock, the police were forcing Uncle Smokey to take up a subject position – ‘Tūhoe terrorist’ – that would be evidenced by his knowledge of the whereabouts of such ‘camps’. Yet so ludicrous was this assumption, that even in the face of the sharpened spear of state violence, and in comical refusal of subjectification, Uncle Smokey lead the police on a skyward journey across the vast reaches of Te Urewera, to point out what were no less than the Department of Conservation huts scattered throughout the evergreen landscape.

¹²⁰ USAA23112016.
¹²¹ The Department of Conservation (DOC) administers a network of nearly 1000 tramping huts in National Parks across New Zealand. See Department of Conservation (2018) for more detail.
Figure 48: The magnificence of Lakes Waikareiti and Waikaremoana from the air, a sight Uncle Smokey glimpsed from a police helicopter as he pointed out the DOC tramping huts throughout Te Urewera. © Dougal Townsend, GNS Science, 129648.
Revelling in his inaugural helicopter flight, simultaneously making light of the preposterous Police accusation, this – to use Foucault’s terminology – was the body producing a ‘counter-attack’ that severely diminished the legitimacy of the encounter overall, instead spinning a new web of force relations in which the police became subject to Uncle Smokey’s desire to explore Te Urewera from above.

**PHOTOGRAPHS AND PHONE-TAPPING**

Humour, as we have seen, can be used to great effect in disrupting the circuitry of power. Another two instances, shared by Angie, highlight this potentiality and the wholesale refusal to be subjectified as criminals and terrorists. The first relates to the photographing of whānau at the roadblock by police:122

So our brother … came through with his wife, and they got stopped [at the roadblock]. And that’s when they were taking photographs of all them and their licence plates. And you have to find humour. So he stands there, and [is told] ‘We need to take a photo of you sir. A photo of you and your car in front of the licence plate.’ ‘Oh! I haven’t had a photo with my wife for a while! Can I have a photo with my wife?’ And we were going, ‘Really brother?’ And he goes, ‘I didn’t know what they were doing! So I was just going to get a photo with my [wife].’ I said, ‘You’re neat all right brother!’

As Angie aptly put it, ‘You have to find humour.’ The second equally humorous response concerns the landline phone surveillance of the Tāneatua and Ruatoki communities by the Police in 2007. Phone tapping was widespread, Angie explained, but it was so visibly (or rather, audibly) conspicuous, it was difficult to see it as anything but “hilarious”.123 In the course of telephone conversations, Police surveillance would be prompted by the utterance of a variety of key words, such as ‘gun’, ‘raids’, ‘bush’ and so forth. At that juncture, an echoing and crackling sound could be heard which signalled the tapping of the conversation. “Watch this”, said Aunty Angie on one occasion to a friend on the phone, “I’ll say this word and then we’ll
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122 Kōrero with Angie, 10 February 2017 [AH10022017].

123 Ibid.
be tapped.” As she proceeded to mention one of the key words, the crackling interference was heard. So widespread was the awareness of this surveillance within the Tāneatua and Ruatoki community – “We knew the line was compromised”, Angie specified – that whānau would have open conversations with their surveillance counterparts listening in. “Can I tell you about my dumb weekend?” some would ask. Whānau would scatter known buzzwords into their everyday phone conversations, all the while “getting a good laugh out of it.” “We would do it for fun!” said Angie, explaining that whānau would litter their conversations with “irrelevant gobbledygook”, and “just talk about absolute crap.” “Everyone knew,” she clarified; “We used to think it was funny. You had to.”

On some occasions, whānau would even hear the surveillance operatives talking in the background of their conversations. “Oh, that’s not very good surveillance!” commented Angie. “They can have my shopping list” she chuckles. Both of these instances reflect technologies and apparatus of surveillance that purported to subjectify the Ruatoki and Tāneatua communities as home to criminals and ‘Tūhoe terrorists’, but failed in their attempts.

That whānau were taking humourous liberties at the police’s expense rendered such insinuations and allegations farcical, because they were subject positions whānau could never have occupied in the first place. While this is demonstrative of the potential for power to stimulate action, we must keep in mind that such action cannot be accurately predicted: these responses were likely unanticipated by the police, and again, reduced their legitimacy in both of these encounters. There is much to be said for the observation that it is difficult to take seriously a figure of authority who has become the object of others’ laughter. In the end, this collection of stories from whānau exemplifies the notion that resistance finds manifold
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expression in the most ostensibly oppressive of scenarios. Indeed, such situations are the most fertile opportunities for the articulation of such resistance. With the state’s concentrated focus upon certain bodies, in instances such as Aunty Waicy at the roadblock, Uncle Smokey’s helicopter ride, and whānau being photographed or otherwise surveilled, unanticipated ‘counter-attack’ back-fires can be triggered that short-circuit the operation of power. Moments such as these, I suggest, expose us to the realisation that we as individuals are never powerless, but are always-already imbued with the capacity for resistance.126

Community responses to Operation Eight

The police raids in 2007 caused widespread and significant trauma for whānau of the Whārua, but determined not to be overcome by this, the community organised a series of events to provide support and whakawhanaungatanga (ethic of relationship building centred on the value of family). The first of these was the peace hikoi I spoke of earlier, in which Angie determinedly asserted: ‘No – they’re not going to own our community. They’re not going to make us scared of using that field.’127 This denotes a reclamation of the rugby field from a space of invasion – for it was the base of operations for the Police and landing site for their helicopters – to one of whānau celebration. Aunty Waicy continues this story, recounting the Christmas function held at their marae, Waikirikiri, that she and other whānau organised to lift spirits:128

Mā ngā tamariki, ngā whānau, i raru, i whakatumatuma e ngā pirihimana. So in terms of ā mātou whānau, ō mātou tamariki, what I tried to do, and what I did do, ka tukuna e au he pānui … [kia] whakahuihui mai a Tūhoe a Ruatoki i ā mātou whānau katoa i raruraru, ki te karakia … Tō mātou marae, ka haere mātou ki te awanui, ki te wai, ka karakia mātou i reira. I muri mai ka hoki mai mātou i Waikirikiri, and we had a little party mā ngā tamariki. Ko ngā tamariki o ngā whānau. So … we brought presents mō ngā tamariki, we had a little Christmas hākari for them [K]o te rest of te [donated] money we gave kai vouchers … So [i] hoatu he vouchers mō ngā whānau... Koirā ā

126 I would be remiss if I did not clarify that while we may have the capacity for resistance, our actions can equally precipitate oppression – for power and resistance are two sides of the same coin.
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mātou ki Waikirikiri ... Ka raruraru ana ngā tamariki i mua atu i te kirihimete. Leading up to Christmas … Kei te kirihimete kei te raruraru tonu ngā whānau, kua kore he māhi a wētahi, kei te herehere wētahi, and we had this little pool of money [that had been donated] and I wanted to make sure we [used] it in the best possible way, and that's all we could think of, mā ngā pēpē, mā ngā whānau, kai vouchers. And then ētahi punua koha mō ngā pēpē.129

The impacts from Operation Eight continue, however, to be felt today. This is most manifest in the on-going raids that have targeted Ruatoki and Tūhoe communities in the decade since 2007. As I go on to argue, these raids combined are re-enactments of state sovereignty and originary violence.

FEBRUARY 2012

In February 2012, the AOS conducted a similarly violent raid at Uta, a small hamlet at the termination of the state road in the Valley (see Figure 3). The police alleged that a “known and dangerous criminal” was being harboured at Uta, and proceeded to deploy a full-scale paramilitary raid on one of the homes, in which “[t]ear gas was fired into the house, windows were smashed, and holes fired into cupboards and walls” (Te Kaokao a Takapau, 2012: 2). Angie spoke with me about this,130 explaining that as the raid occurred at roughly eight o’clock in the morning on a school day, the hamlet’s tamariki were standing on the road waiting for the school bus to arrive. “So all our kids were on the road … all our babies were out on the road, because we’ve got lots of kids down that end. Lots of kids! … And the [AOS] came in in force with their trucks, their guns, their gear. And they surrounded the area…” Uta is flanked by a mountainous

129 ‘[This was for] the children and families who had been terrorised by the Police. So what I tried to do, and did do, for our families was to distribute a notice for our tired and weary people to come together in prayer. We gathered beside our ancestress, the great river flowing beside our marae, and there we prayed. Thereafter, we returned to our marae, Waikirikiri, and had a party for our children. We brought them presents, and had a little Christmas feast and get-together for them. The rest of the donated money we put towards food vouchers, and gave those to families in need. That was us at Waikirikiri, because of how troubled our children were in the lead up to Christmas. Come Christmas time, many families remained overcome with fear and anxiety, finding themselves out of employment and with no money, and some in police custody. I wanted to make sure that the little pool of donated money that remained was used in the best possible way, and so we organised food vouchers for those whānau while showering our babies with gifts.’ Translation mine.

130 AH05122016.
ridgeline, which extends into the heart of Te Urewera, and at one point, the AOS haphazardly fired shots into the surrounding hillside. The tamariki bore witness to this, and panicked parents ushered them back inside or onto the school bus “to get them out of harm’s way”. Despite being indoors or aboard the bus, whānau remained anxiously worried amidst the flurry of Police activity and the discharging of weapons outside. “But are we really safe here?”, Angie recounted.

Aunty Waicy spoke to Māori Television’s Mere McLean about the raid at Uta. This was in light of the IPCA’s (2013) report into Operation Eight, following the recommendation that the police review their procedures around raids:


As the raid unfolded, one of the local koro exasperatedly cried out to the police that they were raiding the wrong house, as it was his son they were pursuing, and his house that he would be at. The koro continued to plead in vain; “Shut your mouth!” was the only response he received. As it transpired, however, his son had long since left the Valley, rendering the raid futile. In assessing the “potential health hazards the whānau [now] face” in the aftermath that followed, a Public Health official admitted their department had no experience about homes that had been tear gassed. In lieu of this, a specialist decontamination company suggested it would cost in excess of $12,000 to clean the home. Despite having raided the wrong
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131 ‘In 2012, [the Police] forgot about what they had stipulated. They came to the home of my younger brother … and fired shots at his house. At that time of the morning, from six to nine o’clock, our grandchildren are still at home.’ Translation adapted from Mclean, 2014.
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house, the then Acting Area Commander explained that the police were not liable for any of the damage incurred (Te Kaokao a Takapau, 2012: 2).

APRIL 2014

We return now to the raid on the Teepa whānau homestead in April 2014, the reason for my entry into doctoral study. In the early hours of the morning, a few kilometres north of Uta, the AOS raided the homestead in pursuit of suspects allegedly involved in the theft of a cache of weapons near Whakatāne (Leilua, 2014). A helicopter, about ten vehicles, and dozens of black-clad AOS troopers, swooped in on the Teepa homestead to conduct the raid. Inside the home were Mum, Dad, and their tamariki and mokopuna. Waitangi describes the encounter: “I te moe noaiho mātou, kātahi ka kite au i ētahi rama, he rama mai i tētahi wakatopatopa, etāhi rama pūwhero i runga i ahau. Ka āhua tūmeke katoa ahau” (Te Karere, 2014). Having surrounded the property, the police then ordered the whānau out of the house. During my kōrero with Waitangi about the raid, she spoke of how the front door of the house came to represent an intimate threshold breached by the violence of the AOS.

That front door to me is symbolic of the terror the AOS put on Mum and Dad. Because it was that front door that opened to see all the red beams, to see all the helicopters, to see the voices, to see the shadows, cos you know you can’t see [their] faces. And it was at that front door my dad stood while they were trying to take my Mum. And he said, ‘You are trespassing, we do not agree to this behaviour. We do not agree to what you are doing, and we do not agree to be … treated as third class citizens.’ That was what he said over and over again.

She continued on, describing in detail what happened that morning. Her Mum’s sharp intake of breath stirred her from slumber:

**Waitangi:** So what initially woke me up, like made my eyes pop open … was Mum’s deep intake of breath. … So I was looking after the kids [that night, and] Mum and Dad

134 ‘We were just sleeping, and then I saw lights from a helicopter, and the red lights from [the scope of] a weapon pointed at me. I was startled and frightened.’ Translation adapted from *Te Karere*, 2014.

135 Kōrero with Waitangi, 6 October 2017 [WT06102017].
went to [Uncle’s] birthday. I was at home with … the kids. Chilling back and enjoying this night life, dreaming about what I’m going to do. Will I go to uni? Will I conquer the world? … I felt uneasy. I had felt uneasy as soon as the sun had gone down. And then I was looking on Facebook to see what the Whārua was doing. And some of the whānau from the … bottom of the Valley [had posted:] ‘There’s some people sneaking around outside … They’re going past all sneakily’ … [I thought,] ‘Bloody people bringing trouble into the Whārua!’, as you do … I didn’t feel easy … The animals told me something was wrong. Like it was so unusual to not hear them. As a country kid, you just know. And in my trained country brain, animal silence means danger. And our pigs were like squealing, and then all of a sudden stopped … I was really freaking out, and was waiting for Mum and Dad to come home… I was afraid for them for some strange reason. And then they came home; ‘We’re home!’ … [I] went back to bed and was like ‘Yay, glad I’m asleep and I’m glad Mum and Dad are home because that means that everything is right in my world.’

Me: Were you in the boys’ room?

Waitangi: Yes, so I was in the boys room … snuggled all in. And it was Mum’s hesitant breath [that] made me wake up. [I thought she was having a heart attack] … [Then I ] heard Dad going, ‘No, what are you doing? No. No. Mum, come back, come back!’ …

During my kōrero with Waitangi’s Dad, he similarly spoke of this particular moment:136 “[The AOS] came in the back here … And then put their laser things through the window. And they come to the door, and one of them had their gun pointed at me. I just grabbed it – ‘If you’re gonna use it, use it. Otherwise take the fuckin’ thing out of my face.’” Waitangi continued:137

And when I looked at the windows, I could see these lights. ‘It’s really bright outside!’ [I thought]. Like really bright. And then I looked out the window [and thought] there was an ambulance outside, or helicopters or something. And I was freaking out, thinking mum is about to [fall ill] … And then I step out of the room, and the first thing I hear was ‘Come outside!’ And then the click. The lock. And [when] you hear it, and you can’t hear it, the sound … And they’re like, ‘Hands up!’ And you’re like freaking out. And I look at my Dad, and he’s barricaded the door so they can’t force their way in [to make sure they couldn’t take] Mum. And then when they told me to walk out, I was like ‘Oh my fucking God! Oh my skiddy undies!’ And then I was like, ‘They’re trying to take Mum away!’ … There [was] this guy standing at the door … ‘Who’s all in the house?!’ How many occupants are on this property?’ [he said.] … Mum’s following [their orders] because she’s polite. You know, instant manaakitanga kicks in … And then Dad’s like, ‘No!’ I was like ‘Don’t fucking follow them, Mum. Go and check on the kids.’ And she … looked at the police, looked at me and Dad, and [then] went back into the house to check the kids, knowing full well that they could have shot her … ‘How

136 Kōrero with Dad, 21 November 2016 [DT21112016].
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many occupants!’ [the officer said, aiming] his questions at me. And Dad turns to me and he said, ‘Hoihoi. Whakarongo.’ … ‘Shush. Listen’. And so I knew at that moment, that that was my instruction to look around and see exactly what’s happening … So I’m there. And then I start looking around properly. I’m counting the shadows ‘cos my eyes have adjusted by that time … counting the red pin marks that are on our bodies. I’m looking at the shadows that must have been parked everywhere. I would say there would have been about thirty or something ridiculous. It was over the top! … And a helicopter! … My first thought was, ‘How the fuck could they afford to send all this here?!’ …

Me: So you saw 30 people, and you could see the trucks as well?

Waitangi: Yeah, the outlines of some of the vehicles parked down the driveway. … It was just so undignified. … [This was shock, yes,] but what’s worse is seeing your parents whole value system being smashed. You know you don’t address a person if they’re not dressed in the right attire. My mother was in her pyjamas! That’s intimate between [a husband and wife], that’s family intimate. My Dad was in his long johns and a holey singlet … I hate the fact that they saw us in such an undignified manner. I mean holey long johns? … ‘How dare you do this to us. How dare you hurt my parents in such a way that you smash their values. That was over the top’, [I thought.]

Me: So by this time you and Dad were in the doorway, and Mum was inside?

Waitangi: Yep. Dad’s talking to the command[ing officer] … [H]e was [physically] really really close [to Dad]. I don’t know how other raids work, but me and dad [were at the doorway, and they were inches away from us.] … I thought if this carried on, then him and dad were going to have a bit of a hongi match. Na honest, because that’s how close! … And then there’s another [AOS officer] here, [spaced out in a triangle, flanking each behind.] They were all holding weapons… They were some big guns. Biiig big big big guns. At close range!

Me: How long did the whole thing it last?

Waitangi: So it started off around about 11, but when I made sure to document it on Facebook, it was about 2:15 … They kept asking, ‘Are you sure there are no dangerous weapons? Blah blah blah. And Dad’s not answering them’. [But I’m thinking, there are guns here, it’s a farm!] There are fertilisers, there are axes, … there’s like lots of farm [stuff!] It’s a farm. It’s a farm.

The disregard for bodily integrity Waitangi describes is similarly applicable here, exemplifying the aleatory perception of the Tūhoe body. The most troubling element of this encounter, however, was that in their haste, the AOS had again proceeded to raid the wrong property, echoing the blunder at Uta two years prior. “All they said was, ‘Wrong car, wrong house’, and then they just pissed off”, explains Waitangi’s Mum to Te Karere (2014). It is difficult to
comprehend that such a basic error of intelligence could have occurred, but this does little to minimise the intensity of the force used upon the Teepa whānau. As Waitangi concluded:138

They trampled on my whenua. Not land whenua. But my pito mata. They had trampled on that. They had trampled on my Dad’s pito mata. They trampled on my Koro’s pito mata, on my Nanny’s pito mata. They had trampled my urupā. And it was more [that they] had broken my soul … Te pito mata. Ko te pito mata te kaiwhāngai i a pēpē kia tipu ake ia i roto i tō kōpū.139

Land and people are intimately bound together, reflected in the sustenance that whenua, as land and placenta, provide. For the Teepa whānau, this sacred imbrication was violated by the police in April 2014, exacerbated by the staggeringly erroneous nature of the raid. It is, perhaps, revealing, that some whānau, when asked ‘What is a ninja?’, responded with, ‘Those people that wear those black things and has guns … They terrorists.’ Combined, the several raids conducted in Ruatoki over the last ten years underscore that Te Urewera endures today as a contemporary frontier within the New Zealand settler colonial project.

MARCH 2016

The most recent major incident involving Tūhoe and the police in the last decade occurred just outside of Kawerau, in March 2016. Kawerau is a roughly 45-minute drive from Ruatoki, and many whānau there whakapapa to Tūhoe. Dubbed the ‘Onepū’, ‘Kawerau’, or ‘Bay of Plenty Siege’, the AOS were deployed in response to an individual Tūhoe man, Rhys Warren, who had fired shots towards a police-marked aircraft, as well as officers, resulting in an “intense stand-off with police” (Radio New Zealand, 2016). This resulted in four officers being shot by Warren. These facts are not in dispute. In response, leave for all police officers in the Bay of Plenty region was cancelled, resulting in approximately 100 police descending upon Onepū,140 whereupon

138 Ibid.
139 The ‘pito mata’ is the life-giver to baby while in the womb, that is, the umbilical cord.
140 Kōrero with Reverend Wayne Te Kaawa, 2 February 2018 [RWTK02022018].
the property was cordoned off, and a “Defence Force NH-90 tactical helicopter and three light armoured vehicles (LAVs) were called in” (Radio New Zealand, 2016).

My reflection here concerns the rationalisation of deploying this overtly military equipment in response to an individual Tūhoe man. These aspects, I assert, were the salient discursive elements that rationalised these ‘walnut and sledge hammer’ tactics. Here, the discourse of ‘Tūhoe the violent, male savage’, already well in discursive circulation, remained at the forefront of Police thinking in 2016 to justify such a heavy-handed response. I am forced to consider whether such tactics would be deemed appropriate in the affluent suburbs of Auckland or Wellington. Let me be clear. My comments here do not endorse Warren’s behaviour that day, but rather are aimed at the nature of the police operation in Onepū in response to a single Tūhoe man. This, I suggest, is exemplary of Foucault’s stipulation that the protection of the ‘one true race’ must be conceptualised as a war through and through, and no clearer could this be demonstrated than with the deployment of machines, designed unambiguously for war, against an individual New Zealand civilian.
Figure 49: The Teepa whānau homestead, raided by the AOS in April 2014. Ruatoki, 2016. Photograph by Tatsiana Chysanava.
Figure 50: The shed, an eastern annex of the homestead, that was similarly raided by AOS officers during April 2014. Photograph by Tatsiana Chypsanava.
In early 2018, I spoke with the Reverend Wayne Te Kaawa, who is from the area and related to Warren’s whānau, about the AOS callout in Onepū. Reverend Te Kaawa was present during the incident, and felt that

…The two LAVs that they deployed, that was a bit over the top! When I asked … ‘Why have you brought those in?’, they said, ‘Well, the police officers outside the front are feeling a bit exposed. So we’ve got to protect them in some way.’ So they parked both LAVs with the Police standing behind.141

Regardless of the police justification, the net effect the utilisation of military equipment had was to render Onepū and the surrounding area a warzone, and Warren himself a hostile combatant therein. The Reverend also spoke about the prior protocols that had been established with the police regarding callouts in Māori communities:142

And they put this protocol in place for what happens when there’s some sort of Armed [Offenders] callout in a Māori community. And one of the top priorities they said was, ‘Kōrero ki ngā kaumātua o tērā takiwa. Kōrero ki te whanau. [Speak with the elders of that area. Speak with the families].’ … [And then] this happens, and all that protocol went out the door. And that’s what [whānau] were really angry about. So … another hui [was held] a couple of months after that at Te Kaha … [where some of the] koroua [(male elders)] said, ‘What happened to our protocol? Why wasn’t that put in place? That you agreed to?’ … It’s not what happened [in Onepū].

Here, he echoes a sentiment I heard repeated throughout nearly every conversation I had with whānau in Ruatoki: the police must work with and through their kaitakawaenga Māori (Māori liaison officers) in situations like these. Indeed, this crisis was resolved only when an officer in this capacity, Warwick Morehu, who knew the whānau, arrived on-site and defused the situation (Radio New Zealand, 2016). Morehu’s involvement was in fact requested by Warren’s whānau,143 but he arrived after the paramilitary apparatus had been deployed. The ultimate question, then, is why kaitakawaenga Māori were not involved from the outset.

141 Ibid.
142 Ibid.
143 Ibid.
The police operations in 2007, 2012, 2014, and 2016 were all major paramilitary incidents that, as I have suggested, were re-enactments of originary violence in the re legitimization of state sovereignty. I turn shortly to a more expansive analysis of this, but before I do so, I would like to highlight what I have termed ‘police microaggressions’ that whānau in the Valley have been repeatedly subject to in the past decade. Let me preface the following story with two key points.

There is only one road into Ruatoki, and at the termination of the state road is a one metre high stopbank ‘hump’ emplaced to redirect river flow in times of flooding. In practice, this means only four wheel drive vehicles are capable of proceeding beyond, and any low vehicles are incapable of passing through. Secondly, as many Ruatoki whānau have impressed upon me, ‘We don’t want trouble in our Valley.’

In December 2016, Anthony Wharton, unknown to whānau in Ruatoki, attempted to escape his police pursuers in his (non-four wheel drive) vehicle by hiding in Te Urewera. The subsequent chase reached speeds of over 180 kilometres per hour, bypassing the local kura in the process (Whakatane Beacon, 2016: 2). Angie explains:

And look at that 180k chase! Why would you do that? [The police] know [there’s only] one way into our Valley! So once you pass that turn off to the bridge to the other side, … [t]here’s absolutely no way out. All they would have had to do was wait. They wouldn’t have had to chase him past our school. You don’t have to chase them past our school because there is no other road … So where he [eventually] stopped, [at the embankment,] that’s our village [at Uta] … The police … know that that’s a one way road, they didn’t have to chase him down there. They didn’t! There’s absolutely nowhere he could go.

In the Ruatoki-proper stretch of the road in the Valley, whānau rarely drive more than sixty kilometres an hour, horses wander on and off at whim, and on a hot summer’s afternoon, it is
common for tamariki to be playing either on the road or in the creeks adjacent. Fortunately, on the day in question, through the active networks of communication between whānau (via text and social media), the Valley was alerted to the impending pursuit, and tamariki were brought in off the road for their safety. In response to the chase, local whānau took it upon themselves to apprehend Wharton, with the clear message of, “Don’t come into our Valley and do this. We’ll get rid of you.” Angie continued:

So [Wharton] ran towards [a whānau] home, which is right in the bush. And then he must have seen them watching, so he turned around and came back. … [T]hey got all our horses, all our young boys, all our horses, and they just flushed him out. … They just flushed him out, in a few minutes. So our [nephews] were all there, because they all do horse riding, they do barrel racing? So they must have been practicing around the corral with their Koro. So he just gathered them all up, and they were just going to corral him and bring him back.

With that, Wharton was apprehended and delivered to the police, having been promptly rounded up by the men on horseback. The point Angie underscored, however, was that endangering whānau and tamariki of the Valley, by pushing Wharton to drive at ever-increasing speeds, was entirely inappropriate, not only in terms of safety, but also because local whānau, with intimate knowledge of their environment, would quickly see that such a troublemaker should be ‘flushed out’ of their Valley. That police felt it necessary to sustain such speeds reflects both a disconnect from local people and knowledge – a conduit that could be maintained by kaitakawaenga Māori – and a willingness to treat Ruatoki as a ‘space of exception’, to which ordinary rules of safety and engagement do not apply. There are numerous other examples of police microaggressions that I am unable to detail here, but broadly include the belittling and patronising demeanour of police officers towards whānau (see, for example, *Morning Report*, 2015), as well as other Police chases and operations of similar character. As
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numerous whānau remarked to me, “[T]heir ‘South Auckland’ tactics [of policing] don’t belong here.” The point I am approaching, revealed through my ethnographic and historical research, is that Ruatoki, and Tūhoe whānau more generally, exist within what Italian philosopher Giorgio Agamben has termed a ‘permanent state of exception’ (Agamben, 2005).

STATE OF EXCEPTION

Informed by Foucault’s notion of biopolitics, Giorgio Agamben is most notably known for his work on sovereign power and bare life (Homo Sacer) (1998). While Homo Sacer offers a potentially insightful analysis of Tūhoe experiences of state violence, it is Agamben’s later work, State of Exception (2005), that provides a compelling frame for these events, in what he described as a ‘state of exception’. In essence, Agamben draws attention to the disjuncture between what is celebrated and held to be the law, and the actual political realities of the everyday that persistently contravene such constitutional frameworks. In practice, this means that although some enjoy the full benefits of citizenship, others, while constituent members of the social body, remain deprived of this privilege. This is operationalised through Foucault’s ‘biopolitical caesura’, or the division between those deemed worthy of life vis-à-vis those not. The state of exception denotes the abeyance of “the juridical order itself” (2005: 4), characterised by “…the extension of the military authority’s wartime powers into the civil sphere, and … a suspension of the constitution (or of those constitutional norms that protect individual liberties), … merging into a single juridical phenomena” (ibid. 5). While the constitutions of Western liberal democracies generally demarcate a clear distinction amongst the executive, legislative, and judicial apparatus of government, the state of exception is typified by an executive (that is, ruling body) “[conferred with] the power to issue decrees having the force of law [premised upon] the provisional abolishment of the distinction among [these apparatus]” (ibid 5, 7). This state of affairs was born both from the matrices of external warfare
and the ‘insurrection’ of civil war, the state of exception being “...state power’s immediate response to the most extreme internal conflicts” (ibid 2). What has emerged today, then, is a 

...modern totalitarianism [that] can be defined as the establishment, by means of the state of exception, of a legal civil war that allows for the physical elimination not only of political adversaries but of entire categories of citizens who for some reason cannot be integrated into the political system. Since then, the voluntary creation of a permanent state of emergency (though perhaps not declared in the technical sense) has become of the essential practices of contemporary states, including so-called democratic ones (Agamben 2005: 2).

As Agamben remarks, this state of permanent emergency or exception defines the contemporary world, and rationalises the acute levels of violence suffered by certain groups within a given population.146 Dovetailing and expanding upon Foucault’s notion of ‘on-going purification’, I assert that Tūhoe living in and around Ruatoki exist within a state of permanent exception and emergency, evidenced by the various aggressive raids on their communities during the last ten years. Let us keep in mind that the road blocks emplaced by police in Ruatoki and Tāneatua during Operation Eight were direct violations of law and legal procedure.

We can here bring Agamben and Wolfe into conversation with one another, as the way this unfolds in a settler colonial context is distinct. As Wolfe has discussed (2006), settler colonial sovereignty is predicated on the logic of elimination, the principal articulation of which is the negation of Indigenous sovereignties. Building from Agamben’s thinking, I suggest that the operation of sovereign law under Western liberal democracies necessarily has to construct Indigenous sovereignties as a form of permanent insurrection, requiring on-going subjugation by settler sovereign law. While the state might enter into treaty-based relationships with Indigenous peoples, or provide a measure of Indigenous recognition, it by and large chooses to

146 Agamben provides the example of the United States' Patriot Act, which erased the legal status of detainees to the extent that those Afghani Taliban captured during the war “...[did not] enjoy the status of POWs as defined by the Geneva Convention ... [nor that] of persons charged with a crime according to American laws” (2005: 3). In fact, all those held to be ‘illegal combatants’ were subject to this ‘erasure.’
forcefully reassert its own legality through a violent negation of Indigenous sovereignties. This is achieved through the continuous attempts by the state to discursively constitute Indigenous peoples as criminals, in the latter’s desire for sovereignty and self-determination.

In this manner, I think it more appropriate – in a settler colonial context – to think of the state of exception not as an *event*, but rather, per Wolfe’s thinking on invasion and colonisation (2006: 388), as a *structure*. This offers a more nuanced and compelling analysis of the repetitive nature of Tūhoe experiences of state violence over the last decade, experiences which, I believe, are better explained through a ‘structured’ rather than an ‘events-based’ analysis. Angie’s remark during my kōrero with her about the 2007 raids is here fitting: 147 “I remember going past Mum’s, and our men were spread eagled against the fence … I don’t remember if it was during then or one of the other raids… But I don’t remember if it was from this raid or one of the other many raids.” So commonplace have raids become that it is difficult to discern each of them apart, and in this context, news of ‘yet another raid’ does not elicit surprise where it once may have. “It’s normal,” Aunty Waicy elsewhere commented to me. 148

**RACISM AGAINST THE ABNORMAL**

“Anō nei he kararehe mātou,”149 Aunty Waicy’s words reverberate in describing the essential characteristic of the raids on Tūhoe over the last decade. The ethnographic stories shared in this chapter have highlighted the callous treatment of whānau by the police, and the key element linking them together – that I have left for discussion until now – is that of the norm. The function of biopolitics is to foster the health and wellbeing of the body populace, but as I explained earlier, this beneficence is extended only to certain members of the population. The
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norm, described Foucault, is the instrument that determines which bodies are valorised – and are thus entitled to the privileges of citizenship – and those, conversely, that contaminate the health and purity of the social body, which must be quarantined ‘for the greater good’. Racism, predicated upon Social Darwinism, informs what the norm is, precipitating the demarcation of biopolitical caesura within a given population. Like an immune system producing antibodies to expel pathogens from the body, this entails a process of ‘permanent purification’, in which ‘contaminant bodies’ are regularly expunged to maintain the overall health and equilibrium of the social body.\(^{150}\)

The insights shared from whānau across the Ruatoki Valley demonstrate that, in a biopolitical framework, the Tūhoe body is an abnormal and aleatory component that threatens the purity of the broader population. Its violent ‘excision’ therein is evidenced by the numerous aggressive and unrestrained paramilitary operations over the last decade. These policing practices continue to be informed by the discourses of ‘Tūhoe savagery’ still in circulation, grotesquely demonstrated by the detainment of Whaea Kēkē Awhi and her young children in the garage in 2007. In commenting on those raids, then Police Commissioner Peter Marshall offered the following statement:

> And four search warrants were executed in Ruatoki. And I want to tell you that eighteen firearms of various description were located at those four addresses. In fact there was a pistol, loaded, under the mattress of one of the occupants of one of the addresses. Some of the firearms were loaded, some of them were hidden. It was a serious situation which required a serious response … So I make absolutely no apology at all for the investigation, for the arrests and the prosecution. And I think the New Zealand Police did a wonderful job and should be thanked by the public for getting rid of that rot out of the Ureweras at that particular time … We didn’t choose the Ureweras. It could easily have been the Riverhead Forest, or indeed, the Akatarawa Ranges. We were drawn to that area because of the antics of those particular people involved in serious criminal offending from our point of view. It was that serious. They brought shame on the people.

\(^{150}\) See Derrida (Derrida, Habermas, and Borradori, 2003) and Esposito (2011) for their thinking on the biopolitics of ‘autoimmunity’. While a potentially fruitful avenue of exploration for my thesis project, I have left their thinking for another time.
in those various locations up and down the country. And they brought shame to the people of Ruatoki. If we were to consider the harm done to the people of Ruatoki and other areas where search warrants were executed … Often when I’ve gone to addresses I’ve found innocent people who happen to be there. I’ve found people who’ve been visiting the address during the course of search warrants. I’ve found neighbours who’ve been affected, and I’ve found people in the area who have been affected as a result of road blocks. Those people have often been inconvenienced, some of them have been distressed, some of them have been fearful. To those people, I say I’m sorry that they were inconvenienced, that they were distressed, or they were fearful. But, make no mistake, there is no apology in relation to those people who caused us to be involved in this serious criminal investigation … I fully support the Police officers involved in this investigation. I fully support the approach they took. They did it in a very considered way, in a very professional way. They abided by the law all the way through, well done to them. And as I say again, I think the New Zealand Police is owed a debt of gratitude by the public of this country (New Zealand Police, 2012).

Nowhere is the biopolitical logic of purification more ardently manifest than in Marshall’s determined metaphor, of “getting rid of that rot out of the Ureweras”, a position he unreservedly makes no apology for. It is also notable that Marshall views the Riverhead Forest and Akatarawa Ranges as geographically comparable to Te Urewera. As forested mountains far beyond the urban metropolis, these are ‘outer areas’ that demarcate the boundary between savagery and civility – a context, I suggest, Marshall was gesturing to in his comment. “We had no option but to act in the interests of public safety”, Marshall elsewhere described of Operation Eight (Premium Official News, 2012), underscoring that its execution was in the interests of the overall health and wellbeing of the population. This is further reflected through his posturing that the public ‘owe a debt of gratitude’ to the police, in keeping law-abiding citizens safe from such threats.

In his congratulatory remark to the police for a ‘job well and professionally done’, Marshall simultaneously whitewashes the violence experienced by whānau on October 15, rendering this an ‘acceptable loss’. This is reinforced by his deflection of blame (for police behaviour during the raids) away from the police, and instead towards the targets of Operation Eight itself. In the end, however, a litany of experiences of state violence have been precipitated. The net effect of
this is that each of these instances reinforces the sovereignty of the New Zealand settler colonial state at the expense of Tūhoe existence. Here, the violent logic of settler sovereignty has no choice but to view Indigenous peoples as a constant internal threat, so long as it is does not recognise their own sovereign existence.


To summarise, since the punitive Crown confiscations of Tūhoe land in 1866, there have been five major paramilitary Police operations upon Tūhoe communities, the majority of which have targeted the Ruatoki Valley. While the nuance of context varies greatly between each raid, especially that of the 1916 invasion of Maungapōhatu and the Ruatoki raids of the last decade, I assert that each of them represents a re-enactment of originary violence in the shoring up of state sovereignty. As Rawinia Higgins has similarly commented, “The police raids in Rūātoki on 15 October 2007 echo a history of turmoil and injustice that Tūhoe has had to endure in maintaining their Mana Motuhake [(sovereignty)]” (2008: 205). Watson and Moreton-Robinson stipulate that such ‘re-enactments’ must be regularly performed, as this process requires constant upkeep (Watson, 2009: 48). For whānau of Ruatoki and Onepū, the 2007, 2012, 2014 and 2016 paramilitary incursions were contemporary iterations of this experience, as corporeal manifestations of the on-going violent legitimisation of state sovereignty. Tūhoe life is, therefore, characterised by an on-going state of exception. Upon the frontier of Te Urewera, where the norm is most dangerously threatened, the state will unreservedly deploy its arsenal in response to what it deems a threat. The Ruatoki raids, as Jackson explains, remain “symptomatic of an ongoing exercise of colonising power” (2008: 6).

One critic, with expertise in intelligence and security, has suggested that the ‘real reasons’ for the 2007 raids “[were] far more prosaic; ordinary and everyday. It was a simple police cock up.
Fuelled, I agree, by ongoing ignorance, paranoia and racism, but mostly by simple incompetence and ineptitude” (Te Putatara, 2015). My discussion here does not disregard this perspective (nor, more importantly, is it one I am qualified to speak on), but rather highlights the dangers of seeing any of the raids upon Tūhoe as isolated events or ‘simple police cock ups’.

Viewing the raids as exceptional risks ignoring the historic colonial violence experienced by Tūhoe over the last two hundred years. In line with Watson, Moreton-Robinson, and Foucault’s theorisations, I argue that the raids were not exceptional, but nominal and routine functions of the settler colonial state. Therefore, while the granular detail of each raid may vary, a poststructuralist reading of Tūhoe history reveals how the state has continued to maintain its sovereignty and dominance over Indigenous peoples through re-enactments of originary violence, exemplified in Ruatoki, and, more recently, Onepū, over the last decade.

Vijay Devadas (2008: 138-142) has already explored how the 2007 raids were reflective of the functions of biopower, state racism, and ‘purification’, whereby the Tūhoe body was excised from the populace. My discussion builds on Devadas’ argument to demonstrate how this process has vehemently continued in the decade since his publication. As he explains, “the arrests and media reportage [during Operation 8] are more about managing indigenous life, indigenous sovereignty, as a threat that must be violently dealt with to secure the wellbeing or security of the rest of the population.” This is potently demonstrated by the raids that have continued to target Ruatoki whānau in the years following Operation Eight. This, then, is a fundamental “investment [that] ensures the continuation of a racialised state sovereignty” (ibid. 141–2), and is how the state is able to maintain its right to exist (ibid. 124). When these experiences are set against the historical background of broader Crown hostilities over the last two centuries, what becomes clear, per Agamben’s logic, is that Tūhoe remain an existential threat to the settler colonial state itself.
CONCLUSION

My discussions here have highlighted the different ways Indigenous life is managed by the New Zealand settler colonial state in the twenty-first century. I have explored how, in the interests of the ‘purity’ of the social body, certain Indigenous ‘contaminants’ are ‘let to die’, whereby the sovereignty of the state is violently reinforced by quarantining and expelling these from the body politic. Per Agamben, the Tūhoe experiences of this violence demonstrate that Tūhoe themselves exist within a permanent state of exception, in which the ‘juridical order’ has been suspended, precipitating the abhorrent treatment of whānau by the state. Through the ongoing experiences of state violence, we can conceive of the numerous paramilitary raids on Tūhoe whānau as the corporeal process of the shoring up of state sovereignty, in which Te Urewera endures as a contemporary site of originary violence. Such re-enactments of originary violence are not exceptional, but routine functions of the settler colonial state. As Moreton-Robinson urged, the Crown retains a vested interest in the reiteration of its supremacy – a task that requires constant upkeep – and for Tūhoe, this manifests in violent reinscriptions of state authority upon the frontier of Te Urewera. It is through the lived experiences of tamariki, pakeke, kuia and koro of Tūhoe whānau that the violent operation of state power is traumatically felt. This serves as a stark reminder that the articulation of biopower, through the machinations of the settler colonial state, continues to render the Tūhoe body a disposable and expendable material.

Over a century ago, in the aftermath of the 1916 police raid, Karaitiana Rarere of Ngāti Kahungunu offered the following lament: “I weep for what has just happened at Maungapohatu in Tuhoe. The Police raid seems to be about punishing Kenana for questioning the Crown and will only take us back in the mists of fear and doubt…I wonder if we will ever stop worrying when it might happen again” (Jackson, 2007). As the stories interwoven throughout this
chapter have revealed, Karaitiana’s concern appears to have been well founded. “It makes me ask the question,” commented Reverend Te Kaawa in relation to this, “What have the Crown got against Tūhoe’? It seems to happen every generation!”151 Similarly, remarked Whaea Kēkē Awhi, “This is not a new thing, and it’s still continuing in different ways.”152 As Reverend Te Kaawa and I ended our kōrero, I asked, “Do you worry that something like Onepū could happen again?” “Absolutely,” he responded. “Absolutely.”
CHAPTER VII: MATEMATE-Ā-ONE

INTRODUCTION

Land is the central, defining feature of Indigenous existence, and the articulation of sovereignty – that is, the struggle over territory and resources – has been the principal thread interwoven throughout this thesis. Tūhoe’s sovereign claim is an adamantine bond interlaced within the soil, rocks, and greenery of Te Urewera since time immemorial, but that claim was displaced through ‘sword and musket’ as foreign people and ideas cascaded into the evergreen landscape some two hundred years ago. In drawing this dissertation to a close, this chapter explores in more depth the intimate and hallowed relationship between Tūhoe and Te Urewera – that is,
between people and place – through the unique philosophy of matemate-ā-one, ‘death born of earth’.

RELEGITIMISATION OF STATE SOVEREIGNTY

The enmeshment of people and place is what the settler colonial state finds so threatening, for Tūhoe have greater ontological and existential legitimacy in a landscape nonetheless dominated by Crown strategies of extermination. Building from my analyses thus far, I explore in this chapter the following hypothesis: in a settler colonial context, the biopolitical equation of purification, in maintenance of the ‘norm’, is fundamentally premised on the negation of Indigenous sovereignty, the extermination of Indigenous peoples, and the dispossession of their lands and estates. That Tūhoe continue to live in communities scattered throughout Te Urewera and beyond renders the colonial project a failure, and the state – aware of its inadequacies in this regard – strives, through multiple violent means, to stake its own claim.

I begin by contrasting European notions of land and sovereignty to matemate-ā-one. In essence, matemate-ā-one denotes the identity between people and place, a union rendered immortal through Tūhoe’s ancestral ties to the land itself. Continuing this theme, I then return to a Foucauldian frame of thinking to illustrate the central nature of land to Tūhoe existence. I offer an alternative reading of ‘somatechnics’, a theoretical framework highlighting the essential role technology plays in shaping life, to instead suggest that for Tūhoe, land is the techné, or technology, that gives rise to life. Matemate-ā-one concerns the relationship between people and place as much as it does between people themselves, and I also explore how manaaki – as an expression of this – offers a critical counterpoint to biopower, as a mode of existence that is not premised on violent biopolitical caesuras.
This segues into examining how the police might better develop rapport and relationships with Tūhoe, and the Ruatoki Valley in particular, drawing again upon perspectives of whānau of the Whārua. The ongoing difficulty, however, is that the state only ‘knows’ Tūhoe through discourses of savagery and aggression, which continues to inform the violence inflicted therein. The final section of this chapter returns to the theme of representation, offering a small collection of photographs taken in and around Ruatoki, mostly captured during my time there in 2016 and 2017. These photos not only provide glimpses into the everyday nature of Ruatoki life, but more importantly, are representations untethered to such notions of violence, providing an alternative way of ‘knowing’, and therefore ‘interacting’, with Tūhoe. Let us begin through a close examination of how land is conceptualised, both to the state and Tūhoe.

**Continental conceptualisations of land and sovereignty**

Notions of bounded space are central to European conceptualisations of land. From the sixteenth century, the world as it was seen, experienced, and understood came to be known in terms of boundaries which demarcated ‘your place’ from ‘my place’. While the essence here of rights to land are by no means unique to the northern hemisphere, it was here that the European concept of sovereignty evolved, in which “…control of a territory becomes the foundation of sovereignty [itself]” (Neocleous, 2003: 411). Such control is most ardently expressed at the interface – or border – between neighbouring states, precipitating a “permanent policing of territorial boundaries. States become and remain ‘sovereign’ not just in the sense that they are all-powerful within their territories, but also because they police the borders of a particular space and claim to ‘represent’ the citizens within those borders” (ibid. 411). This echoes Foucault’s reflection that state power concentrates at the outer edges of society, where the ‘norm’ of life and the ‘order of things’ remains jeopardised. Central to this ‘border patrol’ is the necessarily aggressive nature of this process, demonstrated equally in
practice as in etymology: it is no coincidence, as we have seen, that *terra* (*land, territory*) and terror (to frighten) share a genealogical foundation. This etymological logic rests beneath Neocleous (2003) and Watson’s (2009) observations that the state is born of a ‘founding’ or ‘originary’ violence, a violence that must be perpetually maintained and re-enacted to ensure the existential legitimacy of the state itself. Colonisation is, therefore, an on-going war for territory and the bounties it holds, and in contemporary settler colonial states, this assumes a distinctly biopolitical charge.

**MONEY AND LAND: EPHEMERALITY AND ETERNITY**

Maintaining the settler colonial status quo, therefore, is to maintain the state’s sovereign control of land and resources. A brief collection of examples, some of which I have already outlined in earlier chapters, highlights this point. The *1896 Urewera District Native Reserve Act*, envisioned by then Premier Richard Seddon to provide Tūhoe with autonomy in law, was successively undermined by consecutive administrations following its legal ascension. As Brooking argued, the promise of autonomy the Act purported to provide (however genuine Seddon’s intentions) was frustrated by the operation of a settler colonial government (2014: 212). Moreover, by 1907 the Crown had made Te Urewera subject to the 1905 Mining Act, allowing it to grant mining and prospecting licences without the General Committee’s consent (thereby overriding their authority), should it be revealed that the region was minerally abundant (Binney 2009: 499, 510).

More recently, what had been the anchor of the Tūhoe-Crown settlement negotiations – that Te Urewera National Park be repatriated to Tūhoe – was removed from the ambit of negotiations through executive intervention by John Key in 2010 (Morning Report, 2010a). Condemned by Tūhoe and non-Tūhoe alike, some whānau aired concerns that this was a move
by the then National government to exploit Te Urewera for its mineral wealth (Morning Report, 2010b), who at that exact time was signalling this very possibility for New Zealand’s conservation estate (Chug, 2010). The subsequent $170 million 2014 Tūhoe settlement arrived at a compromise of “shared management of Te Urewera National Park” (National Business Review, 2012), establishing the Urewera Board comprised of both Tūhoe and Crown representatives. The unique aspect of the legislation in question, *Te Urewera Act 2014*, was, however, the granting of legal personhood upon Te Urewera. Although lauded as “ground-breaking” (*Gisborne Herald*, 2017) and “undoubtedly legally revolutionary here in Aotearoa New Zealand and on a world scale” (Ruru, 2014), the Act shares one essential characteristic with its (modified) historical counterpart from 1896:

Throughout *Te Urewera Act* the legislation is clear that Te Urewera may still be mined. Section 64(1) is one example of this where it states: ‘Despite anything in this Act, Te Urewera land is to be treated as if it were Crown land described in Schedule 4 of the Crown Minerals Act 1991’ (see also s 56(b) where a mining activity authorised by the Crown Minerals Act can be undertaken without authorisation from the Board) (Ruru, 2014).

‘Despite anything in this Act’, proclaims the legislation, Crown sovereignty is paramount. As is clear from Ruru’s analysis, the authority of the Board can be circumvented by Crown interests, *precisely* the case with Tūhoe’s General Committee over a century ago. While the 1896 and 2014 Acts may have been innovations in their own right – and in echoing the thinking of Wolfe, Brooking, Moreton-Robinson and Watson – both underscore the fundamental reality that settler sovereignty is supreme, its control over its territorial bounty equally so.

In 2017, I attended a guest lecture at the University of Otago that, at one point, claimed the 2014 Act provided Tūhoe with regional autonomy. To this, I respectfully disagreed. Sovereignty  
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153 For more detail about the Tūhoe-Crown settlement, see New Zealand Government (2018a, 2018b).
is *unqualified* autonomy, and the superseding authority of the *Crown Minerals Act* upon Te Urewera is unquestioningly an absolute qualification. Since their earliest clashes with the Crown nearly two hundred years ago, Tūhoe have long asserted the desire for regional autonomy of their own affairs, while recognising (and respecting) the Crown’s sovereign existence exterior of Te Urewera. Seddon attempted to find a way of expressing this through law, but these efforts immediately unravelled in the decades that followed 1896. Similarly, any hint of endowing Tūhoe with a measure of autonomy – through repatriation of Te Urewera – was resolutely rejected by Key in 2010. In this way, therefore, the $170 million settlement *in no way* provided full and unqualified autonomy to Ngāi Tūhoe, and nor, more importantly, was it ever designed to. My discussion here highlights the following colonial axiom: ‘You can have money, for that is ephemeral, but you cannot have the land, for that is eternal.’

The settler colonial state is incapable of recognising any other sovereignty except for its own – two suns may not share a single horizon. Invoking Agamben, Indigenous peoples and their sovereignties – which, while *displaced*, were not *ceded* – endure as a constant internal threat, and must circumscribed by any means necessary. Despite this, the broader question remains – why does the state respond with such excessive violence in dealing with Tūhoe *in particular*, in comparison to other iwi? Indeed, why is the state so threatened by Tūhoe existence? I have attempted to respond to this throughout my various discussions thus far, but I shall take this moment to reply in brevity: Tūhoe are the land as much as the land is Tūhoe. Allow me to explain.

---

154 Generated through my own reflection.
Matemate-ā-one

By contrast to control over territory through violence, Tūhoe’s sovereign mantle instead comes from within the earth itself. While I have repeated this point throughout this thesis, I have left it until now to explore in more depth the relationship people and place, which, for Tūhoe, is encapsulated by the philosophy of matemate-ā-one: a ‘uniquely Tūhoe philosophical and conceptual framework’ (Te Awekotuku and Nikora, 2003: 21). As esteemed Tūhoe leader Pou Temara remarked, matemate-ā-one “…literally translates to ‘death born of earth,’[;] death that makes life precious and interconnected” (Liu and Temara, 1998: 138), gesturing to the unbreakable bond between Te Urewera and its people. For Professor Ngahuia Te Awekotuku and Linda Nikora, the primal expression of this symbiosis is between “people [and] the environment which nurtures them”, and forms the central basis of a Tūhoe worldview (Te Awekotuku and Nikora, 2003: 21). As Te Awekotuku has elsewhere described, this translates to a “craving for a particular place: a relationship with one’s forebears. A sense of timeless belonging, of blood within the earth, across the waves, and in the skies” (Liu and Temara, 1998: 142).

The core value here – of maintaining relationships – is articulated as much through the interface between people and place as it is between people themselves, which is why matemate-ā-one is a “living philosophy practiced by a living, dynamic community, in which the values sustain the people who continue the values” (ibid. 22). Land – Te Urewera – is the pillar of Tūhoe existence, an altar tended to by generations of descendants, that has provided shelter and sustenance in kind. For, as the phrase itself reiterates, death, for Tūhoe, is born of the earth. The duality of meaning encoded in the word ‘whenua’ (land and placenta, both of which nurture and provide), articulated through the common phrase, 'tangata whenua', anchors this significance for Māori in general, but for Tūhoe, as a people literally born of the earth, this is
markedly amplified by matemate-ā-one. By contrast to understanding land as territory held through acts of violence, matemate-ā-one invites us to recognise the eternal bond and relationship between Tūhoe and Te Urewera.

While Tūhoe’s historical exercise of mana whenua has, at times, involved warfare, the more pressing issue is that Tūhoe’s existential legitimacy transcends time and space, and is fundamental to their ancestral identity. “[L]and is a central aspect of our personal and cultural identity”, wrote preeminent Tūhoe academic John Rangihau in the mid-1970s (1975: 158), a sentiment echoed by other Tūhoe leaders: “[It is] essentially a feeling of genuine relationships and behaviour between people, place and property” described Tamaro Nikora, and for Wharehuia Milroy, “Matemateaone grows from within the group, knowing and getting to know each other. The physical cues such as trees, mountains, rivers and kainga (villages) etc. are all factors that activate matemateaone” (Te Awekotuku and Nikora, 2003: 22-3). Matemate-ā-one is, therefore, a way of living that does not involve relationships between land and people premised upon violence (\( \frac{\text{terra}}{\text{terror}} \)).

Matemate-ā-one features little in literature about Tūhoe, and as Te Awekotuku and Nikora note, “[the term] does not occur in the prolific writings of Elsdon Best.” This, however, might suggest “…that it was simply taken for granted by the locals [Best] interviewed [and thus unnoticed by him]” (ibid. 21). For whānau today, its permeation into everyday Tūhoe experiences is palpable, as Koro Bill reflected on his participation in the Vietnam war:

Nā Tūhoe tēnā kupu [(Matemate-ā-one/ is a word from within Tūhoe)]. Basically, [matemate-ā-one is] the love for everything, ki te whenua, ki nga manu [(to the land and birds)]; covers everything, [like] whakapapa. Anything that features for you, in your world. Haere au ki te whawahai [(I went to war)]... I a au i Burnham, i kite au i tetahi mapi, patai ki te sergeant [(While I was at the training camp in Burnham, I saw a map and asked the sergeant about it)], [‘Why is New Zealand and Australia printed in gold on the map?’] ‘Cos … President Suharto, he wants to rule [us]. He wants us to be under
Indonesians’ [replied the sergeant] … My love for our country came first above everything else – to keep our country free of communism. [It means a] deep love for the land. McDonalds doesn’t just come out of the shop .... [it] comes from the land. Everything we have, we do, comes from the land … And [as] soldiers – we’re told we have to fight for our country. That is our love for the Queen. Love of your kai, love of your beef burger, everything in your world. Kāore te mea kotahi [(it is not simply one thing)] … [P]iiki kupu tērā [(That is a word of significant gravitas)].

At its core, then, matemate-ā-one denotes the nourishment of relationships, the primordial template of which is that between land and people: “[Te Urewera] provides us with a sense of belonging and locatedness within the world. For as much as Tuhoe is Te Urewera, Te Urewera is Tuhoe. Each belongs to the other … Te Urewera and Tuhoe – the place, the people – are synonymous” (Te Awekotuku and Nikora, 2003: 19, 9). As Wolfe similarly recognises in his deliberations upon the logic of elimination, “So far as Indigenous people are concerned, where they are is who they are, and not only by their own reckoning” (Wolfe, 2006: 388).

July 2017

“Tikina he wahie”, 156 Aunty Waicy said to her moko during our kōrero of her upbringing in the Valley. Ruatoki’s heat in summer is matched only by its cold in winter, and as the fire roared back into life, she pointed to her recent and distant ūpuna adorning the wall. As she moved from ancestor to ancestor, she told stories of each of them, before turning to her own childhood. “Piikiwhara ia, ana o a te māka tēnā mea!”, she said at one point, our kōrero being conducted entirely in te reo. Unfamiliar with those terms, I asked, “He aha wērā kupu ka whakamahia, ana ko te ‘piikiwhara’ me te ‘oa te māka’?”157 Aunty Waicy laughed, saying, “Oh! Nā Tūhoe ēnā kupu; ko te piikiwhara te 'big fella'; ko te oa te māka te 'over the mark'”. “Kua taka te kapa!” 158 I said, joining in on the laughter. After combing through numerous dictionaries, I couldn’t find these or many other words whānau had variously used, and soon realised they were special and unique words within the Tūhoe dialect.
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155 Kōrero with Koro Bill, 10 July 2016.
156 ‘Fetch some firewood.’ Translation mine.
157 ‘What do those words mean, ‘piikiwhara’ and ‘oa te māka’?’ Translation mine.
158 ‘Oh! Those are Tūhoe words; ‘piikiwhara’ means ‘big fella’; ‘oa te māka’ means ‘over the mark’’. ‘Ah, the penny has dropped!’ Translation mine.
COMPETING SOVEREIGNTIES

The conflict between Tūhoe and the Crown is perhaps best understood as a competition of sovereignties, with one inexorably eclipsing the other. At its heart, then, Tūhoe are perceived as an existential threat to the state because of their superior sovereign claim of guardianship over the land, a prerogative born of the earth and voiced through the leaves, rocks, crested peaks and flowing rivers of Te Urewera. I suggest that when the body of the person and land are one, as here with Tūhoe, they are viewed as a greater biopolitical threat. Despite the state’s resolve, however, Tūhoe have survived sustained attacks – through various manifestations – upon their existence and way of life. The critical issue is that European conceptualisations of land are premised on the singular sovereignty of the state: multiple co-existing sovereignties are anathema to this modality. To reiterate my point here, and following Agamben’s thinking on the state of exception (2005), as long as the state does not recognise the legitimacy of other forms of sovereignty, it has no choice but to view Tūhoe (and Indigenous peoples more generally) as a persistent internal threat. As long as this is the case, the state’s behaviour towards Tūhoe will remain tethered to, and informed by, this violent, unstable logic. Yet, as this thesis has attested, Tūhoe life continues on, and matemate-ā-one remains an everyday philosophy of day-to-day living. We continue with this theme of Tūhoe-Te Urewera synonymity as we explore the theoretical framework of somatechnics.

SOMATECHNICS: SHAPING LIFE THROUGH TECHNOLOGIES

We return at this juncture to Foucault’s meditations on biopower, and the micro and macro expressions of this through disciplinary power and biopolitics. While these are distinctive poles – that is, one operates at the level of the individual body; the other, that of the species – they
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159 Consider, for example, the overtly violent manner in which the Spanish state responded to Catalan desires for indepence (Al Jazeera, 2017).
are not antithetical, and indeed, are connected to one another. This nexus, for Foucault, was established through sexuality, and is why he dedicated himself to composing a discursive history on the topic (Foucault, 1978; Pugliese and Stryker, 2009: 3). For critical scholars Joseph Pugliese and Susan Stryker (2009), sexuality alone does not explain the relationship between these two modalities of power. Instead, they offer an alternative frame of reference that emphasises the role technologies play in shaping (or disciplining) individual bodies towards biopolitical objectives, quoined by researchers at Macquarie University in the then Department of Critical and Cultural Studies as ‘somatechnics’.

The term combines the Greek-derived words for body – soma – and technology – techné – to denote that “…material corporeality (soma) is inextricably conjoined with the techniques and technologies (technics) through which bodies are formed and transformed” (ibid. 1; see also Haraway, 1991). In other words, our everyday lives are – to more or lesser degrees – affected and influenced by technologies: “[e]mbodiment is always biocultural, always techno-organic, always a practical achievement realized through some concrete means … [W]e have never existed except in relation to the techné of symbolic manipulation, divisions of labor, means of shelter and sustenance, and so forth” (ibid. 2, my emphasis).

This is a useful theoretical matrix to uncover the ostensibly apolitical role of technologies in producing individuals as subjects (and therefore subject to power relations), exemplified in the normalising effect of wearable technologies like health motivation devices (or apps), that appraise users in relation to standardised norms (such as whiteness) (Nicholls, 2016, see particularly pp. 105-7). Somatechnic analyses have been applied to a broad variety of areas, including, for example, transgender studies and critical examinations of race, stemming from the desire to keep the definition of somatechnics “somewhat improvisational and provisionally
sketched out” (Pugliese and Stryker, 2009: 2). It is this definitional latitude that provides me with the opportunity to consider more carefully the imbrication of people and place for Tūhoe existence.

Matemate-ā-one: A productive somatechnics of mana whenua

In turning this reading of somatechnics on its head, I would like to instead suggest that for Tūhoe, the land itself is the *techne* through which existence is realised. As a people rendered of and from the earth, it is the land that has nurtured, provided, and shaped Tūhoe for generation after generation. Tending to cultivations and animals upon farms in the Ruatoki Valley, tamariki embarking on adventures across Te Tāhū o Haokitaha, or to the river during the intensity of summer’s heat, and whānau gathering upon marae to celebrate new life or farewell lives lived, reveals the somatechnical potential of land to mould Tūhoe as Tūhoe. Feet touching earth enfolds one as the other, where the most primal connection – between Te Urewera and its descendants – is reified each day as Ruatoki whānau continue to exist as communities bound by kinship and ancestry, an existence anchored by the earth itself. Tūhoe are kissed by the land, and caressed into maturity through its provision of life, underscoring the reality that Tūhoe and Te Urewera are one in the same (Te Awekotuku and Nikora, 2003).

Somatechnically, therefore, land is the embodiment of life. The ancient practice of burying whenua in the land serves to maintain this sacred, intimate relationship, its repetition of practice amongst Tūhoe in Te Urewera an on-going articulation and reawakening of matemate-ā-one. For Tūhoe descendants living afar from their ancestral landscapes, this potentiality endures, as their bloodlines are eternally – and *genetically* – tied to the vast reaches of Te Urewera. Tūhoe’s mana whenua – that is, their ancestral jurisdiction over the land – is informed by matemate-ā-one, as a claim exceeding infinitely beyond the state’s brief existence.
I would like to suggest, therefore, that matemate-ā-one might be thought of as a productive somatechnics of belonging to land that the state cannot – and will not ever – extinguish.

**MANAAKI: A CRITICAL COUNTERPOINT TO BIOPower**

As I described earlier, matemate-ā-one refers also to relationships amongst people. Manaaki, or manaakitanga,\(^{160}\) is a mode of socio-political organisation, and offers a critical counterpoint to biopower as a form of population management.\(^{161}\) Biopower concerns the extraction of maximum productive potential from the social body, where certain bodies (white, able-bodied and so on) are valorised, while aleatory bodies are purged and discarded to ensure the overall health, integrity and prosperity from the population. Conversely, throughout my time spent in the Ruatoki Valley, elders, pakeke and tamariki alike have reiterated the fundamental Tūhoe value of manaaki tangata (‘be kind and generous to people’), and I was a privileged recipient of significant manaaki while I was there.

In Māori society more broadly, manaaki remains a fundamental cultural practice that establishes and maintains relationships over generations. Manaakitanga “centres on the ideal of giving in order to receive and therefore maintain (or establish) authority, prestige, and status, hence manaaki being a derivative of ‘mana’ [authority, prestige, power, and influence]. The more one [gives] the greater one’s mana” (Kawharu, 1998: 30). Thus, kin would “become powerful [through] the capacity to negotiate mutually rewarding relationships” (Durie, 2001: 82). Manaakitanga is, therefore, the ultimate manifestation of mana (ibid. 83), the practice of which served to stitch together the social and political fabric of Māori society. For Tūhoe, manaaki tangata is encapsulated by the ancient proverb ‘Tūhoe moumou kai’ (‘Tūhoe wasters

\(^{160}\) ‘Manaaki’ is the verb; ‘manaakitanga’ is the derived noun thereof.

\(^{161}\) A modified version of this discussion appeared in my 2017 article *Trouble on the Frontier*. 
of food’), which bespeaks the great sacrifices made in the practice of manaaki tangata. During part of our kōrero, Uncle Smokey explained:\ref{162}

![Image: Uncle Smokey explaining]

We’ve always been told to feed people from off the road, no matter what. Sick, kei te mate, he aha anō, tiaki ana. Tiakina, he tangata tērā, koira te tikanga o taua kōrero [(Regardless of if they are sick or otherwise indisposed, be kind to them, nurse them, and feed them. That there is a person; be good to them. That’s the essence of that saying)].

In one of my kōrero with Mum over a cup of tea and some freshly made frybread and homemade jam, she spoke of her son, Whare, Waitangi’s older brother: “Given a chance, Whare would feed the world.” Mum and Uncle Smokey’s words together exemplify the disjuncture between Tūhoe value systems, and state practices of population management critiqued by Foucault. In a Tūhoe worldview, interactions with people are occasions to extend manaaki, where ‘bodies’ are rendered not as exploitable and disposable resources, but opportunities for strengthening one’s mana.

\begin{table}
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|l|}
\hline
\textbf{11 February 2017} \\
\hline
It’s a hushed, quiet evening in the Valley. The moon is brilliantly radiant, the night bathed in a vanilla, milky light. The clouds have abandoned the skyline to reveal the lunar spectacle above, the stars sparkling in effervescent union above the Valley’s expanse. A cool wind soothes the remnant heat on the ground. Earlier this afternoon, Des and I took the tamariki down to the river to cool off, before heading over to her and Whare’s place for a kai. Boil up with pork bones and watercress – a treat for this ‘city Māori’! After our kai, Des and I chatted as we did the dishes, her on washing, me on tea towel duty. “Netball, athletics, league and rugby”, she said, describing how she takes four of her tamariki regularly go into town or nearby cities for their various sports activities. “Wow, lots of logistics there!”, I said, Des nodding in agreement. Dishes done, we sit down at the dinner table, and Whare joins us for a cup of coffee before I head off. As the sun vanishes, I take my leave and the dogs join me on the walk back.

PhD work going really, really well. Tomorrow – head back to help Des and Whare stack their wood.

Time for bed I think. Pō mārie.
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\ref{162} Kōrero with Uncle Smokey and Whaea Kēkē Awhi, 23 December 2016.
Two further examples illustrate this discussion. In the aftermath of the blundered 2014 raid on the Teepa homestead, the Police Area Commander from Whakatāne met with the Teepa whānau to offer his apologies. Waitangi’s sister, Juanita, explained to me that despite the intensity of the raid, and the wake of trauma it had left in its path, Mum and Dad offered manaaki to the officer and invited him in for a kai and a cup of tea. The Area Commander refused, citing that as he was on duty, it would be inappropriate for him to accept. To be offered manaaki by his hosts, amidst the repercussions of a severely violent raid executed under his jurisdiction, and then for that manaaki to be refused due to the minutiae of ‘appropriate procedure’, is the height of indignity and insult. “[W]e’ve offered you hospitality and you’ve [thrown it in our faces]”, narrates Juanita as she recalls the encounter.163 “What does [manaakitanga] look like?”, ponders Waitangi.164 “It looks like a whānau that’s been raided, [who have then] put their feelings aside [to] host you – the person who [has] done wrong to me – to provide you with this kai; and you turn around and you spit on it.” Waitangi’s explanation echoes that the exercise of manaaki often comes at great sacrifice, which in this case exacerbates the Area Commander’s reaction. His behaviour not only represents an astonishing level of cultural ignorance and disrespect, but also reiterates how manaaki is a discrete approach to socio-political organisation that valorises relationships, not certain bodies at the expense of others.

The final, and equally compelling example from my fieldwork, emerges from one of my conversations with Angie about the 2007 raids, and the manaaki extended to the Police and AOS officers. She explains:165

163 Kōrero with Juanita, 22 January 2017 [JT22012017].
164 Kōrero with Waitangi, 6 October 2017 [WT06102017].
165 Kōrero with Angie, 15 February 2017 [AH15022017].
You know what our community did for the police? They were based [on the rugby field] 24/7 … The police stayed there overnight, and it was cold, and [raining]. It was really, really cold. And it was raining … So it was cold, raining, wet [and] our community were feeding them … I remember my mother taking kai to them, my nannies, stopping in and taking [kai to them], cos [the police and AOS officers there] were only young. They were really young boys, frightened looking young boys. And the maternal instinct kicking in for our kuia, who go and take them kai, hot kai, cup of tea. They started looking after these boys who were stuck there because we were 'terrorists'. They were stuck there to monitor us … They just stood there with their [paramilitary] gears … Two weeks they were based there … Our community [were] feeding these poor young boys. They seriously looked about 12 some of them, they looked so young. They were so young, and really courteous. Really, really courteous. Well, hey, of course you’re going to be polite and courteous when we’re being lovely to you. But that’s what our community started doing … And our nannies were feeling sorry for them, so we had our [Māori Women’s Welfare League] taking them hot scones and feeding them, [giving them] cups of tea … Even my mother [instructed us to manaaki them] … So yeah[, Mum told us], ‘Go and take those boys a cup of tea!’ ‘No Mum’, [, I responded]. ‘I don’t even know if they’re allowed to take kai!’ ’Of course they’re allowed to take kai!’[, she replied. ’] It’s dark and its wet!’ I think in the end she just drove down and took them food. And they were really grateful. … They’re just doing their job. [It was a simple matter of], ‘Let’s look after them cos they’re in our community’. And that’s exactly how [our] kuia saw it. They’re doing their job, and they’re in our community so let’s look after them.

In other words: manaaki overrides all other considerations, and the ethnographic examples detailed here powerfully demonstrate the proverbial ‘feeding of your enemy’. For, as one of my koro once explained to me when I was young, “hoariri [(enemy)] just means ‘angry friend’, and sometimes all he wants is a good feed.”166 This is comparable to Rua’s gestures of manaaki to the Police in 1916, epitomising the Tūhoe axiom, “If your enemy hunger[s], feed him” (Binney, Chaplin and Wallace, 1996: 91).

The practice of manaaki, then, demonstrates that Tūhoe can exist beyond hierarchical structures of biopower, and the violently divisive nature of biopolitical caesuras. The discursive depiction of Tūhoe as savage, violent, and primitive is the basis upon which such caesuras rest, but the practice of manaaki, which reaches across boundaries of class, race, gender, ability and
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166 ‘Hoa’ is the word for friend; ‘riri’ for angry.
so forth, renders this fundamentally ontologically unstable. Expressed otherwise, manaaki offers opportunities to disrupt and challenge these discursive formations. Offering a cup of tea – a quintessential New Zealand gesture of hospitality – is an articulation of resistance in destabilising stereotypes about Tūhoe. What the exercise of manaaki exemplifies, therefore, is that discourses, and the biopolitical caesuras they engender, do not preclude the possibility of resistance. Manaaki – and especially those instances of manaaki extended to the police – is a glimpse of one way in which that resistance might be realised.

EFFECTIVE POLICING

Many of the kōrero I had with whānau of the Valley broached the topic of the Tūhoe-police relationship, exploring how, from their perspective, the police might conduct themselves and ‘do their job’ better. I must admit this was not an area I initially considered exploring, but it consistently emerged throughout my ethnographic research as a key theme whānau wanted to deliberate upon. For every whānau I spoke with, this was because they wanted to build stronger and more positive relationships with the police, to ensure a safe and happy future for their tamariki and mokopuna. The repeated remark by whānau was that the Police need to actively use their kaitakawaenga Māori as conduits into Ruatoki, particularly to mitigate the impacts upon tamariki during Police operations such as raids (see also Radio New Zealand, 2013). As Waitangi succinctly summarised, “[W]hy not use your iwi liaison to do their job?” The role of kaitakawaenga Māori has been central to the way policing is conducted in New Zealand (Crawford 2008: 108-9), but as former Māori Police officer Luke Crawford has noted, “I know that some police leaders, particularly at the operational level, still struggle to believe that iwi liaison staff and Māori networks can be trusted to participate at these tables. This may be why decision-making around police actions at [Ruatoki] excluded … iwi liaison staff” (ibid. 110).
Nevertheless, in the decades prior to the twenty-first century, the local officer in Ruatoki was known as “Copper”, who knew all of the Whārue’s parents. Waitangi explains:

[Copper] knew that Dad knew everyone, so he was always at home. He knew Dad liked finishing, so he’d randomly turn up to the river just to chinwag about the day. But it wasn’t anything imposing like waiting at the river with his hand on his hip, and making you feel uncomfortable … And if you stopped to talk to him, that was kei te pai [(OK)]. And if you didn’t, that was kei te pai [(That was also OK)].

This, then, is what effective policing looks like in Ruatoki, as a rural Māori community where ‘South Auckland tactics don’t work.’ As Juanita explained, “…just [Copper’s] threat of ‘I’m going to tell your parents on you!’ was enough[!]” Building up trust and rapport is central to this, as she continues:

You know you understand that they have a job to do but it’s just that little bit of interpersonal stuff, [to] go out of your way to visit families – not to visit them because something was troubling them, but that you just happened to be in the Valley and decide, ‘Oh, may as well go and call in and see them.’ And if [Copper] happened to be out in the Valley, he’d just call in for a cup of tea. With that interpersonal stuff, you’re more cooperative.

Throughout my research, there was only one police officer who received unanimous praise from every whānau I spoke with: Constable Trish. A Pākehā officer from Whakatāne, Constable Trish regularly visits Te Wharekura o Ruatoki169 to teach the tamariki about things such as road safety, cycling, and so forth. “[O]ne of the really positive things, in terms of the police, is they have this Policewoman, Trish, that comes to the school, who does all these wonderful things with our kids”, describes Aunty Waicy. “So if anyone’s built bridges in terms of the children at our schools and the police, it’s Constable Trish.”170 Just prior to Christmas in 2016, I took some of the Teepa tamariki into Whakatāne to do some shopping, and at one point,  
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169 The principal primary and secondary school in the Ruatoki Valley.
170 Kōrero with Aunty Waicy, 6 June 2017 [AW06062017].
they saw Constable Trish, in police uniform, in the distance. The faces of the tamariki lit up as they saw her, and they cheerfully waved and called out to her. The embodied happiness of the tamariki upon glimpsing Constable Trish is a testament to her work in Ruatoki, and is a template for what effective policing might look like in the future for the Valley.

The concern I have, however, is that the great efforts of those like Constable Trish are undermined by the state’s continual raiding of Ruatoki (and Tūhoe) communities, an apprehension shared by many of those I spoke with. Moreover, it is particularly unhelpful in cases such as Helen ‘Nen’ Tulloch’s, a then-Police College applicant, who in 2016 was denied entry “because she was from Tūhoe and knew too many locals” (Forbes, 2016). As Juanita commented to me in reflecting upon the 2014 raid upon her homestead, “We were never a ‘f*ck the police’ [whānau]. Never have been. We’re not now, but we’re very wary now.”

There appears much work to be done for the Police to strengthen their relationship with whānau of the Ruatoki Valley.

ALTERNATIVE WAYS OF ‘KNOWING’ TŪHOE

We turn finally to the visualisation of elements of everyday Ruatoki life, composed through a short photographic essay. Having described in detail the intimate fusion between Tūhoe and Te Urewera, that is, between people and place, this section offers a window into viewing how matemate-ā-one is embodied in everyday existence. As the physical body is the principal focus of discourses of Tūhoe, the Tūhoe body itself presents us with ‘fault lines’ and ‘pressure points’ to produce “discursive counterpractices” (Halperin, 1995: 48) – ‘counter-attacks’ from the body, as Foucault described (1980: 56). The Tūhoe body – or rather, the photographs of Tūhoe people – is therefore, the means through which to resist the predominance of prevailing
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discourses, short-circuiting the power-knowledge duality that frames Tūhoe in reference to violence and savagery. This is to insist that other forms of representation are available and can be put into circulation, contesting racialised regimes of representation (Hall 1997b: 269), and interrupting prevailing discourses through transcoding (ascribing alternative meanings to visual symbols). More importantly, the state only ‘knows’ Tūhoe through discourses of savagery and aggression, a discursive rendering that informs the violence precipitated upon Tūhoe communities by the state. Alternative ways of ‘knowing’ Tūhoe – untethered from notions of violence – are expressed throughout the photographs that follow, and I hope that in providing such a modality of representation, the state may be invited to reconsider the way in which it interacts with Tūhoe.

The photos themselves demonstrate that counter-discourses – other realities – are always possible, and putting them into discursive circulation in the university archive, through my thesis, is a way of ‘speaking back’ to the colonial arrogation to know Tūhoe in particular ways. I have confidence that the reader is now in a position to engage with the photographs in this manner, without requiring further explanation from me. The photographs have been roughly arranged as if tracing a typical day’s activities, from sunrise to sunset in the Ruatoki Valley and its surrounds. The majority were taken during 2016 and 2017, but a small collection of them were taken by Tatsiana in the months after the 2014 raid. All of the photos here have been reproduced with the explicit permission of each whānau. It is time, then, for me to leave the photos to speak for, and unto, themselves.
Figure 52: Cows congregating for 5am milking on the Teepa farm. Ruatoki, 2017. Photograph by Tatsiana Chysanava.
Figure 53: Hinepūkohurangi returning to the mountains as day breaks. Ruatoki, 2016. Photograph by Pounamu Jade Aikman.
Figure 54: Des, Waitangi’s sister in law, amidst the flurry of early morning milking. Ruatoki, 2017. Photograph by Tatsiana Chysanava.
Figure 55: Brothers Te Wanea Ngakurukuru (*left*) and Whareauahi (*right*) in the homestead. Ruatoki, 2014. Photograph by Tatsiana Chyspanava.
'They wanted mohawks!', Whare explained. Ruatoki, 2017. Photograph by Tatsiana Chypsanava.
Figure 57: Kōhanga bound. Ruatoki, 2017. Photograph by Tatsiana Chypsanava.
Meanwhile, the older tamariki head off to kura. Ruatoki, 2016. Photograph by Tatsiana Chysanava.
Figure 59: Siblings Te Hemanawa (*left*) and Whareauahi (*right*) outside their kura, Te Wharekura o Ruatoki. Ruatoki, 2017. Photograph by Tatsiana Chypsanava.
Figure 60: Whare preparing to feed the calves. Ruatoki, 2017. Photograph by Tatsiana Chysanava.
Figure 61: 'Be careful around the animals', reads the sign. Ruatoki, 2017. Photograph by Tatsiana Chypsyana.
Figure 62: Dad herding cows on the farm. Ruatoki, 2017. Photograph by Tatsiana Chysanava.
Figure 63: Aunty Waicy during one of our kōrero sessions. Tāneatua, 2017. Photograph by Tatsiana Chypsanava.
Figure 64: Koro Bill flanked by his tūpuna and mokopuna, at his home close to the Pekatahi Bridge. Tāneatua, 2017. Photograph by Tatsiana Chypsanava.
April 2017

“Kua rakiraki aku heihei!” laughed Koro Bill on the phone. “Kua tae mae a Tangaroa, waipuketia te whenua. Anyway, ā hea koe tae mai ai? Kei te boil up au i tā tāua nei boil up!” I laughed as he spoke, and then replied, “Reka! Haramai au hei te hāpahi i te tekau mā rua, kei te pai tēnā?” “Āe, pai tēnā boy. Haramai.” I headed off for his home, the drizzle gradually turning into heavy, tear-shaped droplets, which cascaded across the windshield as I drove. After arriving, I made haste to the front door. “Haramai boy, kua reri tā tāua nei kai,” koro said as I walked inside. I was greeted by the eager chattering of pots on the stove, who together released a rich aroma that gave a welcome reprieve from the deluge outside. “Noho mai,” he said, gesturing to the seat around the dining room table. “Māu te karakia”, he said, and I offered a prayer of thanks. We feasted, the kūmara, pork and watercress a sumptuous way to begin the afternoon. We rested for a while, before clearing the table and washing the dishes. Soon thereafter, it was time to kōrero. “E koro, ko wai tēnā?”, I asked, pointing to the stately portrait of a rangatira gazing out from his elevated perch on the far wall. “Ā, ko Tamaikōha tēnā [see Figure 23], ko ia te koroua o taku māmā. I noho ia i Tauarau me Whakarae me Ruatāhuna hoki. He ingoa anō mōna ko Te Areare.” He continued, describing the great rangatira’s erudite knowledge of the land and bush of Te Urewera. “Ana ka haramai ngā Pākehā, ka kīa atu, ‘Homai tō ātua kia puru atu ahau i roto i taku paipa!’ Ana koinā.” I sat enthralled as koro went on to illustrate Tamaikōha’s life, occasionally glimpsing up towards the revered chieftain, who watched us in silent reflection.172

172 “My chickens have become ducks!”, laughed Koro Bill on the phone. “Tangaroa [(ancestral deity of the oceans)] has arrived, and the land is flooding. Anyway, when are you arriving? Our boil up is boiling up as we speak!” I laughed as he spoke, and then replied, “What a treat! I’ll be over at about half past twelve, does that sound OK?” “Of course.” I headed off for his home, the drizzle gradually turning into heavy, tear-shaped droplets, which cascaded across the windshield as I drove. After arriving, I made haste to the front door. “Come in boy, our feast is ready,” koro said as I walked inside. I was greeted by the eager chattering of pots on the stove, who together released a rich aroma that gave a welcome reprieve from the deluge outside. “Join us,” he said, gesturing to the seat around the dining room table. “Will you say grace?”, he said, and I offered a prayer of thanks. We feasted, the kūmara, pork and watercress a sumptuous way to begin the afternoon. We rested for a while, before clearing the table and washing the dishes. Soon thereafter, it was time to kōrero. “Koro, who is that?”, I asked, pointing to the stately portrait of a rangatira gazing out from his elevated perch on the far wall. “Ah, that is the grandfather of my mother – Tamaikōha. He lived in Tauarau, Whakarae, and Ruatāhuna. He’s also known as ‘Te Areare.'” He continued, describing the great chieftain’s erudite knowledge of the land and bush of Te Urewera. “When Pākehā and evangelists came, he once said, ‘Give me your god and I’ll put him in my pipe [to smoke]!’ And that was him.” I sat enthralled as Koro Bill went on to illustrate Tamaikōha’s life, occasionally glimpsing up towards the revered chieftain, who watched us in silent reflection.’ Translation mine.
Figure 65: The Teepa homestead in the heat of the afternoon sun. Ruatoki, 2016. Photograph by Tatsiana Chysanava.
Figure 66: Lunchtime in the homestead’s kitchen with the tamariki. Ruatoki, 2014. Photograph by Tatsiana Chypsanava.
Figure 67: Whareauahi gathering grapefruit. This rākau kuia (*elderly tree*) is over a century old. Ruatoki, 2017. Photograph by Pounamu Jade Aikman.
Figure 68: Drinking the freshest water from Arerowhero, atop Te Tāhū o Haokitaha. Ruatoki, 2016. Photograph by Tatsiana Chypsanava.
Figure 69: Mid-kōrero with Uncle Peho. Uta, 2017. Photograph by Pounamu Jade Aikman.
Figure 70: Feeding time for the pigs. Ruatoki, 2017. Photograph by Tatsiana Chysanava.
Figure 71: Whareauahi making grapefruit juice – deliciously refreshing but eye-wateringly sour. Ruatoki, 2016. Photograph by Pounamu Jade Aikman.
Figure 72: Mum and Des discussing farm life. Ruatoki, 2017. Photograph by Tatsiana Chypsanava.
Figure 73: Frujus provide a refreshing reprieve from Summer’s heat. Ruatoki, 2016. Photograph by Tatsiana Chypsanava.
Figure 74: Horse riding after school. Ruatoki, 2016. Photograph by Tatsiana Chysanava.
Figure 75: Whaea Kēkē Awhi and Uncle Smokey with their young mokopuna. Ruatoki, 2016. Photograph by Tatsiana Chypsanava.
Figure 76: Whaea Kēkē Awhi and one of her mokos (in Spiderman costume). Ruatoki, 2016. Photograph by Tatsiana Chypsyana.
Figure 77: Enjoying the evening sun as it dips into the horizon. Ruatoki, 2016. Photograph by Tatsiana Chypsanava.
Figure 78: Prepping the Christmas day feast, with trifle and pavlova aplenty! Ruatoki, 2016. Photograph by Pounamu Jade Aikman.
Figure 79: The quintessential dining table spread upon the marae. Waikirikiri, Ruatoki, 2017. Photograph by Pounamu Jade Aikman.
Figure 80: Tapu flanked by the evening sun. Ruatoki, 2016. Photograph by Tatsiana Chyspanava.
Figure 82: Mum cradling her mokopuna to sleep as the moon ascends. Ruatoki, 2017. Photograph by Tatsiana Chypsanava.
Figure 83: Technology-induced evening silence! Ruatoki, 2017. Photograph by Tatsiana Chypsanava.
Figure 84: Whare was famous Valley-wide and beyond for his brilliant Christmas lights display each year. Ruatoki, 2016. Photograph courtesy of Whare Teepa.
Figure 85: The doorway, the threshold of manaaki, of the Teepa homestead. Ruatoki, 2014. Photograph by Tatsiana Chypsanava.
CONCLUSION

I have explored in this chapter the hallowed and intimate connection between Tūhoe and their land, encapsulated through the philosophy of matemate-ā-one. Te Urewera – the land itself – is the fundamental techné through which Tūhoe life comes into existence. This sacred imbrication vests within Tūhoe an existential legitimacy that supersedes that of the Crown, and it is this fusion between people and place that is rendered incompatible with the operation of the settler colonial state. So long as the state is unwilling to acknowledge the existence of other forms of sovereignty, this will endure as the status quo. In a settler colonial context, therefore, biopower is premised upon the negation of Indigenous sovereignty, effected both through the on-going extermination of Indigenous peoples, and the dispossession of their lands and estates.

Yet as I have demonstrated, this state of affairs is premised upon the state’s ‘knowing’ of Tūhoe through an exclusively violent optic. If alternative systems of representation, not premised upon such aggression and ‘savagery’, were to be put into circulation, it might herald an attitudinal and behavioural shift for the state. The photographs presented here were an attempt at this, visualising the articulation of matemate-ā-one in everyday Ruatoki life. Matemate-ā-one’s emphasis on the integral and crucial nature of relationships allowed me to also consider manaaki as a critical counterpoint to biopower, as well as explore the ways in which the police might strengthen their relationships with Tūhoe of the Whārua. The stories of whānau explored throughout this chapter (and thesis more broadly) resist and challenge how Tūhoe are ‘known’ in contemporary society, their voices literally ‘speaking back’ to such discursive formations. It is from here that we might begin to envision a world beyond the destructive optic of the settler colonial gaze.
CHAPTER VIII: CONCLUSION

Figure 86: Dad herding his cows. Ruatoki, 2017. Photograph by Tatsiana Chypsanava.

A TŪHOE NARRATIVE OF SOVEREIGNTY AND STATE VIOLENCE

At the beginning of 2014, my days were spent learning the craft of automotive engineering, while my evenings were dedicated to finishing off my Master’s thesis. Having studied for nearly six continuous years since completing seventh form, I considered it high time to move off in search of work, upon completion of these two endeavours. (To be sure, this was a situation born of circumstance, as my rising student loan began to curtail my intellectual longing to remain a life-time student – a sentiment more pronounced with each rising dollar!) Although I had considered the possibility of it, doctoral study held no appeal because I felt I had all I needed to work for the causes I believed in. My kōrero with Waitangi some five years ago decidedly changed all of this, and heralded my entry into doctoral study. Although I had no

346
idea what shape my thesis would take, I knew that a such an opportunity would allow my fire and passion to find expression. This precipitated taking a singular thread – the April 2014 raid upon the Teepa homestead – and revealing the much larger tapestry within which it was woven. April 2014 cannot be read outside of this context, and nor can any of the litany of recent paramilitary raids upon Tūhoe communities.

I began this meditation by exploring the philosophy of matemate-ā-one, before describing Tūhoe’s autochthonous emergence from within the land itself. In Chapter III, I detailed the unfolding of this by briefly outlining some of Tūhoe’s principal ancestors, and narratives of creation. Fundamental to my thesis has been the relationship between people and place, and in this chapter I established how Ngāi Tūhoe, as a people literally and figuratively born of ‘earth and sky’, maintain a sovereign claim of guardianship over Te Urewera in perpetuity. Crown arrival to these lands sought to rupture this intimate connection. Through their monopoly on force and manipulation of the law, this was enacted with staggering efficiency. Colonial depictions of Tūhoe rested on notions of isolation, aggression and savagery, discourses which materially informed the attempts to ‘exterminate’ Tūhoe from existence. In stark contrast to this, Judith Binney’s considerable body of critical and in-depth historical work has shown Tūhoe to be a people open to new ideas and people, and their homeland, Te Urewera, to be a place of movement, interaction, and flows of information. This provides significant nuance to nineteenth century Tūhoe and New Zealand histories, perspectives that are often left out of everyday conversations about Tūhoe.

In Chapter IV, I brought into sharper focus nineteenth and early twentieth century instances of Crown violence in Te Urewera. This, as I described, was the ‘originary’ violence that contributed to the establishment of the New Zealand settler colonial state. Through a
multiplicity of means – confiscation, invasion, the infamous ‘scorched earth’ policy, complicated legal manoeuvres, the 1916 police raid on Maungapōhatu, and let us not forget the fraudulent acquisition of Te Houhi – settler sovereignty burned its way into existence in Tūhoe’s ancestral homeland. This was the violent exercise of the ‘logic of elimination.’ Nevertheless, at every possible step, Tūhoe’s echelon of leadership tried desperately to work with the colonial administration, a desire that, alas, did not find traction within an expanding settler colonial state. Rangatira decisions to defend their homeland, therefore, must be read with reference to Crown usurpation of their estates and lands. In 1896, the *Urewera District Native Reserve Act* purportedly attempted to bestow upon Tūhoe autonomy in law, in recognition of their ancestral mantle, but this was quickly undone through successive early twentieth century liberal governments. Chapters III and IV together provided the essential context to the more recent paramilitary raids upon Tūhoe communities, highlighting the ongoing Crown aggression towards Tūhoe since the earliest stages of colonisation in New Zealand. This formed the bedrock for my overall argument, that raids of the last decade are ‘re-enactments’ and ‘re-creations’ of originary violence in the shoring up of settler sovereignty.

Stereotypes collapse together form and essence, to provide the illusion that certain peoples are predisposed to specific traits and behaviours. This has been emblematic of the way the state has ‘known’ and interacted with Tūhoe over the last two hundred years. Adopting Foucault’s archaeological method in Chapter V enabled me to uncover the unstable and ‘imagined’ nature of depictions of Tūhoe, as reflections of the discursive operation of words to ‘create the reality about which they speak.’ Through a careful analysis of recent and early literature about Tūhoe – including newspaper articles, commentaries, research publications, and televised news broadcasts – I highlighted the artificial and constructed nature of these discourses. The hallmark of discursive formations, however, is that they are considered to be accurate
representations – ‘truth’ – and thus people are induced into thinking these characteristics of Tūhoe (as savage and violent) are ‘truthful’ portrayals. The words of preeminent Māori lawyer Moana Jackson aptly summarise my thinking here:

> The racism of the body is evident in the archive of inferiority that has been applied to Indigenous Peoples, including Māori. Whether it is the ancient depiction of a warrior race, or the modern profiling of young Māori as potential shoplifters because they ‘look’ criminal, it has been a desired conclusion in search of a fact to prove it. Its contempt has bred a familiarity that has proved to be as alluring and persuasive as it has been destructive. Like a bad novel, it has conveyed a kind of truth – even though it has all been made up (Jackson, 2017: 8).

Through interrogating the police dossier of evidence for Operation Eight, I also demonstrated how these discourses materially influenced the manner in which police conducted themselves in Ruatoki during October 2007. More importantly, it is the supposed authority held by these discourses that continues to rationalise the intensity of recent police violence against Tūhoe communities, exemplified in the 2012, 2014 and 2016 raids.

Moving from Foucault’s archaeology to his genealogical method, Chapter VI highlighted the ‘subjugated knowledges’ that are eclipsed by the state’s ‘knowing’ of Tūhoe through an optic of violence. These ‘nonlegitimised’ knowledges were the Tūhoe experiences of state violence over the last decade, and reproducing them in this chapter was a way of ‘speaking back’ to those state-sanctioned discourses. Weaving these experiences with the historical contexts I outlined in Chapters III and IV, I explored how each paramilitary raid or operation in the last decade represented a re-enactment of originary violence in the shoring up of state sovereignty, resulting in the on-going renunciation of Indigenous sovereignty. Using a biopolitical frame of analysis, I showed how Tūhoe remain a ‘contaminant’ that threatens the health and wellbeing of the social body, and must be expelled – however aggressively – to ensure the safety and security of the wider population. Tūhoe are ‘aleatory bodies’ in this framework, to whom norms
of civility do not apply. This was potently demonstrated by the ‘ungendering’ of wāhine Tūhoe during the raids, which simultaneously stripped them of any gender-determined expectations of appropriateness and respect. “Anō nei he kararehe mātou”\textsuperscript{\ref{footnote:animal}}, Aunty Waicy’s words echo, precisely encapsulating the aggressive police behaviour towards Tūhoe whanau over the last ten years.

Te Urewera therefore endures as a perpetual frontier within the New Zealand settler colonial project, and as the outer threshold between ‘their savagery’ and ‘our civility’, this is a border patrolled with violent determination. To this end, the state will, without hesitation, deploy its most aggressive machines of war in the circumscription of Indigenous existence. From this perspective, and drawing together the thinking of Wolfe and Agamben, I suggested that the operation of sovereign law under Western liberal democracies necessarily has to construct Indigenous sovereignties as a site of permanent insurrection, requiring on-going subjugation by settler sovereign law. This is a structural phenomenon; in other words, it continues to define the relationship between Tūhoe and the state. In settler colonial contexts, therefore, biopower is premised upon the perpetual negation of Indigenous sovereignties. As long as the latter is incapable of recognising any form of sovereignty but its own, Tūhoe will continue to exist within a permanent state of exception. To see any of the recent paramilitary raids as isolated events risks ignoring a history saturated in Crown violence, and so, I urged, each flash of state violence cannot be seen as exceptional (that is, out of the ordinary), but rather as a routine function of the settler colonial state in the twenty-first century. Matua Jackson’s words are again fitting:

If racism is ever recognised, it is either seen as an individual aberration rather than a systemic fact, an exception to the rule of a benevolent ‘settlement’, rather than an

\textsuperscript{\ref{footnote:animal}} ‘As if we were animals.’ Translation mine.
acceptance of the fact that in the end colonisation was constructed on the racist belief that so-called White, civilised people in Europe were innately superior and therefore had the right to dispossess non-White ‘uncivilised’ peoples who were inferior (Jackson, 2017: 7).

Tūhoe remain an existential threat to settler sovereignty, and in my last chapter, I sought to address the particular violence characteristic of the Crown’s interactions with Tūhoe over the past two centuries. The reason, as I suggested, is that Tūhoe retain a mantle of ancestral authority – a superior claim of sovereignty – over Te Urewera, and while their sovereignty was displaced through force of arms, it was never ceded. Synthesising my overall argument, I tied this discussion back to the principle thread that opened my thesis, of the imbrication between people and place, as articulated through the philosophy of matemate-ā-one. Matemate-ā-one – ‘death born of earth’ – is what the state finds so threatening about Tūhoe existence, as Tūhoe alone are the eternal, rightful heirs of Te Urewera, in spite of Crown attempts at ‘extermination’.

As a lived and practiced philosophy of everyday life, matemate-ā-one underscores the relationships amongst people inasmuch as it does that between people and place. In this manner, I considered how manaaki might be thought of as a critical counterpoint to biopower, and briefly discussed the ways in which the police might strengthen their relationships with Tūhoe of the Whārua. As many whānau remarked, “Use your goddam Māori liaison officers!” As I drew Chapter VII to a close, I returned once more to the theme of representation. The state’s ‘knowing’ of Tūhoe through an exclusively violent lens continues to inform their methods of interaction, and if alternative systems of representation – not premised upon discourses of savagery, primitivism, and isolation – were to be put into discursive circulation, it may signal a move away from these destructive practices. Offering photographs of elements of the everydayness of Ruatoki life, as a visual articulation of matemate-ā-one, was a
contribution to this, as an alternate way of ‘seeing’ – and hopefully, in future, interacting with – Ngāi Tūhoe.

The stories shared in this thesis are but one segment of a significantly more extensive colonial cloth. Central to this is the role of the prison-industrial complex in the negation of Indigenous sovereignty, as thousands of our people remain disproportionately incarcerated by the settler colonial state (Jackson, 2017; Jackson, Brown-Davis and Sykes, 2016; McIntosh and Workman, 2017). The broader discourses of Māori predispositions for violence (Ballara, 1986) continue to inform this reality: “For the young Māori man or woman in a prison cell cannot be isolated from the historic profiling of their bodies as inherently or potentially criminal … The fact that Māori men make up fifty-two per cent of the prison population [while comprising only fifteen per cent of the total population], and Māori women sixty-four per cent, is a shameful statistic…” (Jackson, 2017: 10-11). As matua Jackson has elsewhere described, prisons are quintessentially a colonial instrument of oppression against Indigenous peoples, an institution anathema to customary Māori society. Reflecting on this through the violent potentiality of words, he explained:

One of the things that the Crown has got very good at … is coopting our words to describe what they are trying to do. Or imposing their words on us. And so one of the classic examples of that for me, is [Māori] the term which is now commonly used in [the Department of] Corrections for prison[:] ‘whare herehere’. Well, our people had no word for prison because we had no concept of imprisonment. So if you don’t have a concept of locking people away, you don’t have a word for it. In [Ngāti] Kahungunu [(matua Jackson’s ancestral people)] we do have a word – ‘here’, which means to conciliate. To rejuvenate. To refresh. And I actually find it offensive that that word is now applied to prisons. Because prisons are not about conciliating, they are not about refreshing, they are about exercising the control and power of the colonising state (Jackson et al., 2016: 2).

The persistent irony, however, is that prisons themselves were considered a failure from the outset. As Foucault describes, by “…1820 it was already understood that the prisons, far from
transforming criminals into honest citizens, serve only to manufacture new criminals and to
drive existing criminals even deeper into criminality” (1980: 40). This provides significant
insight into the widespread incarceration of Māori in New Zealand society today. Furthermore,
the very name of the service tasked with managing New Zealand’s prisons – ‘Corrections’ –
gestures unmistakably to the process of normalisation, the incarceration of Māori a coercive
way to discipline them toward the ‘correct’ way of living. As I have said, words matter.

Preserving the norm is effected equally through violence as it is through knowledge, and in this
way, the disciplinary function of prisons is shared also with that of schools, which both “…[act]
with precision upon its individual subjects” (Foucault, 1980: 40). This is most ardently
demonstrated through the refusal to teach colonial history in the New Zealand school
curriculum (Smallman, 2018), which does nothing to broaden the intellectual horizons of our
most precious taonga (treasure of great worth), children. As my autoethnography
demonstrated, the schoolyard is a crucible within which stereotypes of Māori are actively
perpetuated, and privileging only one version of history actively fans these flames. Exploring
the biopolitical function of normalisation in other aspects of New Zealand society is an equally
compelling area of inquiry, such as the violent ‘Dawn Raids’ conducted by police upon Pasifika
families during immigration crackdowns of the 1970s and 1980s (Kightley, 2017; Radio New
Zealand, 2018b; Robson, 2018; Smith, 2018). “There is much to be done”, echo the words of
innumerable whānau of mine.
HE ITI NĀ TŪHOE E KATA TE PŌ!

To Waitangi, Mum, Dad, Juanita, Whare, Des, Aunty Waicy, Angie, Whaea Kēkē Awhi, Uncle Smokey, Uncle Peho, Reverend Te Kaawa, Koro Bill, and the many whānau of Ruatoki who humbled me with their manaaki, thank you all for the privileging opportunity to live amongst you, and now, bestow this thesis upon you. As I bring my kōrero to an end, I draw once again on the insight and wisdom of Tūhoe knowledge. In describing the epic of the famed warrior Rangi-te-aorere, nephew of Tūhoe-Pōtiki and son of Uenuku-rauriri, Tiaki Mitira writes of the battle for Mokoia (an island in Lake Rotorua) by a small contingent of Tūhoe against the well-fortified hapū of Kawa-arero:

Then were heard derisive remarks from Te Arawa directed against Rangi-te-aorere, who, with his handful of one hundred and fifty fighting men, proposed to take Mokoia from the multitude of Kawa-arero. A voice was heard, ‘Katoa ranei koe to Kotahi?’ (Will you alone effect this?) ‘Yes,’ replied the son of Uenuku, ‘He iti na Tuhoe, e kata te po.’ (Few by Tuhoe, make Hades laugh.) (Mitira, 1972: 182, 185, and 182-7 more generally).

What this uniquely Tūhoe whakataukī highlights is the strength and determination commanded by few that prevails over insurmountable odds, a tenacity and strength so
profound it can reawaken the dead into laughter. “This saying has been preserved right down to the present time”, explains Mitira (1972: 185), and I offer here these exalted words as a testament to the survival and prosperity of Ngāi Tūhoe despite overwhelming odds at the hands of the settler colonial state. Let it be heard across the land: ‘He iti nā Tūhoe e kata te pō!’
EPILOGUE: HE TUKUNGA WHAKAARO

Figure 88: Returning to the Whārua. Photograph by Pounamu Jade Aikman.

—CHRISTCHURCH, DECEMBER 2018

I tūtaki tuatahi māua ko Pounamu i te tau 2013. I taua wā, i whai wāhi māua ki tētahi kaupapa e kīa ana ko Te Rārangiwhaunui. He kaupapa whakarauika tēnei i ngā rangatahi Māori e mahi ana ki ngā whenu whakarauora ahurea Māori, tuakiri Māori, kaupapa Māori anō hoki kia eke panuku āi ki roto i tēnei ao. He wānanga te kawe o tēnei kaupapa, nā reira, ko te mātua tāngata he whakawhanaungatanga, he whakaaro nui ki ngā kaupapa e wehi nei i te ngākau – ka oti, he whaiwhai huarahi whakaora anō hoki kia puta ā-ihu, kia whanake ai mātou katoa hei tangata whenua, hei Māori ki tēnei ao pākehā nei.

Nō te mutunga o te kaupapa, ka whakamōhio mai āia i te hūnuku tōna koroua ki roto o te Wairākei noho ai (nō Te Waimana Kaaku āia), nā reira tērā pea ka āhu whakauta mai ki te manawa o te Ika hararei ai. Ko tuku whakautu, āe, nau mai haere mai ki Ngā Taumata, ko Ruatoki noho tahi ai ki te taha o te whānau. Kātahi ka taki pukukata nā tuku mōhio me pakari te tangata inā hiahia ai te noho ki waenganui i a mātou, ā, ki tō mātou koroua whare hoki. He aha ai? He kāinga pākarukaru, he tawhito, he waiwhera kore (māu anō te wai e whakamahana ki te ahi), ko te wharepaku kai waho – ā, me waia ki ngā kararehe maha. Ki te kore, ka raru katoa.

Nā runga i tuku pōhēhe he tangata ‘hoiti toiti’ āia ka kore e rata mai. Heoi, tae mai rātou ko āna hoa tokoru (nō tāwāhi) ki te kāinga ka huri katoa tōna ao. Ko te manaakitanga, ko te whakawhanaungatanga, ko te aroha tētahi ki tētahi ngā tino whaipaianga o tōku whānau me ngā whānau katoa o te kāinga. I konei pea ka tīmata tōna kōrero ki tuku māmā mō ngā kaupapa huhua nei, waihoki, nā konei ka hamumu mai ngā kupu wairua o tōku māmā, ‘We’ll make a Meowry out of you yet Pounamu’. Puku kata katoa mātou ki ēna kupu.

Ka haere te wā ka noho āia hei hoa pūmāu ki a mātou ko te whānau. Nā tēnei, he māmā te kōrero ki āia mō ngā take huhua – ngā take poke i te tamaiti Māori, te tangata Māori – aua.
In the final stages of preparing this thesis for submission, I, like many other New Zealanders, listened in horror as news unfolded of an Australian white supremacist launching terrorist attacks during Friday prayers at Christchurch mosques on March 15. With dozens killed or injured, the shootings are the deadliest instance of terrorism in New Zealand’s modern, postcolonial history. The sense of disbelief, outrage, and disgust was palpable throughout the communities I am a part of, and tens of thousands grieved together in vigils held across the country. Jacinda Ardern spoke of how such extremist thinking is the inverse of what our society stands for (Patterson, 2019). As much as I relish the intention of such words, there is, perhaps, a contradiction between their utterance and the colonial context we exist within, still defined by the negation of Indigenous sovereignties and the marginalisation of peoples of colour. Commentary after the raids highlighted the glaring contradiction that while Muslim communities have long remained the target of state surveillance in New Zealand, white supremacist groups have not (Pennington, 2019; Māori Television 2019). Together, these instances highlight the norms of whiteness that remain central to the settler colonial state. Had I the time, I would have liked to reflect more deeply upon this in relation to March 15. In lieu of that, may I offer a prayer for those whose lives were lost or forever changed, and while recognising the ‘colonial contradiction’ I noted above, I hope that in the future, Ardern’s words find meaningful expression in our society.

—— P.J.W.E. AIKMAN.

—— WELLINGTON, MAY 2019
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In the words of one of my koro, ‘Kua rahi o tēnā. That’s enough for now.’

* * *