



THE UNIVERSITY OF
WAIKATO
Te Whare Wānanga o Waikato

Research Commons

<http://researchcommons.waikato.ac.nz/>

Research Commons at the University of Waikato

Copyright Statement:

The digital copy of this thesis is protected by the Copyright Act 1994 (New Zealand).

The thesis may be consulted by you, provided you comply with the provisions of the Act and the following conditions of use:

- Any use you make of these documents or images must be for research or private study purposes only, and you may not make them available to any other person.
- Authors control the copyright of their thesis. You will recognise the author's right to be identified as the author of the thesis, and due acknowledgement will be made to the author where appropriate.
- You will obtain the author's permission before publishing any material from the thesis.

**“On and On It Goes”:
Representations of the New Zealand Wars in Novels, Film, and
Theatre**

A thesis
submitted in partial fulfilment
of the requirements for the degree
of
Doctor of Philosophy in English
at
The University of Waikato
by
Brendan Daniel Sheridan



THE UNIVERSITY OF
WAIKATO
Te Whare Wānanga o Waikato

2019

Abstract

This thesis considers fictional representations of the New Zealand Wars. Through the media of novels, feature films, and drama with links to Shakespeare, it explores common features between representations. It examines how these representations change in tone or style over time and how different representations negotiate the complex issues of race, gender, and colonialism.

I examine key representations ranging from 1861 to 2017 in terms of genre. I begin with the nineteenth-century novel as many of the key tropes used in representations of the New Zealand Wars emerge in this period. I then look at the twentieth-century novel, before concentrating specifically on Maurice Shadbolt and Witi Ihimaera. My discussion then turns to the genres of film and theatre. In all of these diverse representations there are recurring tropes and motifs. Many of the fictions feature stock characters such as the European traveller, the imperial official, and the Māori maiden and bear the imprint of historical romance conventions, popularised by Sir Walter Scott's *Waverly* and James Fenimore Cooper's *The Last of the Mohicans*. The vast majority of stories take place in the North Island between 1860 and 1870. Variations in the depiction of historical events are shaped by the historical scholarship and dominant ideologies of the time, such as the post-colonial tonal shift that emerges following the publication of work by James Belich and Ranginui Walker. I contextualise representations with their point in history, and how they treat the New Zealand Wars in terms of events, characters, and historical figures.

Through this approach, my thesis argues that representations of the New Zealand Wars do not form themselves in isolation and do not occur in isolated clusters. This thesis seeks to demonstrate that representations of the New Zealand Wars occur on a steady continuum. Representations of the conflict exist in parallel

to one another (intentional or not) and are affected by the social climate, dominant ideologies, and published histories available to the author at the time of writing. The variety of representations—novel, feature film, stage play—share many core tropes. Even so, chronologically this continuum also features shifts in tone, ideologies, and sympathies. A novel of the 1980s has a very different perspective regarding settlers compared to a novel from the 1860s. In the same manner, a play staged in the 2000s shows a different attitude towards the conflict compared to a film from the 1940s. This thesis demonstrates that while representations of the New Zealand Wars share a common subject, how they approach the material is constantly evolving.

Acknowledgements

No thesis is written in a vacuum. I could not have accomplished this work on my own. I am first of all indebted to my supervisors Kirstine Moffat and Mark Houlahan for their incredible support throughout the project. I also am deeply thankful to Nēpia Mahuika for sharing his insights and knowledge, and for being able to meet with me to discuss the topic and providing the crucial indigenous perspective and criticism needed for material of this nature.

Next I wish to thank Anne Ferrier-Watson, the fantastically sharp subject librarian who was always happy to assist with any of my queries whether it was finding a review for a decades old play, formatting my thesis, or simply explaining how to use basic library systems.

I am also incredibly thankful for my family who have supported me the entire way my PhD, especially my dad, Paul Sheridan who was always interested in my ramblings about Colonial New Zealand and my sister, Rhiannon, for being close at hand.

To my friends Harry Evans, Eric Lunenberg, Alex Bunn, and Abbe Judson, visiting you kept me from going too crazy our games nights were invaluable, thank you. Meanwhile all my fellow graduate students, especially Ben Redder, Nicola Lemberg, Fai Tongdesthri, Sarah Ali, and Saikrishna Srinivasan you helped me to embrace my crazy and keep working in spite of it all.

To everyone who has helped me along on this journey, diolch yn fawr!

Table of Contents

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iv
Introduction	1
Literary and Historiographic Scholarship	9
History, Ideology, Text and Context	21
Thesis Overview	29
Chapter One: Romancing the New Zealand Wars: The Novel from 1861-1899..	34
The Traveller/“Hero” – To Boldly Go	44
The (Un)civilised Sphere of the Town	51
The Kāinga Feels the Strain of Change	66
The Perils of the Bush	83
Conclusion.....	104
Chapter Two: Complicating the Narrative: The Novel from 1914 – 1967	106
Mona Tracy and Perpetuating the Colonial Myths.....	109
William Satchell Deconstructs and Reaffirms the Romance	113
Olga Stringfellow Feminises the Narrative	135
Errol Braithwaite Sides with Settlement against Empire	144
Conclusion.....	152
Chapter Three: The New Zealand Wars Get Postcolonial	154
Is History Ticklish?	166
Finally a Māori Perspective.....	197
The Points of Difference	211
Conclusion.....	220
Chapter Four: The New Zealand Wars Go to the Movies	222
Hayward and the Nation-making Agenda	227
Utu: Postmodernising the New Zealand Western	249
River Queen’s Return to the Historical Romance?	263
Conclusion.....	281
Chapter Five: Shakespeare and the Land Wars.....	283
Utu, “I Like Revenging”	286
Watch Your (Shakespearean) Language	292
Staging the Land Wars	295
Conclusion.....	315
Chapter Six: Conclusion	317
References	323

Appendix One: Timeline.....	340
Appendix Two: Glossary of Māori Words and Terms	345

Introduction

On Tuesday December 8th 2015, a class of students from Ōtorohanga College presented a petition to the New Zealand Parliament to set aside a day of remembrance for one of New Zealand's longest and arguably most influential periods of conflict, the New Zealand Wars. Their petition had received over 13,000 signatures and had the support of more than four hundred Māori elders. These students had been studying the conflict in school and had visited the sites of two significant moments during the conflict, Rangiaowhia and Ōrākau. Their actions were prompted by their shock at the history and the lack of awareness about the New Zealand Wars in the general populace (Smallman and Small). The aim of a public holiday did not eventuate, but the pressure was enough that in 2016 it was announced that October 28th would be a day of commemoration for the decades-long conflict (Smallman).

While New Zealand as a whole commemorates participation in overseas conflicts with Anzac Day (April 25th) and Armistice Day (November 11th), previously there was no corresponding day for internal conflicts. The absence of commemoration is marked, given the significance of the New Zealand Wars:

The New Zealand Wars of 1845-1872 were a series of conflicts involving the British, Imperial and colonial, and the Maori tribes of the North Island. They were not, as is sometimes suggested, storms in a teacup or gentlemanly bouts of fisticuffs, but bitter and bloody struggles, as important to New Zealand as were the Civil Wars to England and the United States (Belich, *The New Zealand Wars* 15).

Belich's comparisons to these international civil wars highlights perhaps why the New Zealand Wars have been neglected. If they can be argued to be civil wars,

with all of the underlying pain and weight, it is perhaps convenient for the victors to ignore the conflict. Yet this avoidance of history does not change the fact that it happened.

Despite this lack of direct commemoration (as dates that do provide a measure of remembrance are angled towards other events such as Waitangi Day), New Zealanders have been trying to process and create representations of the conflict for over one hundred and fifty years. Novels such as Henry Butler Stoney's *Taranaki: A Tale of War* (1861), William Satchell's *The Greenstone Door* (1914), and more recently Witi Ihimaera's *The Matriarch* (1986) are just a few textual representations. The conflict has also seen visual depictions with films such as *Utu* (1983) and *River Queen* (2005). Representations of the New Zealand Wars span much of the country's history showing how ingrained they are in the national psyche. This thesis takes a macroscopic view of these representations and examines them as a whole.

The New Zealand Wars have been a part of the New Zealand fictional landscape since its first novel was written. The generally accepted first New Zealand novel *Taranaki: A Tale of the War* (1861) by Major Henry Butler Stoney is set during this conflict and was written by a soldier who served with the 40th Regiment, a unit that saw combat in the North Island during the New Zealand Wars. In fact, the novel was written while the New Zealand Wars were still taking place, just after the First Taranaki War and a little before the Waikato Invasion. Many novels with a New Zealand Wars setting followed. Rolf Boldrewood's *War to the Knife or Tangata Maori* (1899) is a typical example of the nineteenth-century representations which are written in the adventure mode and tend to valorise the victorious colonials while depicting Māori as a courageous and honourable foe. Departures from pro-imperial rhetoric are found in the work of

non-Anglophone authors Jules Verne and Sygurd Wisnowski. This abundance of representations continued into the opening of the twentieth century with William Satchell's *The Greenstone Door* (1914).

The New Zealand Wars novels did not end in the early twentieth century, however. More writing emerged in the mid-twentieth century, such as Olga Stringfellow's *Mary Bravender* (1959) which placed a much greater emphasis on the perspective and experiences of women. Of these mid-twentieth-century novels, Errol Braithwaite's *Flying Fish* (1964), and its sequels, *The Needle's Eye* (1965) and *The Evil Day* (1967), are probably the most familiar. Another period of literary resurgence occurred in the 1980s with Witi Ihimaera bringing a greater visibility of Māori perspectives in a space that previously was the sole purview of Pākehā. In addition to the added Māori voice, there was an increase in historical war fiction (epitomised by Maurice Shadbolt's *The New Zealand Wars Trilogy*), a literary trend which continues to this day.

Representations of the conflict on the stage also emerged from the 1980s. Plays such as Mervyn Thompson's *Songs to the Judges* (1981) and Apirana Taylor's *Whaea Kairau: Mother Hundred Eater* (1995) were clearly written and produced with the Waitangi Tribunal cases in their minds. These stage productions were joined by the Shakespeare inspired work *Manawa Taua/Savage Hearts* (1994) which pushes forward the impact of cultural colonisation. Later, the turn of the millennium produced Shakespeare productions that use the wars as a setting. Here the Shakespeare is not so much interrogated as it is embraced, and is used as a vehicle in which to present the Land Wars and its nuances to a New Zealand audience.

Representations of the New Zealand Wars have not been confined to just the written word and stage performance; since the 1920s these conflicts have inspired film makers as well. The most prolific was Rudall Hayward with his early twentieth-century films *Rewi's Last Stand* (1925) and its remake in 1940, as well as *The Te Kooti Trail* (1927). Hayward's films presented the Wars as a grand narrative of nation making, a view moulded by his engagement with the histories of James Cowan. More recent films such as *Utu* (1983) and *River Queen* (2005) were less tied to specific events of history compared to prior films. Instead they sought to develop a mood of the New Zealand Wars, while blending with popular genres such as period costume drama and the western. The diverse range of representations emphasises the need for the New Zealand Wars to not be examined in small pockets of work but as a multi-media enterprise that is ingrained in the New Zealand cultural landscape.

My choice of topic may evoke surprise due to my background. I am the first member of my family born in Aotearoa; my parents and older brother migrated to New Zealand a year or so before I was born. Why would the son of relatively recent migrants have any interest in the New Zealand Wars specifically? I attribute that to my father's influence. I grew up hearing about various colonial actions of the British, French, Spanish, Ottoman Empires and the United States of America. I heard stories of the colonisation of Africa, India, and the United States, with my father providing either context or criticism for films that we watched set within those periods. These films included *Little Big Man* (1970), *Last of the Mohicans* (1993), and *Zulu* (1964), but the watching always would be contrasted with comments about books like Dee Brown's *Bury My Heart at Wounded Knee* (1970). In fact, one of the first New Zealand films my father bought when he

emigrated to Aotearoa was *Utu*, which appealed to his combined interest in westerns and the treatment of colonised peoples.

I was born and raised in a region surrounded by evidence of the New Zealand Wars, a little way north of the mouth of the Waikato River. In the general area of where I grew up was a variety of military activity in the nearby villages of Tūākau and Pokeno, shown by signs indicating the location of old redoubts in the townships. Whenever I visit the town of Pukekohe, I pass the memorial to the Battle of Titi Hill. This battle took place during the early stage of the Waikato campaign not far from the villages of Puni, Mauku and Patumahoe. Furthermore, in Ōtāhuhu, a kilometre north of where I was born, there is a statue to Colonel Marmaduke Nixon who was the commanding officer at the massacre in Rangiaowhia.

Throughout my schooling, however, little was taught on the subject of the New Zealand Wars. It was only towards the end of my fourth year of high school that I received any education on the Wars, which is unfortunate considering my home town's proximity to the conflict. Our study of the New Zealand Wars culminated in a field trip around the north Waikato, visiting several pā and redoubts and ending with a visit to Rangiriri. This excursion opened my eyes to the pervasiveness of the New Zealand Wars in the geography of the North Island, and was likely where my interest was first sparked.

The presence of the New Zealand Wars in my life has since endured and expanded. In my first year at university I was enthralled by Nēpia Mahuika's segment on the conflict in the history paper "War and Society" in 2009. His lectures inspired me to write my research essay on the Battle of Rangiriri and first introduced me to the work of Ranginui Walker. I had another opportunity to

revisit the New Zealand Wars during my graduate studies in English. While taking a graduate paper on New Zealand Literature the New Zealand Wars formed the background for a creative writing assignment.

As there are culturally charged issues surrounding this topic it is important to define my intentions. Paul Monin, commenting on the publication of his book *This is My Place: Hauraki Contested, 1769-1875* (2001) engaged with similar issues.

The subject of my history is Maori-European history, not Maori history. It examines the place of encounter between the two peoples, the zone of interaction. It ventures into 'traditional' or exclusively Maori history only to set the stage for that interaction (Monin 84).

My examination of the New Zealand Wars operates along similar paradigms. It is the interaction between cultures, the clash and cooperation, that interests me. I am aware that, as a Pākehā, I have benefitted from British and New Zealand government actions during the colonisation of New Zealand. My personal perspective on the New Zealand Wars, however, differs from older Pākehā families within New Zealand; my family emigrated here long after the New Zealand Wars ended, at a time when restitution was finally being granted. The purpose of my work is to unpack a range of textual representations of the New Zealand Wars and the varying ways with which they are engaged.

The position I find myself in requires that where possible I try to find and include Māori critical discourse relevant to the topic to ensure that it is as inclusive of differing perspectives as possible. This thesis is concerned with all representations of the Land Wars, not solely Pākehā. Alison Jones and Kuni Jenkins state:

The shared indigene-colonizer/Māori-Pākehā hyphen not only holds ethnic and historical difference and interchange; it also marks a relationship of power and inequality that continues to shape differential patterns of cultural dominance and social privilege (473).

This historical difference and interchange is an ongoing point that I engage with throughout my thesis, coming as I do from a Pākehā perspective. It is in fact this difference in perspectives that draws me to the topic; for representations of the New Zealand Wars are highly nuanced. “In each retelling of these familiar scenes from our shared past, their power relations shift and become dramatically more complex” (Jones and Jenkins 472). The complex interconnections of how writers and directors engage with the material of our shared past is what I examine in the course of my thesis.

The New Zealand Wars affect both Māori and Pākehā alike, albeit in different ways. Māori were not the only people who fought in the conflicts and neither are they the only ones who still fight the wars, albeit on different terms today. Māori suffered a dispossession of land, but retained a culture of remembering the conflict. In contrast, while Pākehā gained possession of land, they were subject to a cultural campaign of forgetting, alienating themselves from their own history.

Within this topic, specificity is required for my terminology and the time period that I am addressing. The historical conflict at the heart of my thesis has been given multiple names over the years: James Cowan titles them as *The New Zealand Wars*, in *Wars Without End* Danny Keenan calls them the “Land Wars,” while in *The Origins of the Maori Wars* Keith Sinclair says “The Māori Wars.” I will be using the phrases Land Wars and New Zealand Wars throughout the thesis though each differs in meaning. By the term New Zealand Wars, I will refer

specifically to the period itself that is examined with a defined end. The Land Wars, however, can be understood to also refer to the struggle that persists regarding the land and the issues born from the conflict.

It is also important to distinguish the period I examine from the Musket Wars of the early nineteenth century. In this instance I follow James Belich's lead. I refer to the Musket Wars as occurring prior to the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840 and the New Zealand Wars following the signing. Belich's time scale for the New Zealand Wars also works well in terms of defining the large-scale military conflict, commencing with the Wairau Affray, and tracking conflict up to the early twentieth century. I would place the final significant event of the New Zealand Wars earlier, however, with the declaration of peace by King Tawhiao, which occurred in 1881, thirty-five years before Belich's 1916.

My reason for this change is the shift from the New Zealand Wars to the Land Wars. 1881 was the end of the New Zealand Wars, but the Land Wars do not end there, as the move towards passive and non-violent resistance at Parihaka and its suppression by the colonial government continued after Tawhiao's declaration. While there were minor violent actions in the later periods leading to Belich's end of the New Zealand Wars in 1916 with the arrest of Rua Kenana, I would still term them as part of the Land Wars, as they were not part of concerted military campaigns but still part of the overall struggle. Some of the battles in the courtroom over the destiny of the land still continue today.

The principle aim of this topic is to examine the fictional representation of the New Zealand Wars through a blend of historiography and various literary theories. This approach requires a cross-disciplinary engagement with history, cultural studies, literature, theatre, and film. While there has been an extensive

amount of recent scholarship regarding the New Zealand Wars from an historical perspective, there is still ample need to explore the topic from a literary, cinematic, and theatrical context. That is why this thesis aims to provide a fresh unifying analysis by examining the influence of the New Zealand Wars on the combination of film, theatre productions, and novels.

Literary and Historiographic Scholarship

Literary critics and historians have engaged with the New Zealand Wars in a variety of ways, some scholarship concerned with the intersections between historiography and literature but other analyses approaching the conflict from a specific disciplinary focus. My approach is informed, in particular, by two influential articles on literary engagement with the conflict penned by Nelson Wattie and Philip Steer, both of which are concerned with the relationship between text and context. My work builds on the frameworks provided by these two scholars in terms of contextualising history, incorporating a broad range of perspectives and texts, and engaging with texts of different time periods. Historical interest in the conflict, particularly since the 1980s, has been considerable, however, more needs to be done with regards to literary and filmic criticism. Literary scholarship has tended to examine clusters of New Zealand Wars fiction, focusing on certain time periods, or interrogating individual texts or authors. Film criticism is predominantly focused on either individual examples or else looking at the films in terms of genre, although Annabel Cooper's recent *Filming the Colonial Past: The New Zealand Wars on Screen* (2018) interrogates film as a means of historical representation. The relationship between Shakespearean and onstage representations of the New Zealand Wars, meanwhile, has received limited critical discussion and deserves greater attention. My research fills these gaps in scholarship through both its engagement with texts from multiple genres and mediums that span the full-sweep

of New Zealand literary engagement with the conflict, from 1861 to 2017, and its interest in the relationship between representations across genres.

As the majority of the texts about the New Zealand Wars are novels, it is unsurprising that these have received the most critical attention. Literary criticism accounts for a significant portion of secondary sources. Wattie's 1990 article "The New Zealand Land Wars in Novels by Shadbolt and Ihimaera" establishes an important framework for discussing literary texts. The article focuses particularly on 1986 as a seminal moment of reflection on the conflict, with the publication of James Belich's *The New Zealand Wars and the Victorian Interpretation of Racial Conflict* (1986), Shadbolt's *Season of the Jew* (1986) and Ihimaera's *The Matriarch* (1986). Wattie also opens up the history of the genre, with mention of Stoney's *Taranaki: A Tale of the War* (1861) and Satchell's *The Greenstone Door* (1914). Crucially, Wattie argues that there has been a "repression of the wars in the New Zealand public mind", a repression and silence that he attempts to both identify and liberate (Wattie 446). He contends that the conflict is "at the chronological and moral basis of New Zealand life" (446) and that a focus on both texts representing the Wars and the context in which these literary meditations were written is vital to understand the complexity of New Zealand's past and Aotearoa's continued outworking of issues of encounter and settlement. Since the publication of this article in 1990 the New Zealand Wars have increasingly become a matter of political and historical debate and literary discussion, but Wattie is crucial in establishing a framework of analysis.

Writing in 2007, Steer explicitly builds on Wattie's analysis, but focuses on three clusters of literary representations, 1887-1899, 1959-1968, and 1982-1993:

The occasional surges in popularity enjoyed by this subgenre suggest that neither the contours of Pākehā identity nor Pākehā attitudes towards the

history of settlement have been as monolithic as are currently implied (Steer 115).

Steer advocates for an examination of the New Zealand Wars novels within the context of their writing and publication as a means to better make judgements regarding Pākehā identity, which often informs how authors represent the New Zealand Wars. I expand upon Steer's method and make reference to screen and theatrical contemporaries of novels to provide an inter-media analysis. I also make use of Steer's methods with regards to the broad spanning approach and texts examined in terms of their context. However, I also examine novels written by non-Anglophone and Māori writers which are beyond the scope of Steer's focus on Pākehā attitudes towards settlement.

As well as establishing a frame of analysis that emphasises the need to focus on issues of identity and the relationship between text and context — an approach that I follow — Steer is also useful in his challenge to other modes of writing about the New Zealand Wars. One such mode is settlement studies, which concerns itself with issues of settlement and settlers. The classification of the settler is divided by Stephen Turner into two variations: the colonial and the New Zealander: “The colonial wants to subordinate the new place to the old place. To make it like home, which is another place: the old country” (“Being Colonial/Colonial Being” 39). This is the figure that many post-colonial writers would be familiar with, the character who is always looking back to the imperial metropolis for guidance and identity. In contrast is the other form of settler: “The New Zealander wants to be at home in the place. Actually of the place. To be indigenious: have come from here all along” (“Being Colonial/Colonial Being” 39). Turner's examination of settler identity provides an effective tool of examination when discussing figures of New

Zealand literature, particularly within a colonial context. Steer observes, though, that the project has limitations in its approach:

I am not disagreeing with the aim of the project so much as its methodological tendency to unhesitatingly map the concerns of the present onto a handful of “classic” texts isolated from their own literary and social contexts (Steer 131).

While settlement studies is too limited in its perspective to provide an effective framework for this research, its ideological interrogations of New Zealand Wars texts, such as *The Greenstone Door* and examination of settler identity are of value.

Settlement studies presents a number of effective general tools for examining New Zealand colonialism with regards to literature. The approach “encompasses issues to do with large-scale movement of people to a foreign land, involving full-scale reconstruction of people and place for both settler and indigene” (Calder and Turner, “Introduction” 7). In this context, indigene refers to an indigenous person of a particular nation, which in the case of New Zealand is a Māori person, although it is often co-opted to refer to the settler quest for legitimacy through somehow becoming “indigenous”. The particular word “settler” is likewise significant, as it shows the project is not merely concerned with government policy, but also with personal interaction, particularly between Māori and Pākehā, and with the land.

In terms of further useful general literary scholarship, Terry Goldie’s discussion of representation of indigenous people by colonisers in his critical monograph *Fear and Temptation: The Image of the Indigene in Canadian, Australian and New Zealand Literatures* (1989) is crucial. Goldie provides a starting point to examine fictions that have received less critical attention, particularly those written in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Within the

various fictions explored in this thesis, representations of indigenous people are significant as the novels by non-Māori authors and directors utilise similar broad tropes. This is compounded by the fact that the majority of the representations have been constructed by Pākehā settlers. As Goldie states:

The image of the indigene has been textually defined and, through an extended intertextuality, national and international, diachronic and synchronic, which embraces the implied discourse of such apparently *hors texte* items as visual art, it constantly reproduces itself, a pervasive autogenesis (Goldie 6).

These re-representations often lead to a number of stereotypes and artificial constructs of indigenous peoples: “The problem is not the negative or positive aura associated with the image but rather the image itself” (Goldie 10). These images are often presented in terms of violence, sexuality, gender, mysticism and a connection to nature. Also present in Goldie’s work is the pervasive idea of the settler’s attempts to become indigenous: “Through the indigene the white character gains soul and the potential to become of the land” (Goldie 16). This idea is particularly pertinent to many of the pre-1980s novels and to the film *River Queen* (2005) and synergises well with settlement studies.

Most scholars writing about literary depictions of the New Zealand Wars have focused their attention on specific authors or specific decades of representation. Ihimaera, Satchell, and Shadbolt are the only authors in this thesis considered part of the New Zealand literary “canon”; this status means there is a larger pool of scholarship to draw upon. Satchell has received critical attention from scholars such as Jane Stafford and Mark Williams in *Maoriland* (2006) and Alex Calder in *The Settler’s Plot* (2011), as well as some analysis by Nelson Wattie in “The New Zealand Wars in the Novels by Shadbolt and Ihimaera.” Shadbolt and Ihimaera

have received considerably more critical attention. Maurice Shadbolt's trilogy *The New Zealand Wars* is the most widely examined set of New Zealand Wars novels and as of 2019, arguably the most commercially successful. Witi Ihimaera's *The Matriarch* (1986) emerged out of the cultural invigoration of the Māori Renaissance and is the most significant novel regarding the Land Wars written by the first, and one of the most acclaimed, of Māori authors.

Michelle Keown, in *Pacific Islands Writing: The Postcolonial Literatures of Aotearoa/New Zealand and Oceania*, provides a detailed analysis of the development of Māori and Pacific Island writing. Her insights are important to consider, particularly in terms of her salutary reminder that the style and conventions Ihimaera employs will not necessarily be the same as European and Pākehā writing. Joanne Thompkins in “‘It all depends on what story you hear’: Historiographic Metafiction and Colin Johnson's *Dr. Wooreddy's Prescription for Enduring the Ending of the World* and Witi Ihimaera's *The Matriarch*” and Paul Sharrad in “Struggle and Strategy: Literature and New Zealand's Land Wars” provide a detailed examination of how Ihimaera constructs the narrative in *The Matriarch*. The novel does not follow a clear third person linear narration but operates in a series of flashbacks and narrators. Mark Williams in “On the Beach: Witi Ihimaera, Katherine Mansfield and the Treaty of Waitangi” examines Ihimaera's other novels and short stories in relation to other canonical authors like Katherine Mansfield. Alistair Fox also contextualises Ihimaera's writing in “Hybridity and Indigeneity in Contemporary Maori Literature: Witi Ihimaera.” However, Fox examines Ihimaera's writing in the context of non-Māori cultural influences such as Verdi's operas and Greek Mythology.

Shadbolt's *The New Zealand Wars* trilogy begins with *Season of the Jew* (1986), and is only the second trilogy of novels set during the New Zealand Wars.

Yet, his work differs from Errol Braithwaite's *Flying Fish* trilogy in various ways. Shadbolt's works act as clear examples of the historical war novels as mentioned by Steer. They possess many similar characteristics to the earlier New Zealand Wars novels, but are informed by post-colonial ideas inherent in the revisionist histories produced by James Belich. Other critics have examined Shadbolt in detail, with Ralph Crane's article "'Tickling History': Maurice Shadbolt and the New Zealand Wars" and *Ending the Silences: Critical Essays on the Works of Maurice Shadbolt*, a collection of essays edited by Crane, of particular significance. Crane examines Shadbolt's debt to the historical romance writers as well as critiquing his use of history. Similar examinations of Shadbolt's relationship with history can also be found in essays by Lawrence Jones and Ken Arvidson in *Ending the Silences*. Prior scholarship has also compared Shadbolt's work to Ihimaera, such as Nelson Wattie's essay "The New Zealand Wars in Novels by Shadbolt and Ihimaera" which also incorporates the work of Belich, and compares the works back to William Satchell's *The Greenstone Door*. Likewise, although Paul Sharrad's article "Struggle and Strategy" focuses predominantly on *The Matriarch*, there is also some comparison between Ihimaera and Shadbolt, with Shadbolt associated with a continuation of earlier literary traditions and Ihimaera heralded as a fresh departure point.

Other scholars have been preoccupied with the early fiction. A key piece of literary criticism regarding early nineteenth-century fiction is Jane Stafford's scholarship on Henry Butler Stoney in her article "New Zealand's First Novel and the Problems of Acclimatisation." Another is Kirstine Moffat's article "Five Imperial Adventures in the Waikato." These two articles construct a basis for comparative analysis of the differing early British, Australian, and European novelists who were contributing to the corpus of nineteenth-century New Zealand

Wars novels. Stafford's examination of *Taranaki: A Tale of the War* (1861) provides a model of detailed, critical analysis, which assists in my comparison to subsequent novels. She examines the influence of international historical romances, such as Sir Walter Scott's *Waverly* (1814) upon Stoney's work and examines how he writes (and manipulates) history within *Taranaki*. Moffat's article provides some broader criticism of the nineteenth-century novels. Though her focus is on the stories as examples of imperial adventures and Boy's Own narratives, as opposed to their status as representations of the New Zealand Wars, the multi-textual engagement functions as a stepping stone for my first chapter.

There have been multiple articles and essays written which detail the cinematic depictions of the New Zealand Wars. This breadth of scholarship is likely due to the more visible and generally accessible nature of cinematic representations of the New Zealand Wars to an audience. In many instances, however, the articles are generally geared either towards the works as representations of a particular genre, or else are limited in scope. They will typically focus on a single director or cluster of decades. Examples of such scholarship are Fox's examination of the films of Rudall Hayward in *New Zealand Cinema: Interpreting the Past* (2011), and Roger Nicholson's "Romancing the Past: History, Love, and Genre in Vincent Ward's *River Queen*." What I do is examine the films in relation to one another and towards their textual counterparts, and how the film narratives compare with conventions of the novels.

While there are only a handful of New Zealand Wars films, the breadth of the scholarship provides an effective basis for my research. Bruce Babington's essay "Epos Indigenized: The New Zealand War Films from Rudall Hayward to Vincent Ward" gives an effective overview of the majority of films as he gives a cross cinematic analysis. His book *A History of the New Zealand Fiction Feature*

Film (2007) also provides an overview of film-making within New Zealand. Olivia Macassey's essay from *New Zealand Cinema: Interpreting the Past* (2011) provide more specified criticism about such films. *River Queen*, in particular, has accrued considerable critical attention, with Olivia Macassey exploring the issue of trans-national identity. Kirstine Moffat discusses issues of indigeneity in "The River and the Ocean: Indigeneity and Dispossession in Vincent Ward's *River Queen*." Furthermore, Roger Nicholson discusses the love story and how it fits with history in "Romancing the Past: History, Love, and Genre in Vincent Ward's *River Queen*." Lastly Annabel Cooper's monograph *Filming the Colonial Past: The New Zealand Wars on Screen* provides an effective detailed history covering the entirety of filmmaking and the New Zealand Wars. My approach differs, however, as Cooper's work analyses the films from a historian's perspective, while I will be more focused on narrative.

Of all the stage representations of the New Zealand Wars, a significant proportion are Shakespearean. Five Shakespearean engagements with the New Zealand Wars are going to be discussed in this thesis. The presence of the Bard in colonial representations is not unusual, as Mark Houlahan proposes:

Shakespeare has been a great reservoir of story for several hundred years, in performance, retelling and other adaptations. It is easy then to assume, through this dominance, that he always adapts to advantage" ("Shakespeare and the Sea of Stories" 165).

This prevalence requires detailed analysis of the Shakespeare productions. Unfortunately this focus means that I much omit the non-Shakespearean theatre representations. In contrast to film, there is relatively little scholarship regarding any of the Shakespearean themed representations of the New Zealand Wars. Mark Houlahan's foundational studies on Shakespeare within New Zealand such as his

entry in *The Oxford Companion to New Zealand Literature* (1998), and “Unsettling the Bard: Shakespeare in the South Pacific” in *The Oxford Handbook of Shakespearean Tragedy* (2016) provide a useful frame of reference.

Much of the analysis draws from the broader field of Shakespeare studies, particularly those pertaining to colonial variations of his work. With this in mind, Douglas Bruster and Lisa Hopkins have both written about Shakespeare in a broader context. Bruster’s *Shakespeare and the Question of Culture* (2003) provides a theoretical examination of Shakespeare within cultural contexts, and not solely as a literary entity. Meanwhile, Lisa Hopkins’ *Shakespeare on the Edge* (2005) provides a discussion of the works at border places, and boundaries, an effective examination when taken into a colonial context. For further critical material, *Shakespeare Beyond English: A Global Experiment* (2013) edited by Susan Bennett and Christie Carson aids in the discussion of those Shakespeare adaptations of the New Zealand Wars that incorporate te reo Māori. The work of Michael Neill examining the decolonising approaches towards Shakespearean productions is likewise useful to this thesis. Additionally, Catherine Silverstone’s *Shakespeare, Trauma and Contemporary Performance* (2011) provides an effective examination of Shakespeare performances by colonised and indigenous peoples.

Equally important to literary criticism is historiography, given the way in which my exploration of representation is embedded in historical context. During different periods of Aotearoa New Zealand’s history there have been varying approaches and examinations of the New Zealand Wars. In some circumstances this is due to a political agenda, in other cases it is due to a one-sided examination of the period. With the exception of James Cowan’s interviews, many Māori histories were not widely acknowledged until well into the twentieth century. It was not until the 1970s that Māori academics more visibly joined the debate on national history.

Furthermore, there is the noted shift in the histories after the founding of the Waitangi Tribunal which enabled a forum of voices outside of the Pākehā establishment to gain prominence. As a number of historical writings on this period have been characterised differently, this thesis will examine a range of these interpretations of the New Zealand Wars and the Land Wars. While other historians may be referenced and utilised, the following will be the principal writers.

The earliest major history written about New Zealand is William Pember Reeves' *Ao Tea Roa: Long White Cloud* (1898) which serves as a reference point for texts written in the late nineteenth to early twentieth centuries. Reeves' work is notable as being written as an imperial history, depicting the rise of the British Empire within New Zealand, with all of the accompanying bias. Other histories of note from the early twentieth century are James Cowan's various writings. Cowan's work is particularly valid as he gathered accounts of veterans from different sides of the New Zealand Wars, looking to create an authentically New Zealand history and encourage interest in it from the rest of Aotearoa. While Cowan's work had a distinct nation-making agenda, and was thoroughly in favour of the progress of empire and uncritical about colonisation, he had access to primary sources. The first-hand accounts and interviews collected by Cowan enable the voices from the period to be more directly heard and these segments of his work are invaluable.

The first professional historian to write about these events was Keith Sinclair in the 1950s. In *The Origins of the Maori Wars* (1957), Sinclair gave greater attention to the Māori perspective in the conflict and showed a more sympathetic view than Reeves, yet still maintained some of the erroneous assumptions presented as fact since the nineteenth century. One example is the downplaying of Riwia Titokowaru as a threat to the colonial government, and focusing most of his attention on the Waikato.

James Belich's revisionist history is an effective examination of the reassessing of the New Zealand Wars in popular media, in particular his history *The New Zealand Wars and the Victorian Interpretation of Racial Conflict* (1986). Belich's push in the 1980s to re-examine the conflict was one of the most visible revival of the New Zealand Wars in popular consciousness. He critiques previous bias in its depiction and considers the concerted effort to manipulate the facts of the New Zealand Wars. Belich writes that the

degree of Māori success in all four major wars is still underestimated—even to the point where, in the case of one war, the wrong side is still said to have won (Belich, *The New Zealand Wars* 16).

Another key criticism was that many earlier historians, such as Reeves and Cowan, tended to focus on the wars as part of a Pākehā narrative of nationhood and becoming. It is a valid criticism as the title of one of Cowan's books was *New Zealand's First Century: the Dominion's Scene and Story: the Pageant of Nation-making* (1939). Many of Belich's points and arguments have since been contested, such as his comments regarding allied Māori involvement and particular motivations by different iwi. However, *The New Zealand Wars and the Victorian Interpretation of Racial Conflict* (1986) remains one of the most cited texts in any study involving the New Zealand Wars, as well as one of the most detailed histories. Belich's history of Riwā Titokowaru, initially an MA Thesis and later the monograph *I Shall Not Die: Titokowaru's War 1868-1869* (1989), is also very detailed and clearly influenced writers such as Maurice Shadbolt and, potentially, the director Vincent Ward.

The aforementioned scholars are all of New Zealand European or European extraction, and thus are not writing from a specifically Māori cultural context. It would be short sighted to rely solely on Pākehā testimony and scholarship in any

period of New Zealand history. Therefore, Māori scholars such as Ranganui Walker and Danny Keenan provide distinct and valuable lenses through which to further analyse my primary sources. Walker is well-known for his various works on Māori studies and also for his columns in the *New Zealand Listener* which offered commentary on contemporary issues, later collected in the volume *Na Tau Tohetohe/The Years of Anger* (1987). Another important scholar writing with an awareness of and sensitivity to Māori cultural traditions at this period was Judith Binney. While she herself is not Māori, much of Binney's work relies upon Māori oral histories and historical accounts. Her *Redemption Songs: A Life of Te Kooti Akirangi Te Turuki* (2012) will provide in-depth discussions about one of the most popularised areas of the New Zealand Wars, the pursuit of Te Kooti.

Keenan is one of the most prolific contemporary historians writing on the Land Wars, he offers post-Belich perspective on the conflict, reassessing some of Belich's own assertions. Keenan's body of work consists of *Wars Without End: the Land Wars in Nineteenth-Century New Zealand* (2009), *Contested Ground: Te Whenua I Tohea - The Taranaki Wars 1860-1881* (2010), and a wealth of articles. Keenan provides a contemporary perspective on the New Zealand Wars as he examines "nineteenth century Māori activity in the context of conflict and war over land, realigning more recent sources with customary understandings" (*Wars Without End* 22). As my thesis concerns itself with representation, these differing cultural perspectives are particularly relevant.

History, Ideology, Text and Context

At the core of this thesis is representation, particularly what shapes and influences a text. W. J. T. Mitchell argues that "'representation' has always played a central role in the understanding of literature" (11). In my thesis I would argue that representation plays a central role in understanding the New Zealand Wars as a

whole, not just in literature. This particular angle is not a radical idea, as Mitchell further states:

In the modern era (i.e. in the last three hundred years) it has also become a crucial concept in political theory, forming the cornerstone of representational theories of sovereignty, legislative authority, and relations of individuals to the state (11).

All of the concepts laid down by Mitchell here, particularly sovereignty, impact upon the New Zealand Wars and the Land Wars. Therefore it is understandable that representation is an influential idea in the examination of the conflict.

My proposed form of analysis falls into three key categories: the historical context and the ideological and cultural paradigms (in particular imperialism and post-colonialism) which shape textual production, and intertextual relationships. The work of historians will provide an effective historiographic context that will provide a necessary a tool of analysis for understanding the context in which the texts and films analysed were constructed and/or presented. A range of theoretical frameworks will also be employed to analyse the primary sources, in particular post-colonial studies and indigenous studies. Texts will also be compared across chapters, such as film with nineteenth-century novels or plays with twentieth-century novels.

In examining historical representations, the relationship between text and context is important, how the events of a time period affect the production of a text. With this concept in mind, Peter Gibbons' work will be significant in understanding the place and evolution of the New Zealand Wars within fiction; not only how it is affected by histories and events but how they affect one another. Gibbons argues:

Part of the task of literary history is to explore textual genealogies. Where one might begin is difficult to decide; all texts reformulate pre-existing texts,

all writing is rewriting, and the horizon of beginnings recedes beyond New Zealand (“Non-fiction” 28).

Gibbons’ work explains why some of the texts were constructed. He argues that one of the most important actions of the scholar is “to revalue those experiences eliminated, denigrated, or misrepresented” whether they are women, as Gibbons specifically states, or belonging to other marginalised groups (“Non-fiction” 29). Gibbons’ scholarship aids in examining not only the reclaiming of history, but also the earlier formulation of a single dominant history. The side-lining of other narratives in favour of one that best suits colonising interests is something that he specifically mentions, especially in relation to a period of conflict:

The texts, nevertheless, deliver what the soldiers could not: those Māori provoked into resistance are ‘rebels’ (as the *printed* proclamations designated them) who, after a fair fight, are driven from their lands, the remnants pursued until they are beyond causing further trouble; after which they are left in the interior wilderness to brood sullenly upon their defeat (“Non-fiction” 43).

This control and dominance over what is considered history is fundamental to understanding the nature of the interpretations of the New Zealand Wars, as well as why the Wars are consistently revisited.

The struggle against a prescribed history is also significant in relation to attempts at formulating a “national identity” within New Zealand which entails a limited representation on the New Zealand Wars. This is especially significant in regards to what Gibbons terms “Cultural Colonization”, where the cultural practices of a group are marginalised or appropriated and dictated by the settler. “Cultural colonization is but one element of New Zealand cultural history, but it is a significant one, and it deserves detailed attention from historians” (Gibbons,

“Cultural Colonization and National Identity” 14). Cultural colonisation is still an ongoing issue due to a disproportionate number of Pākehā writers and scholars in fields that also pertain to Māori. As indigenous studies are a key field of criticism within this topic, I have striven to use a diverse range of sources and critics, so that I have an appropriately well-rounded study.

For instance, when examining the film *Utu*, the context is particularly important. The film emerged from a politically charged environment that was suddenly more aware of the issues of Māori rights, land and the injustices perpetuated by the New Zealand government. In that period Ranginui Walker states “The use of massive state power to crush the protestors at Bastion Point in 1979 indicates that little has changed in a hundred years” (Walker, *Nga Tau Tohetohe* 37). This direct reference to the New Zealand Wars shows the affirmation that the struggle had not ended, the Land Wars persist. Walker continues his argument by drawing parallels to the Springbok Tour protests of 1987:

In that great trek down Main Street to the rugby grounds of the nation, we affirmed our own humanity, but discovered an elementary truth about our society: it has the potential to oppress us all (Walker, *Nga Tau Tohetohe* 36).

These events give greater understanding to the environment that produced the cynical view of the colonisation of New Zealand that is present within *Utu*. It therefore is crucial to address the histories and events contemporary to the time period in which the texts are produced. No text exists within a vacuum, and even when representing a past event, some of the present has the potential to seep in.

Post-colonial theory will serve as an important theoretical tool within this research due to the subject matter of colonial conflict as well as the necessity of analysing these texts within their own historical period.

When we think about colonies we think, first perhaps, of space, of the appropriation and exploitation of land. But questions of time are just as important when trying to think in (post- or neo-) colonialist context (Bennett and Royle 206).

In addition to concerns of historical context, the post-colonial approach to literature concerns itself with the interplay between the coloniser and the colonised. For these reasons post-colonial criticism has a valid place in a study of representations of the New Zealand Wars, particularly in its analysis of imperialism. This is particularly necessary for any texts, productions, or films following the 1970s due to the influence of Māori activism, the Land Hikoi, and the Māori Literary Renaissance. This era is also of particular importance as it marks a shift towards greater acceptance towards Māori perspectives on the New Zealand Wars and a questioning of the previously dominant ethnocentric narrative.

In terms of cultural studies, particularly within a colonial context, Edward Said's work on post-colonialism provides some useful criticism, particularly his book, *Culture and Imperialism* (1993). As Said states: "At some very basic level, imperialism means thinking about, settling on, controlling land that you do not possess, that is distant, that is lived on, that is owned by others" (7). This concept is reinforced and expanded upon by Andrew Bennett and Nicholas Royle: "Issues of law and justice are at the heart of all (post- or neo-) colonial literature" (Bennett and Royle 293). Given that many of the conflicts within New Zealand Wars concerned the sale, confiscation and/or occupation of land, and were embedded in two conflicting cultural sets of law and justice, this approach has merit.

Said also makes valid points about the creation of national culture within the realm of imperialism. "Neither culture nor imperialism is inert, and so the connections between them as historical experiences are dynamic and complex" (14).

He goes on to state that: “Though for the most part the colonies have won their independence, many of the imperial attitudes underlying colonial conquest continue” (Said 16). These statements support my view that the imperial attitudes and actions of the New Zealand Wars have a continuing effect in present day New Zealand. In addition, Said discusses the representation of indigenous peoples and the importance of these depictions within both a colonial and an ostensibly post-colonial context.

One significant contemporary debate about the residue of imperialism—the matter of how “natives” are represented in the Western media—illustrates the persistence of such interdependence and overlapping, not only in the debate’s content but in its form, not only in what is said but also in how it is said, by whom, where, and for whom (Said 21).

In this regard, Said provides ground for discussing the depictions of Māori within New Zealand Wars literature. However, I think that his perspective is somewhat limited, being principally concerned with the former colonies of the Middle East, India, and Africa, as opposed to the Pacific or the Americas (including Central and South America in addition to the U.S.A. and Canada) where better parallels can be found in terms of race relations.

Within Homi K. Bhabha’s *The Location of Culture* (1994), there is a more in-depth analysis in the creation of the colonial subject. “It is a form of discourse crucial to the binding of a range of differences and discriminations that inform the discursive and political practices of racial and cultural hierarchization” (Bhabha 70).

Bhabha states that:

The objective of colonial discourse is to construe the colonized as a population of degenerate types on the basis of racial origin, in order to

justify conquest and to establish systems of administration and instruction (70).

In this regard, Bhabha provides effective critical material that in general terms is useful in my examination of British and Colonial government action during the New Zealand Wars and their subsequent depictions within media. Bhabha offers a means to understand how the colonised subject is seen by the established imperial power and can aid in how Māori are treated and represented before, during, and after the New Zealand Wars. This generality applicable to various cultures and colonised peoples can provide some insight into the British Empire's "coloniser handbook." This in turn provides a degree of understanding in relation to the Colonial Office's influence and the governors they deployed.

Yet Bhabha, like Said, is limited in his specific analysis. He concerns himself with rather different colonial experiences to what transpired and arguably transpires in New Zealand. He looks at a number of perspectives where either the colonised people are transplanted to a colony from elsewhere, or, following the break-up of the British Empire, the running of the country has returned to the hands of the local population. New Zealand has a rather different dynamic where it was not only colonised, but also experienced a form of plantation by imperial office approved settlers on a scale that was initially experimented with in what is now Northern Ireland, and then replicated in the United States of America, Canada, and Australia, as well as New Zealand. Furthermore, much like Northern Ireland, in Canada, New Zealand and Australia the head of state is still the monarch of the United Kingdom, regardless of the independence granted to the latter three in the twentieth century.

I also utilise Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak's *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason* (1999). Her work provides an examination of groups in contexts that have

been overlooked by post-colonial studies or do not fit its particular paradigm. Therefore Spivak allows for a differing perspective on the issues raised by Bhabha and Said, such as the differing thoughts on indigenous groups where they are now a minority, as well as the treatment of women and lower status members of a society.

As my topic involves colonial conflict, it is also important not only to examine how indigenous people are represented in such fiction by the settler culture but also to incorporate the indigenous perspective regarding the subject matter. With regards to the New Zealand Wars, this necessitates drawing on external Indigenous Studies criticism as well as Māori critical scholarship. Vine Deloria Jr.'s *We Talk You Listen* (1969) provides an effective examination of indigenous issues in both a real terms context as well as in representation. While he is writing from a Native American (Lakota) perspective, his ideas are effective in examining the marginalisation of indigenous peoples within both culture and media as well as comparing the plight of indigenous peoples to other ethnic minorities. Further insight into indigenous issues is provided by Eduardo and Bonnie Duran's *Native American Postcolonial Psychology* (1995) which examines the trauma of colonised peoples and the social ramifications of their colonisation. The concept was addressed in New Zealand in a speech at the University of Waikato in 2000 by politician Tariana Turia who referred to it as "Post-Colonial Traumatic Stress Disorder" (The New Zealand Psychology Society 27-28). Duran and Duran examine this concept in greater detail using the term "soul tear" (24). This provides insight into the psychological ramifications of colonisation upon an indigenous populace, and will be an effective tool of textual analysis.

Due to the nature of representations, Māori and Pākehā approach the conflict differently. One of the most significant Māori studies writers is Professor

Ranginui Walker, whose histories, in conjunction with the rest of his body of work,¹ provides a strong base for the Māori scholarship within my thesis. He comments that the “fight is for justice and equal treatment – before the law as much as for land” (Walker, *Nga Tau Tohetohe* 59). This is a different perspective to Pākehā history, which looks at the New Zealand Wars often as a finished event. From a Māori perspective, particularly as noted by Walker, the struggle continues in a present tense. It has simply changed arenas. It is unsurprising then that one of Walker’s most well-known books echoes the words spoken by Rewi Maniopotō at the Battle of Ōrākau. These words are still a declarative statement of Māori activism and so his book is titled *Ka Whawhai Tonu Mātou: Struggle Without End*. This differing perspective is necessary to understand the tone and methods relating to representations of the Land Wars. In addition to the other major indigenous scholars, Chadwick Allen’s *Blood Narrative: Indigenous Identity in American Indian and Maori Literary and Activist Texts* (2002) and *Trans-Indigenous: Methodologies for Global Native Literary Studies* (2012) provides some specific criticism towards several of the texts.

Thesis Overview

My thesis traces fictional representations of the New Zealand Wars from 1861 to 1917. It attempts to give a sense of the evolving nature and recurring motifs of these representations, but given the proliferation of narratives that focus on the conflict (evident in Appendix One), my selection of specific texts to consider in detail is necessarily selective. My choices have been guided by three principles: the desire to profile a range of depictions and reactions; the need to provide some sense of the evolution of these depictions across time; and the desire to explore a variety of

¹ These include but are not limited to his news columns and his various lectures on Māori and the Māori social issues.

mediums. This selection is not the corpus in its entirety. I examine the representations with arguably the largest audience and critical attention. That is why I limit my focus to a selection of novels, most of the feature films, and all of the Shakespearean examples that I was able to uncover.

My first chapter is titled *Romancing the New Zealand Wars (1861-1899)*. In this chapter I examine the first fictional writings in response to the New Zealand wars, ranging from *Taranaki: A Tale of the War* (1862) to *War to the Knife, or, Tangata Maori* (1899). It also includes two non-Anglophone texts that were later translated, Sigurd Wiśniowski's *Tikera or Children of the Queen of Oceania* (1872) and Jules Verne's *Among the Cannibals* (1868). An array of historians are utilised to provide context to the narratives; Walker, Belich, Cowan, and Reeves, in particular, are critical in examining the material depicted in this chapter. It also provides an examination of the relevant tropes and genre conventions that are prevalent in the New Zealand Wars novel, strongly influenced by the adventure narratives of Sir Walter Scott and James Fenimore Cooper, and how these are shaped by the time period in which the texts are written, and the perspective from which each author approaches the subject.

The next chapter is titled *Complicating the Narrative (1914-1967)*, and examines how early twentieth-century texts continued to adhere to the format of the nineteenth-century novels, while finding ways to play with and complicate the narrative. The chapter charts the rise of the settler protagonist and the incorporation of new examinations of the conflict and the writers' engagement with the available histories of the time period. The first half the chapter discusses the work of Mona Tracy's *Rifle and Tomahawk* (1927) and William Satchell's *The Greenstone Door* (1914). It also discusses the evolution of the heroine and her difference from male protagonists, and the emergence of multi-novel series that depict the New Zealand

Wars. These later two ideas are discussed in relation to Olga Stringfellow's *Mary Bravender* (1959) and Errol Braithwaite's *The Flying Fish Trilogy* (1964, 1965, 1967) respectively. This chapter is where the work of Philip Steer is the most crucial as, apart from work on Satchell's *The Greenstone Door*, there is very little scholarship regarding these texts.

The third chapter, entitled Shadbolt and Ihimaera (1986-2018), is informed by a far greater level of literary scholarship. This chapter focuses upon crucial changes in the New Zealand Wars novel. It discusses the significance of Maurice Shadbolt, whose trilogy is arguably the most popular novelised representation of the conflict. It also examines the transformation of the genre following the arrival of Māori voices in the literary sphere with Witi Ihimaera. This chapter is where Belich's work will be quite significant as well as the work of Ranginui Walker in comparative associations with the texts. The texts from this period will be particularly associated with politics surrounding the Land Hikoi, Bastion Point, and the founding of the Waitangi Tribunal. This chapter also examines how the New Zealand Wars novel continues to progress and transform into 2017, specifically in relation to Ihimaera's later novella *Sleeps Standing/Moetū* (2017). In particular I discuss whether the texts rigidly adhere to or outright reject the conventions of the texts in Chapter One.

Chapter Four moves on from written text and is titled The New Zealand Wars Go to the Movies (1927-2005). This chapter examines the various representations of the New Zealand Wars as they have appeared on screen. It begins with the works of Rudall Hayward— *The Te Kooti Trail* (1927) and *Rewi's Last Stand* (1940)— before progressing to the 1980s with *Utū*, then into the 2000s with *River Queen*. A combination of theories and criticism are relevant here, particularly regarding the latter two films, and the discussion draws on film criticism, Terry

Goldie's *Representation of the Indigene*, and indigenous studies. The chapter also examines the whakapapa of the films and their inheritance from previous representations. It compares them to earlier novels, as well as the effect of the international film market on these New Zealand films grappling with distinctively New Zealand history.

The final chapter also shifts media. This chapter, *Shakespeare and the Land Wars (1983-2007)* examines the on-stage and Shakespearean representations of the New Zealand Wars. In particular, the chapter analyses performances or depictions of the conflict that use either Shakespearean plays or Shakespearean elements. Among these examples are the twenty-first-century productions of both *Othello* and *Troilus and Cressida* which use the New Zealand Wars as their setting. The chapter opens with examining the Shakespearean elements found within the film *Utu*, serving as a bridge between this chapter and Chapter Four. I then examine theatrical performances such as *Manawa Taua/Savage Hearts* (1994), the Court Theatre *Othello* (2001), the Toi Whakaari *Troilus and Cressida* (2003), and the Downstage Theatre *Othello* (2007). In addition to the Shakespeare criticism and the historical contextualisation, indigenous studies take on a significant role within this section, as well as the influence of the representations from previous chapters.

The main body of the thesis is followed by two appendices. The first appendix contains a timeline which includes dates and key events to allow for easy reference. There is also an extensive list of various fictional representations of the New Zealand Wars, including those not examined within the thesis. Furthermore, due to the nature of New Zealand English and its borrowing of Māori words, and the prevalence of Māori words in academic scholarship the second appendix will feature a glossary of Māori terms that I will use throughout this thesis.

This thesis aims to show the literary whakapapa of the New Zealand Wars and how each representation serves in relation to its antecedents. As the thesis moves roughly chronologically it will place more attention on the Land Wars as they become of greater significance over time. The aftermath of the New Zealand Wars left a schism of land and memory. One side (Pākehā) ended up with the land. While the other (Māori) were left with the memory. The resurgence of memory in recent years quite possibly correlates with growing compensation through treaty claims. As the land is returned, memory appears to be recovering. The story of these representations, however, begins with Henry Butler Stoney and New Zealand's first novel, *Taranaki: A Tale of the War*.

Chapter One: Romancing the New Zealand Wars: The Novel from 1861-1899

A bold hero traverses the wilderness of Aotearoa in the nineteenth century, a European man proving himself against the exotic wilds of the bush and the winds of war. Facing him is a Māori warrior defending his home and trying to keep his culture alive in a rapidly changing world. This chapter concerns itself with what I term the New Zealand Wars historical romance which encompasses novels from 1861 to 1899. While these novels provide a range of perspectives on the wars, they are all written by European authors who view the conflict as either a necessary part of European progress or as an exotic backdrop for their tales of heroism and adventure. Throughout this period contemporary commentaries and histories were published— such as John Gorst’s *The Maori King* (1864)—and the novels at times draw on and frequently reflect the ideology of these non-fiction publications. The New Zealand Wars romance style persists across this period as the dominant manner in which the conflict is depicted. Indeed, this style of representation was so pervasive that early romances influenced the future representations. Many of the conventions of the New Zealand Wars narratives are formed in these early novels and set the foundation which later novels, films and plays build upon. They also provide the initial examples of how popular fiction framed and interpreted the conflict and contact within Aotearoa.

This popular fiction occurred in what Kirstine Moffat dubs the “adventure-romance” genre in the nineteenth century (“Five Imperial Adventures” 37). Common features in these novels was a pursuit of the exotic over the humdrum of civilisation and praising of the masculine explorer. Yet their desire for the exotic does not always eventuate in settlement. “These adventurers rarely embrace a new identity as a colonist, preferring rather to return to the civilised comforts of home”

(Moffat, “Five Imperial Adventures” 38). The novels also commonly reflect “European attitudes of racial superiority and fears of miscegenation” (Moffat, “Five Imperial Adventures” 38). These are the narratives which the New Zealand Wars romances are influenced most keenly.

The New Zealand Wars have been a part of Aotearoa’s literary landscape for over one hundred and fifty years. The conflict is ever present in New Zealand writing and writing about New Zealand. The first novel written in New Zealand, *Taranaki: A Tale of the War* (1861) by Henry Butler Stoney is set during the First Taranaki War (1860-1861) so the conflict has been present in New Zealand literature since the very beginning. In terms of approach, Stoney is a loyal imperialist and, as a settler himself, wants to present the settlement of Pākehā in New Zealand in a positive light. Each writer examined in this chapter approaches the subject of the New Zealand Wars in subtly different ways, but there are strong commonalities of style and theme. All of the writers discussed in this chapter are of European descent and have a tendency to see Māori as a doomed people, and their writings use a similar array of tropes. Where representations of the period and the conflict differ is in their details, how the texts interpret conventions of the subgenre.

Appendix One of the thesis highlights thirteen novels with a New Zealand Wars setting were published in the late nineteenth century. It is beyond the scope of this chapter to cover each nineteenth-century representation in detail. I have carefully chosen four representative examples with the intention of providing a range of perspectives. As the first of the New Zealand Wars novelists, Stoney is critical in understanding the development of the style. Although, as Stoney writes from direct experience with the conflict, his emphasis is more military than the others. While these early novels are set during the New Zealand Wars, the actual fighting is often peripheral. Many of these novels are less about the war specifically

and more about the settlement of Aotearoa, encounters with Māori and the land (which are often conflated), and the surrounding circumstances that lead to the conflict. Stoney's focus on military activity is thus crucial.

The other novels which form the focal point of this chapter do not always depict the physical aspects of the wars at any length. Each is attuned, however, to the social aspects of settlement and encounter (in one form or another). Many of the novels are concerned with the changing face of Aotearoa, the construction of Empire and the changes it wreaks. The novels focus upon the interactions between the coloniser, settler, and indigene and the struggle over the land, which lie at the heart of the conflict.

Following on from Stoney, a considerable number of nineteenth-century writers were drawn to the romance and exoticism of the New Zealand Wars as a backdrop for a tale of adventure. Such authors include Emilia Marryat's *Amongst the Maoris* (1874), G. A. Henty's *Maori and Settler* (1891), and Joseph Spillman's *Love Your Enemies* (1895). Many writers using the conflict as a setting were immigrants to New Zealand, such as Stoney; however, others were from overseas such as the Australian writer T. A. Browne. Browne is also known (and subsequently referred to in this thesis) by his pen name Rolf Boldrewood. Boldrewood writes in the tradition of British imperial romance and his fiction is the perfect example of the imperial mindset that dominated the production of New Zealand Wars narratives in Britain and her colonies. Boldrewood constructs an adventure-romance (still with an imperial bias) in his novel *War to the Knife*, (1899). He builds on the established traditions of Sir Walter Scott and the imagery of James Fenimore Cooper featuring conventions such as an admiration for the cultural 'other' from an Anglo-centric perspective, yet still adhering to the Social Darwinist ideas of cultural progress. The imperial, Anglo-centric view is thus epitomised by

Boldrewood. While others, such as Henty wrote in a similar form, Boldrewood is the most iconic of the Anglophone writers.

Some of the nineteenth-century novels featuring the New Zealand Wars were not originally printed in English and these texts are of significance as they profile subtly different perspectives to the valourisation of the military settler by Stoney and the imperial rhetoric of Boldrewood. One example is Sygurd Wiśniowski's *Tikera or Children of the Queen of Oceania* (1877). Wiśniowski was a Polish traveller who passed through New Zealand, but never stayed. Some years later, while in Maine in the United States of America, he wrote *Tikera* for a Polish speaking audience. Wiśniowski, as a Pole, had experienced colonisation first-hand through the partition of Poland at the hands of Hapsburg Austria, the Kingdom of Prussia, and the Russian Empire. Consequently, his outlook is far more pessimistic and critical of colonial enterprise in general and looks sympathetically on Māori resistance to colonial interference. Another non-English novelist is the renowned writer of distant places, Jules Verne, who included New Zealand in the third volume of his *In Search of the Castaways* trilogy (also called *The Children of Captain Grant*), titled *Among the Cannibals* (1868) but who, like Boldrewood, had no first-hand knowledge of New Zealand. Verne is critical of British colonialism throughout the trilogy, and pointedly uses Scottish and French protagonists rather than English. Even so, Verne is still writing from the perspective of a rival colonial power. Therefore, while he delights in the opportunity to critique British imperial expansion, he is not opposed to colonial ideas in general, as evident in his atavistic depictions of the cultural 'other'. Neither Verne nor Wiśniowski originally wrote their novels in English, Verne writing in French and Wiśniowski in Polish. Verne idealises Aotearoa as an exotic fantasy realm, far removed from any ideas of civilisation. In contrast, Wiśniowski gives a perspective that is openly critical of

imperial validity and that questions colonial enterprise from the perspective of a colonised subject.

Much of the research done by these authors was informed by the information available to the writers at the time. Background information was provided by works such as William Swainson's *New Zealand* (1856), A. S. Thomson's *The Story of New Zealand* (1859), and Richard Taylor's *Te Ika a Maui* (1855), and various newspaper's reports on New Zealand Wars supplied specifics. Boldrewood, writing in the 1890s, had a wider array of historical material on which to draw. "Boldrewood's principal source of information about Māori life and history were G.W. Rusden's *A History of New Zealand* (1883) and *Aureretanga: Groans of the Maoris* (1888)" (Dixon 55). These resources gave him a greater array of events from the New Zealand Wars to signpost to his readers. This chapter will compare the four chosen authors, focusing on how their perspectives provide different ways to engage with the New Zealand Wars within the New Zealand Wars romance framework.

As many of these writers had never visited Aotearoa, it was considered to be a distant, mysterious and exotic location. This treatment of the country is particularly significant in cases such as Verne. In certain cases these early works sound like imperialist dogma:

On the one hand, there was admiration of Māori courage and a sense that they were fighting for their own land; on the other hand, there was the realization that the dream of the Pastoral Paradise could be achieved only by the defeat of the Māori, a defeat that was both excused and seen as inevitable by a kind of cultural Darwinism (Jones, "The Novel" 122).

This treatment of the Māori is evident throughout the examined texts with varying levels of attention. The ideas of Empire and progress are on full display throughout

the novels, but they are not producing these ideas in isolation. There was also a great deal of influence on these novels by popular works of the time:

In the first part of the nineteenth century most adventure fiction was written for boys and was modelled on Daniel Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* (1719), Sir Walter Scott's *Waverley* (1814), and James Fenimore Cooper's *Last of the Mohicans* (1826) (Moffat, "Five Imperial Adventures" 41).

Scott and Fenimore Cooper's novels were foundational in the construction of nineteenth-century stories at a frontier in a time of conflict. Due to their pervasiveness throughout the historical romance genre, many of the novels examined in this chapter have distinct parallels to the wider nineteenth-century literary tradition.

As several literary scholars have engaged with the novels and authors examined here, where appropriate in this chapter I will be engaging with prior scholarship. The novels have been viewed through the lens of the adventure-romance (as they draw from the literary lineage of Sir Walter Scott and through him, James Fenimore Cooper). Jane Stafford made such a comparison in her analysis of *Taranaki: A Tale of War*. Meanwhile, Kirstine Moffat examines many of these novels in "Five Imperial Adventures in the Waikato." She argues that they follow a similar narrative arc and revolve around similar thematic preoccupations as imperial adventures such as Joseph Conrad's *Heart of Darkness* and H. Rider Haggard's *King Solomon's Mines*.

Philip Steer, discusses New Zealand Wars novels and they appear in clusters, his idea informing the development of my own work. The widest body of scholarship examining a number of these texts, however, is from the settlement studies project, particularly from the work of Alex Calder and Stephen Turner. Turner's "Being Colonial/Colonial Being" examines the ideas of settlement and

how Pākehā construct mythologies to fit themselves within a land to which they do not truly belong. Calder's scholarship also informs my development of the chapter's structure as noted below. While Steer critiques settlement studies for lacking scope, he also adheres to many of its conventions. Lawrence Jones examines similar ideas to Turner, particularly with regards to early writers who look upon New Zealand as a new fertile land to remake in the settlers' idealised image. This field provides a number of insights into the use of literature as a tool of settler mythmaking, such as Pākehā ties to the land, and interrogates the justifications given for displacing indigenous inhabitants.

I aim to construct a collective analysis of these novels, acknowledging their structural parallels and their influences, as well as building to their impact on subsequent representations in later chapters. I want to examine these novels as a single subgenre while also examining their treatment of history. In this regard I wish to address what settlement studies does not do. I discuss the novels in terms of their founding New Zealand Wars narratives (and from them the Land Wars) into a subgenre with its own distinct form and style. Settlement studies does not examine the role these representations play in subsequent depictions, though Steer's historiographic analysis of textual clusters foregrounds what I attempt. I use this chapter to set up what becomes the norm in subsequent representations, and is interrogated, subverted, or enforced in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries.

As the novels are principally about settlement and contact, my analysis revolves around a series of contested and fraught 'contact zones'. By contact zone I refer to the work of Mary Louise Pratt and her discussion of cultural contact.

I use this term to refer to social spaces where cultures meet, clash, and grapple with each other, often in contexts of highly asymmetrical relations

of power, such as colonialism, slavery, or their aftermaths as they are lived out in many parts of the world today (Pratt 34).

The fictional representations of the New Zealand Wars discussed in this chapter provide a space where encounters between peoples and ideas in Aotearoa are played out against the backdrop of war. The contact zones present in the novels are where the power dynamics are either established or forced from one (or more) culture(s) upon another between the incoming and established people.

This social space leads to the creation of certain effects between the divergent groups. “Autoethnography, transculturation, critique, collaboration, bilingualism, mediation, parody, denunciation, imaginary dialogue, vernacular expression” (Pratt 37). To clarify my point, there are three principle ‘spheres of contact’ within the New Zealand Wars novels. I define these spheres as Town, Kāinga, and Bush. This approach is partly inspired by Alex Calder’s description of *The Greenstone Door*:

The various outcomes and allegiances of the novel can be plotted by tracing a spatial and temporal division between three zones: a metropolitan zone, a semi-civilised zone and a savage zone – a division also found in history novels by Walter Scott and James Fenimore Cooper (Calder 100).

Calder’s three zones constitute Auckland, as a civilised and advanced metropolitan zone occupied by settlers; the Waikato as an intermediary, semi-civilised agricultural zone occupied by progressive Māori; the mountains, a dangerous place “where old-time Māori exist in a savage state under their cannibal chief, Te Huata” (Calder 100). They are “a correlation of the Victorian ladder of progress” (101). My spheres, however, are spaces of contact and encounter. When characters travel between spheres it is not a progressive advance from one space to another other, but sometimes move backwards and forwards. While one sphere may experience

the process of settlement and encounter more acutely, it occurs in all three and they push and pull on one another.

The Town is the place of Empire. It is where the imposition of the colony is most evident upon the land. It is where the colonial holds sway. As stated in my Introduction: “The colonial wants to subordinate the new place to the old place. To make it like home, which is another place: the old country” (Turner “Being Colonial/Colonial Being” 39). The Town is where the colonial’s efforts are most visible in making Aotearoa into an extension of the British Empire. The Kāinga is the indigenous space where Māori authority still holds sway, though this is treated as something in danger as there are many instances of it being affected and eroded from the influence of the Town. In this regard there are similarities to Calder’s comments on the Victorian Social Darwinist ideas which separate the places, yet in these fictions those who inhabit the Kāinga are aware of this state of flux and want to control how much it changes. The depictions, all written by European authors, reflect cultural attitudes of the day and range from the outright barbaric to the mere uncivilised. The Bush is the liminal space between the Kāinga and the Town; in the novels it is the typical place of conflict. The most obvious form of the Bush as a contact zone is the zone of conquest, it is where the actions of colonisation are enacted and resisted (while in the Town it is where they are established). This is the largest contact zone and the majority of cross-cultural interaction and exchange occurs here.

Due to the contact and engagement between Māori and Pākehā when they enter one another’s “sphere,” the Town and the Kāinga are also places of transculturation.

Ethnographers have used the term transculturation to describe processes whereby members of subordinated or marginal groups select and invent

from materials transmitted by a dominant or metropolitan culture...While subordinate peoples do not usually control what emanates from the dominant culture, they do determine to varying extents what gets absorbed into their own and what it gets used for (Pratt 36).

This transculturation takes place in the Kāinga, before its effects then move on to the Bush. To clarify, while there are contemporary examples of cultural appropriation with Māori concepts and traditions moving from the Kāinga to the Town (such as entering the New Zealand legal framework and the common use of powhiri in public institutions), what is examined here passes from the Town to the Kāinga. The Kāinga adopts transmitted materials such as Christianity, muskets, and crops, yet the Kāinga will still adhere to traditional medicine, and retain much of Māori protocol. While some Pākehā characters do spend time in the Kāinga, they are less likely to fully embrace the life. Travellers will at best pay lip service to Māori values and cultural traditions, while Pākehā-Māori will blend ideologies of both worlds and often act as agents of change within the Kāinga itself.

In addition to the three spheres there are a series of stock characters who often appear within these novels. These characters are similar to others from nineteenth-century historical romances. Kirstine Moffat argues: “The protagonists of these adventures are typically courageous and capable of violent action” (“Five Imperial Adventures” 42). In many of the stories there is a focus on the protagonist’s masculinity. Their ability to confront and overcome indigenous men in conflict, their masculine charm that attracts women, both European and Other, are central to the narrative. These characters are strong, active, and daring. Such protagonists are also common in the New Zealand Wars novels. These works, particularly the Anglo-phone pieces, often conform to stereotypes: “the solitary male explorer”, “voluptuous ‘half-caste’”, and a European maiden who embodies

“civilisation and domesticity” (Moffat, “Five Imperial Adventures” 38). As the characters exist as tropes, each is associated with a particular sphere and has specific coded interactions with the narrative and other characters.

Those in Town are agents or symbols of colonial society and the imposition of British values, ideologies, and cultural, political and economic practices on the new colony, such as the imperial official and the European lady. Those in the Kāinga are indicative of the change and transculturation that takes place, such as the tohunga and the clergyman who seek respectively to preserve and change spiritual beliefs and cultural traditions. Others are best aligned with the Bush as they occupy the liminal space between, not part of either world but able to move freely between the two, such as the Māori maiden and the European traveller. Through the course of the chapter I will discuss the various travellers protagonists of the New Zealand Wars romances, and the spheres they move through. I will discuss the sphere and how it is represented, and then the characters that are affiliated with that particular sphere. First I will examine the Town, then the Kainga, and lastly the Bush.

The Traveller/“Hero” – To Boldly Go

Before each sphere is explored, it is vital to discuss the character from the outside who moves between them, the Pākehā traveller. This character frequently embodies the authors’ perspective and provides a useful lens for understanding the aims and approach of each novelist. The traveller can be defined as a person travelling through New Zealand during the narrative. They are usually from abroad, commonly Britain or America, though in the case of Wiśniowski and Verne, Poland and France also feature respectively. As Moffat notes these characters are almost always protagonists:

The protagonists of these novels are not typically missionaries, settlers or Empire-builders seeking to shape the new world into a simulacrum of the old, but travellers in search of the exotic. These adventurers rarely embrace a new identity as a colonist, preferring rather to return to the civilised comforts of home and the known at the conclusion of their explorations (“Five Imperial Adventures” 38).

The traveller is the character whose perspective is presented the most. He introduces the reader to Aotearoa (especially as the authors’ audiences would be unfamiliar with the places and events).

Due to the time period and connotations of the character, travellers are almost exclusively men. Ergo this character is a potential suitor for both a Māori maiden and a European lady, simultaneously demonstrating the character’s masculinity and desirability. The traveller is also likely to be sympathetic towards Māori as they are not physically, fiscally or emotionally invested in the colony. The lack of investment in the colony, however, also means that travellers do not try to make any lasting changes, regardless of their personal feelings. The traveller is often from among the gentry or upper class, being forced to Aotearoa due to circumstances beyond their control (usually matters of wealth). He generally leaves on the conclusion of his adventures, and his reason for being in Aotearoa, is resolved. As mentioned earlier, these characters are tied to the always-male adventure protagonists from literary tradition. Therefore, the traveller is bound by the same ideas of masculinity embodied by their literary predecessors. The traveller will sometimes join the militia, but does not feel any real loyalty towards them. His aim is fortune and glory rather than support for a cause. Due to the traveller’s status as Pākehā (though not necessarily British) and service in the military, he is always

on side of the Colonial Government throughout the Wars. Though his support is potentially marred by cynicism, his position never wavers.

The traveller in Stoney's *Taranaki* is Captain St Pierre, a young soldier who has returned to New Plymouth after having served in conflicts overseas. Unlike subsequent protagonists he is not only a settler, but is presented as a settler paragon:

Besides having received a liberal education—a graduate of Oxford—he had taken his degree as a Bachelor of Medicine; but not fancying the profession, he had obtained a Commission in the Line. During nine years' service he had acquired a fund of general knowledge, which, added to a pleasing address, made him a general favourite. (He had also distinguished himself repeatedly both in the Crimea and afterwards during the Indian Mutiny.)

(Stoney 26).

St Pierre is a man shown to be educated, but also a man of action, making him suitable for settling in a country which is undergoing several military conflicts (particularly Taranaki which was one of the most contested areas during the New Zealand Wars). St Pierre is brave as in previous service he “distinguished himself repeatedly”, and more importantly he is shown to have a notable military record in service of the British Empire, presenting how clear his loyalty is to the Crown, so he is not likely to side with the local Māori. In particular, he has served in places of imperial aggression and ambition. St Pierre has served in the vast campaigns of Empire, as the Crimea was a battlefield much involving far greater numbers than the New Zealand Wars. As evident in his service during the Indian Mutiny, St Pierre has experience in suppressing resistance to imperial control.

St Pierre is the ideal settler character, one who has a confirmed skill in abilities considered masculine, capable in academic endeavours but not a scholar who might be considered soft. He possesses skills of need in the colony, but most

importantly he is a loyal subject of the Crown. He appears less of a character, and more of a wish list for Stoney's model hero.

Unlike St Pierre, Boldrewood's protagonist Roland Massinger is not initially a military man. He comes to Aotearoa in search of a grand adventure and wealth, as he has recently become impoverished in England. His estate is heavily tied up with his own identity. Massinger "has the honour of being Massinger of Massinger, and inhabiting 'The Court,'...with its priceless herilooms and memories!" (Boldrewood 1). The loss of this core piece of Massinger's identity is what pushes him to seek fortune in the colonies. Massinger's travels initially consist of him on a tourist trail. He sees the sights and views Aotearoa as an exotic wonderland. This travelling around allows Boldrewood to introduce New Zealand to his readers, which they experience through Massinger's eyes.

Massinger's experience in Aotearoa changes during the course of the narrative, however, with his service in the militia. This action is significant for Massinger as in the militia he has the opportunity to acquire lands and regain his lost fortune. This decision does not complicate his loyalties towards his Māori lover Erena however, as her tribe support the colonial government during the New Zealand Wars. While with the militia he signs on with the Forest Rangers as it best fits his position and sensibilities. They are "rather more aristocratic; trifle more danger, perhaps. Corps of the Guides, and so on. Von Tempsky's Forest Rangers!" (Boldrewood 234). Signing on with the Forest Rangers gives Massinger a slanted perspective on the Bush as he becomes embroiled in various significant actions during the New Zealand Wars. Massinger's military service takes him across the central North Island, making him the most militarily involved protagonist of these early novels. His fighting at Ōrākau, and then at Gate Pā, as well as later action

against Kereopa Te Rau arguably makes him the quintessential figure of New Zealand colonisation.

Elaborating on this point, to Massinger Aotearoa is (with the exception of Erena) a place to acquire wealth. He was not concerned with the destiny of the colony, nor the Māori alienation from their land. Massinger has no interest in the politics of the war, only the action and reward. This mercenary attitude is compounded by Massinger's future as an English absentee landlord:

He himself held what might be considered an incredibly large domain which must prove of great value in time to come. He would not mention the number of acres. He was *not* going back there [New Zealand] (Boldrewood 418).

He has little opinion regarding the actions of groups such as the New Zealand Land Company, nor an awareness of Governor Grey's motivation in confiscating land to plant military settlers. Massinger's entire perception of the conflict is how it benefits him.

While Boldrewood constructs Massinger according to the Walter Scott role-model which fits in with the dominant ideology of the day, to a modern reader the man is far less palatable. He is one of the most appalling imperialist figures examined in the texts. Massinger becomes an absentee landlord who comes to New Zealand, profits on confiscated land and never visits to pay attention to his holdings. The man embodies the worst of the Raupatu, he sees Aotearoa as a source of profit to the benefit of England and English gentlemen, as opposed to a nation where people live. He wishes to exploit the land for personal gain and has no investment in the country itself.

Among the traveller characters, Wiśniowski's narrator is unusual as he remains nameless. He is based upon the people with whom Wiśniowski had

exchanged stories during his time on the goldfields in New Zealand (Wiśniowski xxvi). As an outsider the narrator is often critical of the colonial endeavour. He has travelled to New Zealand from abroad, and is already an experienced adventurer, having spent time travelling in Peru. Furthermore, unlike the Anglophone characters in this selection of texts, he is not from the British Isles or any colonising country. Like the author, the narrator is Polish. This gives him a differing perspective compared to other characters and makes him far more critical of the colonial experiment. Such a perspective is understandable as at this time Poland was partitioned and different regions had been under the rules of Imperial Russia, Napoleonic France, the Austro-Hungarian Empire, and Prussia.

The narrator's criticism of colonisation is, however, contrasted by his fears of miscegenation, which he uses to recuse himself from the battle for the wahine Tikera's affection. Furthermore, while he is critical of British treatment towards Māori, and is very outspoken in support of their cause, he does not actually join them. As Moffat states:

He complains about British injustice and rapaciousness, but takes the expedient and self-serving route of joining the Pioneers and fighting for a cause in which he does not believe ("Five Imperial Adventures" 52).

The narrator is first and foremost a traveller. His movement from country to country, just passing through, means that he has no desire to become deeply embroiled in the destiny of Aotearoa. He is there to visit, explore, work, and move on. While he offers a differing perspective on the New Zealand Wars, he has no investment in the country to effect any real change. The narrator also has little agency in the novel, he simply moves from place to place, needing rescue by others, be they Tempski, the tohunga, Tikera, or Te Ti. At best he is a sympathetic bystander, while everything happens around him. Even the final defeat of the antagonist Charles

Schaeffer has nothing to do with the narrator (who proved ineffectual at curbing Schaeffer's greed and ambitions).

Unlike the other texts, Wiśniowski's narrator is not the only traveller in *Tikera*. There is also the character of Charles Schaeffer, an impoverished German aristocrat. Schaeffer is a foil to the narrator. Where the narrator is honest Schaeffer is scheming; where the narrator is hard working Schaeffer is lazy; where the narrator is horrified at miscegenation Schaeffer is indifferent; and where the narrator is helpful Schaeffer is greedy. Schaeffer has more in common with other protagonists (such as Massinger) than he does the narrator. The primary difference (apart from protagonist status) between the fortune seeking aristocrats Charles Schaeffer and Roland Massinger is ethnicity, possibly reflecting a Polish bias towards their own colonisers, the Prussians.

Schaeffer wants to make his fortune but does not want to work for it. "He says when they strike oil he will live on the income without needing to work" (Wiśniowski 184). Schaeffer also seeks glory (such as in his joining the Forest Rangers) and insinuates himself with as many female characters as he can, such as Tikera, Anabella, the lay minister's sister and the lay minister's wife. Schaeffer is an exaggerated representation of settler greed, and is the story's villain (the Māori antagonists are not provided with enough character to count). Schaeffer thus exists as a deconstruction of the traveller, and is a means for Wiśniowski to criticise the blatant amorality of many imperial romance protagonists. He embodies many of the traveller's worst qualities and unlike other novels, here they are called out as being malignant.

In contrast to the idea of a solitary protagonist, the traveller role in Verne's *Among the Cannibals* is fulfilled by an ensemble of characters. Leading the group is Lord Glenarven, who fulfils the typical aristocratic role with the aim to travel to

the exotic places leading the search for Captain Grant. Despite these attributes, he is quite different from the typical traveller. He does not meet any love interest on the journey as he is also accompanied by his wife, Lady Glenarven, and with her, Captain Grant's two children. The last member of their group is the French geographer Paganel. On their journey Paganel is a voice of exposition, explaining everything the characters encounter or need to know; he rarely seems lost for words or finds something that leaves him baffled. There is no interaction with a Maori maiden, nor any positive interaction with Māori.

The travellers in this novel are quite different to all others that I examine. They have a clear purpose and quest in their arrival in Aotearoa: to find Captain Grant. The group are shipwrecked/stranded and captured – these are crucial to understanding their contact with the place and with Māori. This novel presents Māori as wholly savage and any interaction between the cultures remains at a level of antagonism, hate and fear. Because of this attitude, Verne's travellers have no positive cultural exchanges in Aotearoa. They do not move between the two sides of the conflict, their whole purpose is to seek out Captain Grant and not get involved in local politics. This cuts the amount of positive cultural encounter they have to a minimum. As a result, in spite of Verne's equivocations about the British Empire this is a novel in which indigenous people are presented most unflatteringly and in a collective rather than individuated way.

The (Un)civilised Sphere of the Town

The first sphere in which the novels typically open is the Town, a decidedly European dominated sphere. Town serves as the outpost of Empire and civilisation, where colonial rule is dominant. The principle purpose of Town, however, is to act as the starting point for the plot and the traveller's adventures. Typically, it is from here that the traveller ventures into the other two spheres. The impetus to leave

Town regularly comes from a precipitating action that forces the protagonist to traverse the Bush. Whether this precipitating action occurs in the Town or prior (such as with Massinger in England), it forces the traveller to venture forth.

New Zealand's first novel, *Taranaki: A Tale of War*, features New Plymouth as its Town. This is understandable as the majority of action takes place in the Taranaki region. It is the home of the protagonist's extended family, the colonial soldier Captain Herbert St Pierre, captain in the British Army. The Town is not spoken of in grandiose terms, it is discussed plainly (like much of Stoney's writing):

The Town consists of only two streets going up and down both ways, crossing each other in the valley, so formed by the hills round, and where two streams from opposite sides converge as they enter the sea; the houses are all of wood and for the most part comfortable-looking, of two stories, with gardens behind, picturesquely extending down each declivity to the rivers, the banks planted with weeping willows (Stoney 30-31).

In his description of New Plymouth, Stoney emphasises its newness. He relates its comparatively small size with only two streets, as well as how the palisade of the barracks is "rough hewn". Despite these implications of the Town's infancy and unrefined nature, it is still a place where the environment and bush of Aotearoa has been managed and civilised according the European standards. His description of the gardens as "picturesque" and the weeping willows as "planted" further implies a desire among the colonists to Europeanise the area. The gardens have been enclosed and lead to the rivers and the fact they have been called gardens rather than lawns implies a degree of cultivation. It is likely that the planting in these gardens is not of native plants or crops but European flora, while the planting of weeping willows accomplishes the same effect upon the riverbanks. The Town is a clear depiction of the encroachment of European influence upon Aotearoa.

Stoney also describes the education opportunities available to people in the area such as school for boys and young men to attend. In addition to these schools there are:

two maiden sisters of no ignoble birth and good education...where they gladly received pupils from the neighbouring families and taught all polite branches of female acquire-ments, more especially music, in which they much excelled (Stoney 36).

The establishment of both education for women and the arts shows that the colony has reached a sufficient size to acquire extra social trappings, such as the desire for women to be accomplished in the arts rather than other forms of education. Stoney depicts a Town conforming to dominant ideas of gendered education for the time period. This shows a replication of British social models within the Town, the sphere is not just Europeanised physically but socially as well.

The Town also uses the military presence as an excuse for the variety of social occasions. For example, Captain St Pierre's cousin Mary informs him that a Colonel's visit brought an invitation "to an amateur theatrical performance and ball" (Stoney 36). The people in Town are inextricably tied to the military presence, either relying on soldiers for custom or seeing men in uniform as a way to host a variety of social and community functions. This gives an Austen-esque impression to the Town, though the war they are confronted with is far closer than Bath was to the battlefields of Napoleon in *Persuasion* (1817). Stoney glosses over the evacuations of many women and children and prefers to focus upon the mood of the people still within New Plymouth. The narrative is interspersed with military dispatches chronicling the nature of the conflict up until Stoney lauds the heroic appointment of Governor George Grey and the arrival of General Duncan Cameron (Stoney 106). In terms of establishing a literary whakapapa, Stoney is useful in his

delineation of sympathetic imperial/settler characters, but limited in that his narrative action stays largely in the Town. So, he does not really fit with Pratt's theory of the contact zone, but sets the ground for later examples that emerge.

For Roland Massinger in Rolf Boldrewood's *War to the Knife* (1899), the Town is a place that shows the progress of the British Empire and the changes that the settlers bring to Aotearoa. He sees the various cornerstones of European civilisation as a positive influence:

Auckland, with its thirty thousand inhabitants, its churches, gardens court-houses, public libraries, vice-regal mansion, and warehouses...a thriving settlement, destined to perform its function notably as a component part of the British Empire (Boldrewood 89-90).

Boldrewood looks at New Zealand (particularly Auckland) through an imperial lens. It is part of a larger political entity and works in the service of the Empire as a whole, rather than as a country in isolation.

The mentality surrounding the growth of the Town and Pākehā settled area is aggressively expansionist: "It would be better for [Māori] and everybody else not to lock up this fertile country" (Boldrewood 92). The idea of Victorian progress is at the forefront of Massinger's mind, particularly in relation to what he considers to be making proper use of the land. These ideas fit within the imperial ideology of the time: land must be tamed and made to produce constantly for profit. Any land that was arable and not farmed was regarded as being wasted.

Little action or activity is spent in Auckland during the course of the novel, however, with much of the focus on either the Bush or the Kāinga. As Massinger is an impoverished aristocrat, he is in New Zealand to make his fortune not to attend social functions like St Pierre.

New Zealand fascinates not as a colony, a miniature Britain, but as a wild frontier environment in which his appetite for adventure can be fed and his masculinity can be tested (Moffat, “Five Imperial Adventures” 43).

Due to Boldrewood’s emphasis on New Zealand as a part of the Empire, arguably the entirety of Britain (but especially Massinger’s ancestral home) can be treated as Town in addition to Auckland. England serves as the place of civilisation within the novel (and comparisons are occasionally made to that extent), it serves as Massinger’s point of departure for adventure. As Massinger has little interest in Auckland as Town, his associations of Town are transplanted to England.

Unlike Boldrewood’s Massinger, the arrival of Wiśniowski’s unnamed narrator to Auckland, is not met by wonder, but jaded pessimism. “Here and there were small trees and bushes, but their faded foliage did not do much to brighten the empty hills and drab houses” (Wiśniowski 4). Wiśniowski spends a great deal of time engaging with Town. *Tikera or Children of the Queen of Oceania* has action and activity in both Auckland and New Plymouth, though it has a far more negative opinion towards such places compared to the Anglophone authors. To the narrator the “empty hills and drab houses” are not a place of enterprise but pale attempts at imitating better colonial environments such as the USA.

The Europeanised part of the colony does not appeal to him, and is found wanting in comparison to other colonised areas of the world:

Showy buildings, their windows packed with luxuries, lay cheek by jowl with tumbledown wooden hovels, sodden with alcohol which evaporated through their wide-open doors and windows. Obviously the North American custom of removing such old buildings from the centre of the town to more remote suburbs and replacing them with permanent structures was not

known in Auckland. Such buildings were left standing until they fell down or went up in flames (Wiśniowski 6).

Wiśniowski does not see a burgeoning city of Britishness expanding positively outwards, but a drab and shoddy attempt at building a city which does not measure up to other relatively young Anglophone nations. The city is not only described as being poorly built but also as a place of vice: “The influx of troops, war-refugees, and common adventurers made Auckland a more riotous town than any other outside the goldfields” (Wiśniowski 8). The narrator also mentions the “many alluring traps prepared for my sex by the sirens of this town” (Wiśniowski 6). This is a very different Auckland to the little piece of Empire described by Boldrewood, this is a den of iniquity and vice where, as the narrator discovers, robbery and murder are not uncommon.

The attempted robbery and murder of the narrator is the event which precipitates the narrator’s departure and is thwarted only by the timely arrival of Te Ti, the Māori militiaman, also known as George Sunray. The rescue from peril hastens the narrator’s departure from Auckland, a place to which he does not return during the narrative. This alternative depiction of Auckland is unsurprising given the difference in cultural perspective by Wiśniowski, a Pole, and the previously discussed authors of British descent and loyalty; he is far more critical of Empire. He also is describing nineteenth-century Auckland from first-hand experience, he knows what the city was like from his own journey to Aotearoa.

Later in the novel, the narrator and his companion Schaeffer arrive in New Plymouth where they become embroiled in colonial events. Unlike Auckland the settlement is not considered a den of vice, but rather one that has been adversely affected by conflict. Wiśniowski is far more descriptive about the effect of the war on New Plymouth than Stoney. “The outlying meadows, seen through the

interlacing leaves of fern trees, were densely covered with the white tents of refugees and dotted with numerous smoking fires” (Wiśniowski 131). The majority of events in this Town do not occur as a result of the war, however, instead they are created by Charles Schaeffer, the narrator’s travelling companion, and show his development into antagonist.

The vice, violence, and general seediness of Auckland is paralleled in the actions of Schaeffer who does his best to scam fortunes out of New Plymouth with fraudulent business and Tikera with false promises of love. Charles Schaeffer’s duplicitous actions in courting both a Māori and Pākehā women at the same time are considered entirely acceptable by the Pākehā establishment, in part due to their racialized thinking and fears of miscegenation. However, while they do condone his misleading of Tikera to also pursue Arabella Whittmore, it is only up to a point. As von Tempski informs the narrator: “I doubt whether the same jury would be very harsh towards her father if, let us say, he should tear the heart out of his daughter’s seducer” (Wiśniowski 247). This reaction from the general populace to Schaeffer’s deception shows that while they may not be terribly concerned about the plight of the young woman, they have no qualms about a white father seeking violent restitution for the insult offered. This blasé approach to justice shows that while New Plymouth is not one for robbery in a hotel or vice, it has its own brutality.

Given Wiśniowski’s depiction of the Town as a thoroughly unsavoury environment whether overt or behind closed doors, the novel’s conclusion is unsurprising. As Moffat states:

Significantly, at the end of the novel, all of the sympathetic characters leave New Zealand, the narrator to continue his vagrant adventures and Doctor Abrabat and Tikera to relocate to Martinique (“Five Imperial Adventures” 52).

To Wiśniowski, the only way for the characters to resolve their problems in the Town, is to leave it. Whether the protagonist is facing blatant robbery and villainy in Auckland or the insidious duplicity and defrauding of New Plymouth, or just plain bigotry throughout, it is not a place of civilised behaviour.

Uniquely among the novels examined here, Jules Verne's *Among the Cannibals*, does not feature the social sphere of Town at all. It refers to Auckland and has the Town as an intended destination for the Glenarven party, however, due to a shipwreck, they end up instead in the Waikato. Given the nature of this novel, it is unsurprising that Verne omits the familiar Europeanised parts of Aotearoa to dwell on the exotic (and exaggerated) parts of the country discussed later in the chapter.

There are two stock characters who embody the values and ideology of the Town: the European lady and the imperial official. The head of the New Zealand Company, Edward Gibbon Wakefield, believed that women were central to the systematic colonisation of Aotearoa.

In theorising about the economics of settlement, Wakefield drew upon Victorian ideals about the family and women's role within the domestic sphere by arguing that successful colonisation necessitated 'civilisation'. The presence of women as moral guardians, in combination with their biological capacity to reproduce and thereby create families, brought order to the perceived unruly frontier (Wanhalla, "Family, Community and Gender" 458).

In this regard, the character of the European Lady is also the emblem of civilisation and European order within the colony. Her role within the narrative means she rarely leaves the Town, as the Bush and Kāinga would not be considered "civilised." The European lady is typically a well-connected society lady and usually a settler

within New Zealand. She often becomes enamoured with a traveller who joins the militia, particularly if he is a non-commissioned officer or junior officer. She is British born, distancing herself further from ties to New Zealand and enhancing her perceived respectability and implied racial purity, she is therefore a fictional articulation of nineteenth-century fears of miscegenation.

The European lady often serves as a contrast figure to the Māori maiden. Where the maiden is emotional, the lady is reserved; where the maiden is free, the lady constrained (either by family or social convention), in both a societal and sexual manner. This character resides in “Town” and only in rare cases ventures into the Bush. The lady’s contrast to the Māori maiden is heightened when they are caught in a love triangle (particularly with the protagonist), though due to the general fate of the indigene maiden, the European lady inevitably emerges victorious. Goldie comments that the indigene maiden “must die, must become of the past, in order for the white to progress towards the future...and achieve possession of the land” (Goldie 73). For Pākehā settlement of the land to truly be achieved the European lady must succeed in the contest for the traveller.

The most prominent character of the Town in Stoney’s *Taranaki* is St Pierre’s love interest, Miss Fanny Wellman. Fanny Wellman is the model for the European lady and acts as a foundational prototype to all subsequent depictions. She fits all of the generic criteria for a young beautiful European lady as she

had reached her twentieth year, and, though to a casual observer, she might not realize the perfection of poetic imagination as to personal beauty, there was a grace and elegance in her carriage and movements, and a sweet smile ever giving lustre to her soft blue eyes, under the dark fringed eyelash and perfectly arched eyebrow that could not fail to strike the beholder as something pure and lovely (Stoney 19).

The desire to present her as “pure and lovely” with “grace and elegance” sets Fanny up as the damsel figure to give St Pierre an ideal of the people in need of protection during a time of conflict. Fanny, is the embodiment of British virtues and positive connotations of settlement. To abandon her is to lead the colony into barbarism. Apart from her appearance and her relatively prosperous settler family, there are few details provided about Fanny’s character. Stoney describes her purpose as being a generic love interest: “the general contour of her regular features, told of one to be deeply truly loved, of superior mind and sweetness of disposition” (19). Stoney indicates that because Fanny is so lovely and clever she should be the one for a protagonist to love. She has no external qualities to exist as her own character, merely that she loves St Pierre and is a young single lady of means in New Plymouth. Fanny has a symbolic narrative function rather than a developed, individuated character – she is a true stock character.

Continuing the Austen-style nature of *Town*, the courtship of Fanny Wellman and St Pierre follows a similar situation of them being introduced by a mutual acquaintance Mary (St Pierre’s cousin) and their time together. There is even a scandal regarding whether he is truly suitable or not caused by malicious gossip about his service in India. This scandal leads to an ostracising of St Pierre by “respectable society” until he is exonerated by a wanderer who knew him abroad.

What follows is a journey for Fanny to Australia to be reunited with St Pierre and they both return to Taranaki to be wed. Jane Stafford comments: “The marriage of St Pierre and Fanny entails that destroyed settlements will be rebuilt” as the “Wellmans’ house described at the beginning of the novel...is destroyed” (363). This ending is a far cry from the historical ending of this Taranaki war (1860-61), where an uneasy peace was brokered by Wiremu Tamihana Tarapipi Te Waharoa between Wiremu Kingi and Governor Grey. As the issues of land and conflict

would return to the region later in the decade, leaving the conflict still unresolved. This ending also shows a contrast to later protagonists, as St Pierre, despite departing, does return to Aotearoa, and proceeds to participate in the settlement and transformation of the land.

The European lady of *Tikera*, Arabella Whittmore, is superficially similar to Fanny Wellman. Both are pretty young European women from well off families in New Plymouth, but where she differs is her romantic interest in Schaeffer. Schaeffer is the polar opposite of St Pierre in terms of his duplicity and underhanded actions, coated by a veneer of respectability by virtue of his class. Furthermore, while Arabella succeeds in claiming Schaeffer from Tikera, her lover is killed before he manages to leave Aotearoa. His reputation with the lady is equally destroyed, with her decrying him as a “cheat and a coward” (Wiśniowski 284). Arabella is instead left alone. In terms of her character’s choices and fate Arabella deconstructs aspects of the European lady, though to a lesser extent than Schaeffer towards the traveller.

Rolf Boldrewood depicts a European lady who finds more success in her pursuits. By expanding the definition of what constitutes as Town (Britain also being where the traveller starts), *War to the Knife*’s Hypathia Tollemache conforms to the European lady’s role of the civilising lighthouse for the traveller. This is supported by her success in the love triangle between herself, Massinger, and Erena. Hypathia is first introduced in England and does not arrive in Aotearoa until almost the end of the novel, just in time for her to emerge victorious in the love triangle. Her character is different from other European lady characters though, as she is shown to be quite active and engaged with charitable works. She argues:

“should any man or woman to whom God has granted a luxurious portion of the blessings of life, stand by and refuse aid, the aid of time and personal gifts, to save these perishing multitudes?” (Boldrewood 230-1).

In fact, her travel to Aotearoa has very little to do with Massinger at all and is instead to assist her friends Cyril and Mary Summers who are missionaries in New Zealand (Boldrewood 285). This engagement with philanthropy and conversion makes her a far more active European lady and more involved in the imperial endeavour than her literary contemporaries, who predominantly exist in a limbo state of not a child, yet still unwed. Hypathia also displays independence, as that she travels all the way from England to Aotearoa of her own volition. Hypathia is one of the women Katie Pickles refers to as “agents of Empire” (226). Her position as an active agent is not unusual as women were “of central importance in the history of whaling and mission stations” (Pickles 227). Given the historical period, Hypathia’s proactivity is not without historical precedent. In this regard, Bodrewood’s European lady has more in common with the historical women of Empire than earlier fictional representations presented by Stoney, Verne, and Wiśniowski.

The imperial official, meanwhile, is generally a mature man, usually ranging in age from his late twenties to early fifties. The character is often a reasonable authority figure. He does not, have any qualms about their tactics in the New Zealand Wars, though the reasonable ones will not exult in their victories, instead showing a weary cynicism. Imperial officials only move between Town and Bush, only venturing into the Kāinga under certain circumstances such as when the Town control of the Bush becomes adjacent to the Kāinga.

The imperial official represents the interests of the colony and is usually the mouthpiece for the establishment. His relationship with the traveller will depend on

the type of official he is. If reasonable, their relationship will be cordial and often supportive, if the official is aloof or unfriendly the relationship is generally antagonistic. The imperial official character is often either based directly on an historical figure or heavily inspired by them. Popular candidates include Governor George Grey, Duncan Cameron, G. S. Whitmore, and Thomas McDonnell. By far the most popular figure, however, is the (in)famous Gustavus von Tempsky, who is adapted twice within these novels I examine.

Von Tempsky is treated as a quintessential romantic figure in New Zealand Wars fiction. Danny Keenan describes him as: “Goldminer, correspondent, settler socialite, Forest Ranger fighting Maori – von Tempsky fits the bill as an enigmatic figure” (Keenan, “Heroes and Villains” 30). He saw service throughout the Waikato, as well as South Taranaki and Whanganui. He was an officer with good publicity. “He was a charming dinner guest, an accomplished musician and, by all accounts, a great singer” (Keenan, “Heroes and Villains” 31). That said, he also attracted controversy, such as his presence at the Rangiaowhia massacre, his part in General Chute’s march through Taranaki in 1865-1866 which burned numerous Māori cultivations, as well as his trial for disobeying orders.

Von Tempsky was a living romantic figure during the New Zealand Wars, dying dramatically in 1868 at what Keenan calls “a disastrous defeat at Te Ngutu o te Manu” (“Heroes and Villains” 31). Given von Tempsky’s larger than life reality, it is unsurprising that he became a popular figure to recreate in fiction. By casting real-life figures from colonial New Zealand as imperial officials, an author both grounds their narrative in the specified historical period and opts for some legitimacy in their representation. The imperial official is the face of colonisation and is the character at the heart of the conflict. How the official is depicted will indicate how favourable the text is towards the colonial experiment.

Both Boldrewood and Wiśniowski use von Tempsky in the role of imperial official. In *War to the Knife* von Tempsky does not appear in person, rather he is a name drop to show the famous company that Boldrewood is in. The impression given is very positive “Splendid fellow Von—Paladin of the Middle Ages” (Boldrewood 234). This von Tempsky features very little but the narrative impression given of the man is that he is a person of some repute and good character, a contrast to his historical infamy. Unlike Boldrewood’s von Tempsky who simply exists to provide Roland Massinger with the opportunity to join the Forest Rangers, Wiśniowski’s “von Tempski” is given far more narrative attention.

Von Tempski is the authority figure to whom the narrator runs for assistance and advice, whether it is avoiding conscription or fighting Māori, or his attempts to thwart Schaeffer’s ambitions. The relationship between the two characters is quite deep. Von Tempski serves as the narrator’s guide throughout the social nuances of the Town, explaining the attitudes of the townsfolk towards Schaeffer and his treatment of Tikera to the narrator. The two characters also bond over their shared heritage. Although, Dennis Eldowney notes: “In his own writing Von Tempsky never referred to himself as anything else than a Prussian, but in family tradition he is accounted a Pole” (296). This interpretation of the character is instead a point of connection for Wiśniowski’s Polish audience, providing a character (aside from the narrator) representing the Polish people.

Von Tempski also serves as a further point of commonality in Wiśniowski’s critique of colonisation, as indicated when von Tempski confesses his distance from his Polish heritage and the language.

“I understand it. I was born in Upper Silesia and brought up in the Prussian army. I never spoke Polish fluently. But do me a favour and speak to me in your tongue. I’ll answer in German” (Wiśniowski 187).

Despite his affability and friendship, Wiśniowski's von Tempski is as supportive of the conflict as in reality. Even so, this version shows a greater complexity in being a colonised person dispossessed of language who is about to inflict a similar fate on another people. Von Tempski even tries to justify his actions: "Conditions in this country cannot be measured by a European yardstick" (Wiśniowski 187). While the two disagree on the conflict, the narrator is visibly disheartened with von Tempski's death (which occurs far earlier than the historical von Tempsky's). For all his flaws, this depiction of von Tempsky provides a positive view of the man, a view that persists to the present, despite the greater awareness of the Forest Rangers' role in massacres such as Rangiaowhia (O'Malley 300), and other behaviour noted in later chapters.

Taranaki is a contrast to the other narratives as it features numerous imperial officials. There is no single official to easily fix on as many provide the various despatches included in the course of the novel. The most significant amongst them, however is Major-General Thomas Pratt. This official has little to do with St Pierre, and is instead mentioned in the historical frame that is apart from the romance taking place in New Plymouth. Though it is acknowledged that St Pierre is serving under the major-general's command, General Pratt's role within the narrative is predominantly as the source of various despatches. He is also shown as a symbol of vexation for his caution and inability to achieve victory. At an engagement in Otama, where soldiers were ready to assault the position, a missive from General Pratt left them "compelled with much chagrin to retire" (Stoney 99). The settler dissatisfaction with Pratt is evident with the arrival of his replacement Lieutenant-General Duncan Cameron "giving hope to the despairing settlers" (Stoney 111). In this respect, Stoney began the trend of critiquing colonial officials, however, as

evidenced by his lauding of Cameron and Grey, his dissatisfaction extends only towards individuals and not the entire establishment.

The Town is a place of civilisation and so the characters most closely aligned with it are representatives of Empire and its influence upon the colony. However, the Town is where the assimilation to Empire has already been achieved, where civilisation is still pushing forward is the Māori dominated sphere, the Kāinga.

The Kāinga Feels the Strain of Change

Where Town is controlled by Pākehā, the Kāinga is dominated by Māori. This sphere is generally a place of cultural contact, where a European character will learn more about Māori people and customs. It is important to note that within these novels neither the Town nor Kāinga are touched by the conflict. Even so, for people from both zones war is not far from their minds. Despite its relative peace, the Kāinga is a place undergoing change. Aspects of the Town encroach upon the Kāinga such as Christianity, education, and some Pākehā who have chosen to live there. Furthermore, in these texts the Kāinga is framed through a European lens, in many ways as an opposite to Town. It is always exotic and other and, as most of the writers have no direct experience with Māori, this exoticisation is frequently negative.

Verne's Kāinga in *Among the Cannibals* is set around a "pah" in the central North Island where the characters are brought after being taken prisoner by the ariki Kai-Koumou. The settlement is surrounded by commercial cultivations. "The path which led to the entrenchment led through fields of phormium and a thicket of trees" (Verne 88). The area is specifically described as "fields" and "phormium" [New Zealand flax] is grown commercially, which shows that the settlement is connected

to the wider country. It is not an isolated village disconnected from civilisation, it engages not only with the rest of Aotearoa, but potentially abroad.

While the Kāinga is usually a place where Pākehā characters will learn about Māori culture and traditions from its inhabitants, here the knowledge is instead supplied by the group's geographer, Paganel. This appropriation of knowledge is patronising and implies that the Māori are either so barbaric they cannot explain concepts to outsiders or that any kind of peaceful interaction with them is impossible. Verne goes out of his way to reinforce ideas of Māori savagery. "The captives were horribly startled at seeing the stakes of the second enclosure ornamented with heads" (Verne 88). The presenting of decapitated heads reinforces the negative impression of Māori, and the characters' distance from civilisation.

Verne does not solely accentuate the negative in the depiction of Māori. The barbarism is tempered by the post-war nature of the Kāinga. The people there are in a state of mourning and anger as the novel is set following the Waikato War.

Of all the chiefs who had risen at the voice of William Thompson,² Kai-Koumou alone came back to the lake districts, and was the first to tell his tribe of the defeat of the national insurrection, beaten in the plains of the lower Waikato (Verne 91).

The main reason why the characters have been captured and brought to the Kāinga is to potentially ransom them to the colonial government for Tohunga³ who is a prisoner as he is "the high priest of Noui-Atoua" (Verne 95).⁴ This depiction of the Kāinga in a post-war state is notable, and is one of the few sympathetic characteristics given to the local Māori. The occupants' concerns about mourning and burying the dead as well as securing the return of the community's important

² Anglicisation of Wiremu Tamihana

³ A tohunga

⁴ Likely meaning Atua Nui

members is a predicament faced by Māori communities during the New Zealand Wars. A particular concern was the imprisonment of many Māori at Kawau Island following the Battle of Rangiriri (Belich, *The New Zealand Wars* 197).

the depiction of Māori does not remain sympathetic, however. In the Kāinga the chief Kara-Tété lays a hand upon Lady Glenarven, crying out “mine!” (Verne 96). In order to provide narrative tension in the Kāinga, Verne resorts to presenting indigenous violence against European women, which erodes any sympathy felt towards the Kāinga and recycles negative stereotypes of indigenous behaviour. This action leads to Lord Glenarven shooting the chief. Following Lord Glenarven’s actions the travellers are imprisoned for three days until the funeral for Kara-Tété. From here Verne shows why the novel is named *Among the Cannibals*, as he depicts the devouring of Kara-Tété’s servants.

In less time than it takes to write it, the still smoking bodies were torn to pieces, divided, dismembered, cut not only into morsels, but into crumbs.

Of the two hundred Maori present at the sacrifice, each had a share of the human flesh (Verne 105).

Verne’s ensemble of characters are set to be sacrificed the next day, but have a timely rescue by one of their number who escaped during the commotion when Lord Glenarven shot Kara-Tété.

Verne’s depiction of the cannibalism has the appearance of sensationalism. It is a means to provide his readers with something gory and shocking in a far off and alien place. Verne’s Kāinga is not in any way surprising; Moffat states that his depiction of Māori

is perhaps explained by the demands of his chosen genre of the extraordinary adventure. Maori are cast as the ultimate threat to the shipwrecked travellers, and as such have a symbolic rather than an

anthropological identity, representing all the things Europeans most feared about the racial ‘other’, particularly cannibalism (“Five Imperial Adventures” 59).

The constraints of genre, however, do not excuse the patronising explanation of Māori culture from a European geographer (not even an ethnographer). Paganel’s exposition is problematic and shows that Verne liked the idea of New Zealand as a setting rather than Māori as a people. Therefore his mouthpiece, Paganel, is the one to explain their culture rather than another Māori character (as in Boldrewood and Wiśniowski).

This lack of engagement with Māori characters reinforces Verne’s distancing of them as a fully realised group. It makes the representation of Māori conform with Verne’s stereotypes of “primitive” indigeneity for the sake of spectacle. Furthermore, the Kāinga is a place of danger for the characters. Here the European characters are far away from rescue and have no allies in Aotearoa as they did not pass through the Town to enter the Bush and the Kāinga. They are in a liminal position, subject to Verne’s exaggeration of callous and antagonistic Māori authority and power. It is only by escaping that they can regain some of their autonomy (and preserve their lives/honour). The Kāinga for Verne is a place to exhibit his characters in peril, rather than a place of (mostly) peaceful contact and encounter with Māori culture as exhibited in the other texts.

In contrast to Verne, Boldrewood’s depiction is more positive, particularly in parallels between Māori and Celts. While his portrayal is still reductive, it is a marked improvement on Verne. Compared to *Among the Cannibals*, Boldrewood devotes a greater amount of textual attention to the Kāinga in *War to the Knife*. The Kāinga is a place where many of Massinger’s preconceived notions about Māori are challenged.

“Why it’s a castle!” exclaimed Massinger. “I had no idea that the natives did things in this style. I doubt whether the ancient Britons had one like this to check the Roman advance. Certainly they had no rifle-pits. Fancy climbing up these precipices to find a double line of desperate warriors at the top!” (Boldrewood 105-5).

Massinger’s surprise at the sight of the pā and rifle-pits is understandable from a colonising culture’s perspective. As Māori were not considered to be as refined as Europeans, there would be dismissal of them engaging in warfare that the British Empire found familiar. Belich argues their perception was that “The Maori might outrank the Hindu and the Hottentot on the scale of martial races, but he was only a non-commissioned officer after all” (*The New Zealand Wars* 329). This design of a pā with defensive rifle pits is not something that would be new to New Zealand in 1860, however. During the 1845 fighting in Northland, the chief Kawiti had already begun the innovation of the modern fighting pā at Ōhaeawai, where the defences made use of fire arms and could resist artillery fire (Belich, *The New Zealand Wars* 52).

Massinger is also drawn to the rest of the Kāinga once his awe of the pā is sated. His description of the village is less praiseworthy and he chooses to examine the Kāinga using superficial language to genericise indigenous culture:

His adventurous soul was stirred within him, as he marked the position of the *wharepuni*, or council-hall, imposing in size and ornamentation, elaborate though rude; the clustering *whares* or wig-wams, each containing the family unit” (Boldrewood 106).

Massinger’s perspective of the Kāinga evokes imagery of other indigenous groups, particularly from the North Americas. This coded language is drawn from writers

like James Fenimore Cooper whose works were popular at the time, with his narratives of the American Frontier. Terry Goldie comments:

Terms such as “war-dance,” “war-whoop,” tomahawk,” and “dusky” are immediately suggestive everywhere of the indigene. To a North American, at least the first three would be obvious Indianisms, but they are also common in works on the Maori and Aborigine (Goldie 10).

While Boldrewood’s language does belong to the legacy of Fenimore Cooper, it is used here to connote the indigenous nature of the Māori. The use of terms from Fenimore Cooper elide the differences between cultures, homogenising them into the indigenous other. Despite great distances of land and history, to Boldrewood the First Nations peoples of the Americas are little different from Māori.

Massinger also emphasises the idea of the Māori as less sophisticated and refined than European settlers. He calls the wharepuni “elaborate though rude” (Boldrewood 106). He also comments that the people in the village are “straying about in careless intermixture” (Boldrewood 106). This reaction shows an admiration, but implies he does not consider Māori as equal to European, as while they can create something impressive, it still lacks sophistication. Boldrewood continues his comments with: “No civilised habitation was visible. No sound broke the stillness of the night, save the murmuring voices of the dwellers in this strange settlement” (Boldrewood 110). For Massinger the Kāinga is an attractive place, but not one for civilised company. It is nice to visit, but he would not want to live there.

In contrast to Boldrewood (and especially Verne), Wiśniowski is far more favourable in his depiction of the Kāinga in *Tikera*. This was likely due to his personal experience and discussion with another Pole who had settled in New Zealand. The man “drew for us the vicissitudes, customs, and sufferings of the Maoris. I will try to translate these campfire stories into a more literary idiom”

(Wiśniowski xxvi). Much like Verne, Wiśniowski commences the narrator's arrival in the Kāinga with descriptions of cultivations, though instead of discussing flax, an exotic export crop, he talks of the staple crops of the locals. "Potatoes, maize, taro, and kumara looked healthier in these kitchen gardens, set on the north face of a fertile hillside, than they did on the European farms near Auckland" (Wiśniowski 55). In contrast to Verne's exotic fields of flax, Wiśniowski instead discusses kitchen gardens, and while taro and kumara would not have been familiar to his readers, maize and potato were by this time mundane staple crops for many Europeans.

This description constructs from the outset a more relatable settlement than Verne's. Wiśniowski continues this discussion of the Kāinga as, rather than a bastion of barbarism, a fairly normal village. "We came to a group of small raupo huts with wide verandahs, thatched with reeds. At the back of each stood neatly stacked piles of firewood, chopped into small logs" (Wiśniowski 56). The narrator's description of the Kāinga, including noting the presence of dogs and pigs, makes it appear more arcadian than an exotic and dangerous place. It is a rural settlement with recognisably mundane indicators: vegetable gardens, pigs, pet dogs, stacks of firewood, and a wide verandah.

Much like the other Kāinga, this one does show signs of a changing world. The meeting with the chief and his son exemplifies the generational change that is taking place in Aotearoa. "I had already noticed that whereas the father was almost naked, the son wore clothes like mine, except that he had a parson's collar" (Wiśniowski 57). This change in clothing is evident in many photographs of the period, showing Māori in both traditional and European clothing (Anderson, Binney and Harris 250-4). The changing nature of the Kāinga is also evident with a conflict between missionary and tohunga. This conflict is different in its

conventional makeup, however, as the missionary is the son of the chief. He is not, however, looked upon as a positive figure even by the Christians in the Kāinga as he is seen as unstable: “He was brought up by missionaries who wanted him to be a minister or a teacher. But he is no good...not all there” (Wiśniowski 69). Though the chief’s son is not in any way ignorant, he is aware of the local affairs as “he understood the every day affairs of the colony just as well as did his white neighbours” (Wiśniowski 61). Furthermore, he shows an awareness of the various denominations: “He clearly knew something of English non-conformists” (Wiśniowski 60). In fact, this is one of the few instances in this array of novels where non-Anglican Christianity is acknowledged.

In a similar fashion to Verne, however, the war does lead to the narrator and Schaeffer’s imprisonment at the Kāinga, but their imprisonment is not one of cruel treatment and looming execution, and Schaeffer is no innocent victim. Instead the prisoners are put to work by the missionary: “You will make gunpowder for us. You will help the women till the gardens so that our warriors may have food” (Wiśniowski 58). The imprisonment of the characters is given a more realistic depiction compared to Verne, who tends towards nineteenth-century stereotyping of indigenous cultures. Instead of a cannibalistic ritual, the prisoners are put to a far more pragmatic use. While Verne did make mention of Kai-Koumou wishing to ransom the prisoners, the leap from ransom to cannibalism was quite sudden. Wiśniowski’s depiction of the Kāinga shows a more balanced view than his contemporaries, likely due to him having done a bit more research and spoken to Māori people or else men who had first-hand experience regarding the nature of a kāinga.

In contrast to the other texts, the Kāinga does not feature at all in *Taranaki*, an unsurprising situation as it does not feature any Māori characters in any capacity

other than conflict. As discussed earlier, this absence is indicative of Stoney's unwillingness to acknowledge Māori in any capacity other than as an antagonist. Given his military background, Stoney's desire is to present the military in a positive light. Furthermore, the majority of the First Taranaki War was centred upon redoubts, homesteads and fighting pā. There were less opportunities for the military to enter the Kāinga compared to later. In this manner Stoney has multiple parallels with Scott's *Waverley*. As Stafford comments:

what both novels, *Taranaki* and *Waverley*, do is exclude the indigene from the happy ending. *Waverley* may be attracted to the wild Highland mystery of Flora Mac Ivor and her brother Fergus, but he marries the less alarming—and less Scottish—Rose (Stafford 364).

Stoney emulates the adventure romance tradition in the same manner as Scott, and continues the marginalisation of indigenous voices. It is clear that “at the conclusion of *Taranaki*, there is no place for Wiremu Kingi or even the peacemaker Wiremu Tamihana, and the particular, idiosyncratic and modern nature of their characters and careers” (Stafford 364). Stoney's position as an officer colours his perception of Māori, he sees them as the enemy so is unable present them in any other light.

The characters who dwell predominantly in the Kāinga are far more varied than those from the Town. They are not total embodiments of Māori resistance to colonial enterprise either. Some are more progressive in the cultural exchange such as the Pākehā- Māori and the missionary, others are more conservative such as the tohunga, while some can occupy either category or appear neutral, such as the Māori warrior. These characters are seldom in complete agreement with one another and present a heterogeneous group.

The Māori warrior is frequently the traveller's rival for the Māori maiden. He is often, but not always, the leader of anti-government Māori. Therefore, he acts

as an antagonist to travellers and imperial officials. His position is not fixed, however, as he is able to start as enemy and become friend or start as friend and turn enemy, depending on the traveller's loyalty to the Crown. His status as an antagonist however, does not prevent him from being cordial. This character is usually located in the Kāinga and Bush, representing the secular pre-contact authority.

Boldrewood's Māori warrior character is Ngarara. He is not, at first, an enemy of the Government; it is Ngarara's jealousy of Massinger with Erena that spurs him to action. In contrast to other Māori characters, Ngarara is an embodiment of savage lust and hatred.

Like his literary hero Fenimore Cooper, Boldrewood uses the adventure staple of the captivity narrative to warn of the barbaric, animalistic self that lurks beneath the many virtues of the noble savage. Roland's captor, Ngarara, is described as 'a study of all the evil passions which degrade the human race to the level of the brute' (Moffat, "Five Imperial Adventures" 54).

Ngarara shares some similarities to Fenimore Cooper's Magua (of *The Last of the Mohicans*). He is an outcast from his tribe (after joining with Kereopa Te Rau), and holds a vendetta against a member of the military, as well as their conflict involving a woman of mixed-descent, Magua with Colonel Munro's daughters, and Ngarara with Erena. The only difference here is that rather than the love triangle involving an indigenous character, his rival is the Pākehā protagonist. "Ngarara is a keen hunter when the prey is near. He is pursuing the Ngapuhi girl Erena, whose heart the pakeha soldier has stolen from him" (Boldrewood 379). This love triangle operates like the struggle over the land in miniature, Massinger and Ngarara compete for possession of the Erena as a proxy for the land. Massinger represents all the newness of Empire and positive effects of civilisation and Ngarara is

presented as a negative depiction of the old traditions and Māori sovereignty. Apart from his parallels to Magua, what truly defines the character is that he lusts after Erena and hates Massinger, desiring the land and violently lashing out at incoming change.

Verne's malevolent Kai-Koumu stands as a contrast to Ngarara. Unlike Ngarara, Kai-Koumu is a chief, he is also stronger and sterner. Where Ngarara only attacks from ambush or with the help of allies, Kai-Koumu is a direct threat. Verne's depiction of his antagonist chief is, however, not wholly negative. In the Glenarven party's first encounter with local Māori, one of the first things observed is the tattoo upon the Kai-Koumu, with Paganel noting:

Dumont d'Urville has given some curious details about this custom. He observes that this custom of the moko takes the place of the armorial bearings of which European families are so proud. But he remarks a difference between these two signs of distinction, namely, that the European armorial bearings generally bear witness to the merit of the individual who first obtained them, without proving anything as to the merits of his descendants; while on the contrary, the moko of the New Zealander is a certain proof that he who bears it has given a proof of extraordinary personal courage (Verne 77).

This is a point of difference to other portrayals of indigenous tattooing which consider such things to be negative. Terry Goldie's notes that Māori tattooing interferes with the representation of the indigene as one with nature. He posits "A belief in the inherent purity of nature creates a central conflict in one aspect of Māori technology, tattooing" (Goldie 38). The use of tattooing interferes with the pure natural state of the indigene and is therefore a corruption. Verne takes a different stance on the use of tattoos, he examines the tā moko through a European

lens that looks at a different parallel to the markings (as a coat of arms instead) and presents the tattoo and chief with a status comparable to European aristocracy.

This comparison helps to provide the description the chief Kai-Koumou: “He was brave and daring, but his cruelty equalled his valour” (Verne 79). This connection of Kai-Koumou with nobility and cruelty echoes Goldie’s comments regarding the Māori chief Te Rauparaha: “Rather than noble savages in the usual sense, Te Rauparaha and his peers are savages who are also noble, products of innate aristocratic qualities” (Goldie 32). Verne is still ascribing Kai-Koumou with negative connotations; despite his parallels with European aristocracy, the chief is still uncivilised, savage and dangerous. While the engagement with Māori is not wholly negative, it is problematic.

The second and most misrepresented character is the tohunga. He is generally located in the Kāinga though occasionally enters the Bush. In many of the novels he is featured as a character practicing banned or archaic religious practices, and can even perform human sacrifice and cannibalism. In certain cases he either is or was openly malevolent. “Most texts from the nineteenth century show little acceptance of the validity of indigenous religious beliefs” (Goldie 130). In this context Goldie affirms that indigenous mysticism in nineteenth-century texts is coded as malevolent (16). Therefore this character is often depicted as not just anti-government but wholly anti- Pākehā.

These depictions severely reduce the role of the tohunga, as it simply uses him as coded language for an indigenous shaman, when, as Ranginui Walker states, the tohunga was more complex than such representations suggest:

This was the generic term for an expert in the various fields of human endeavour. There were different grades of tohunga depending on their speciality. At one level were the artisans and artists such as the tohunga tarai

waka (canoe-builder), tohunga hanga whare (house-builder), tohunga ta moko (tattooist) and tohunga whakairo (carver). Some families tended to specialise in one or more of these fields. At another level were the tohunga ahurewa (high priest) and tohunga makutu (shaman). These tohunga trained at their own whare wananga (schools of learning) (Walker, *Ka Whawhai Tonu Matou* 66-7).

The tohunga were the educated class of Māori society, yet in fiction they are treated solely as figures of mysticism. Therefore, of all of the varieties of tohunga, only the tohunga ahurewa and tohunga makutu appear within these texts, with their roles being conflated into one. This narrow view of tohunga represents the pre-contact religious practices (although a variation of him does appear as a priest who represents the post-contact practices that emerged such as Pai Mārire and Ringatū generally under the umbrella of hau-hau).

The tohunga's principle adversary is the clergyman. The clergyman can be of any denomination, though most often Anglican. The clergyman typically acts as an ally to the hero, either providing advice or material support in the form of food or accommodation. The clergyman is not a person for wild places, so will only be located in Kāinga (if a missionary or Māori lay minister) or Town (if a more conventional reverend or bishop). Typically the missionary/clergy figure is represented sympathetically by the author as a bringer of 'civilisation' and 'religion' – as such he is sometimes a victim to highlight the indigenous barbarism of his congregation. The clergyman is always opposed to the tohunga as they represent differences in religion vying for influence over the local Māori.

The local tohunga in *Tikera* is presented in a vastly different manner to the typical narrow perspectives. This tohunga is not a walking stereotype of 'evil sorcerer' but is afforded a more favourable depiction:

He, it transpired, was a medical practitioner of sorts, a retired witch doctor. He may even have been a grand ‘cutter’ during the ceremonies in which prisoners were killed and roasted and eaten. Nowadays he confined himself to medicine, as he understood it, prescribing fumigation or a mess of herbs, or muttering mysterious words over the sick man’s head (Wiśniowski 61).

This tohunga is implicated in rituals involving the consumption of human flesh, though that is treated as something not engaged with any longer. The rejection of cannibalism was widespread by the 1830s, due to the mass conversions of Māori to Christianity (Walker, *Ka Whawhai Tonu Matou* 86). In this regard, Wiśniowski shows a greater degree of accuracy than Verne, who presents all Māori as anthropophagi, even when the practice had largely been abandoned. The tohunga is equally acknowledged as following medical practices, even if they are not familiar to Europeans. The tohunga is referred to as a “medical practitioner” providing legitimacy to his practices and not treating them solely as superstition.

The tohunga and missionary are divergently opposed in their practices. For instance, when the tohunga is treating Schaeffer he speaks a blessing, to which the missionary disapproves. “This last procedure, applied to my friend, did not appeal to the teacher, who categorically forbade any further incantations” (Wiśniowski 61). Their conflict is not limited to the theological arena either, the push and pull of tradition versus incoming religion continues in a political context in the Kāinga as well. The tohunga and missionary are opposed on whether the Kāinga is to support the Māori fighting the Government. In a point of difference to other narratives, the tohunga is for peace while the Māori missionary is for war. This stance is not ideological however, it stems from their pre-existing opposition.

So long as the leader of the progressive element in the village was for peace, the head of the conservatives, who still clung to their heathen religion, called

for war. When his rival changed tune, the tohunga changed his (Wiśniowski 86).

The missionaries and tohunga are depicted as opposite sides of advocating peace and war respectively, with the Christian teaching also eroding tohunga authority. The missionary and the tohunga's agendas, however, are always opposed, one is always seeking to displace the other. This opposition does not even require a tangible presence of a priest or preacher within the Kāinga.

This opposition is a contrast to the Pākehā-Māori who is a secular force that chooses to integrate rather than change the community. These are Pākehā who live among Māori in the Kāinga and have been adopted by that tribe. As Trevor Bentley notes:

Pakeha Maori were foreigners who became part of the tribe and were treated by Maori as Maori. Some were kept as exotic curiosities or trading intermediaries. Others were designated traditional roles as slaves, artisans and fighting men. A handful became white chiefs and priests (Bentley 9).

This figure is not common, but when he does appear he is often the Māori maiden's father (if she is of mixed ancestry). While such characters are in other colonial societies treated negatively that is not always the case with Aotearoa.

The colonial authorities had a mixed view of such men, but in practice the New Zealand Government took a different approach to other colonial societies.

Unlike the situation in North America, where 'squaw men' were socially marginal figures and disliked by authorities, officials in New Zealand hoped to generate loyalty among these pre-1840 settlers, who could prove useful as translators, mediators, spies and cultural intermediaries. Their loyalty was cultivated through land grants, as evidenced by the passage of colonial

ordinances and statutes relating to interracial marriage in the latter half of the nineteenth century (Wanhalla, *In/visible Sight* 88).

The Pākehā-Māori is a character who possesses a kind of duality. He is a character who is between two worlds. Though it is important to note that he does not move in the sphere of Town as in the narratives he has generally forsaken it for the Kāinga. In this regard he takes the role of an ally, aiding the protagonist. In some respects he can be a vanguard for the influence of the Town upon the Kāinga. In other occasions he is a type of exile who has forsaken civilisation to instead be loyal to a new people, he is critical of the colonial enterprise and forsakes any loyalty to the encroachment of the Town.

Boldrewood melds his Pākehā-Māori character through parallels to *The Last of the Mohicans*; like Colonel Munro, Mannering is a Colonial military figure who is the father of an ethnically mixed daughter. However, these parallels are where the similarities end. Erena's father, Mannering, does not live among Europeans, but has made a home amongst the indigenous populace. Mannering exists to give Erena a convincing Pākehā father to explain her status (he became a war chief and married a high-ranking Māori woman), as opposed to a colonial military figure who continues to hold authority in a settler environment.

While Mannering's status is unusual, his position as a war chief is not without precedent, some Pākehā did achieve great renown after becoming Pākehā-Māori, Jacky Marmon was one such figure:

Marmon, skilled in the arts of ventriloquism and healing wounds accompanied Hongi Hika's first great intertribal army against Ngati Paoa and Ngati Maru at Hauraki in 1821... Marmon was also present on the battlefield at Te Ika-a-ranginui near Kaiwaka in 1825, when a Nga Puhi

musket taua under Hongi Hika finally broke the forces of Ngati Whatua under their chief Murupaenga (Bentley 83).

That being said, by 1840, there were little or no fighting men among the Pākehā-Māori, making Mannering's status roughly twenty years too late (Bentley 98). Outside of these roles, however, Mannering does little in terms of the narrative.

Mannering's presence is to instead mitigate some of Massinger's fears of miscegenation and atavism. As Mannering is described using European warrior imagery, comparing him to Vikings and European warriors:

This man belongs to the true Viking breed, a born leader of men, impatient of the restraints of civilisation, not to be contended without the quickening presence of danger, 'the dust of desperate battle,' the savour of blood, even (Boldrewood 189).

Associating Mannering with the travelling and combative Vikings who once conquered the North of England, gives Roland Massinger a justification for a Pākehā gentleman would choose to live among the Māori. Though there is little in the text to support this, the allusion to the Vikings also implies that Mannering brings societal changes to the tribe, much as the Vikings did with their cultural encounter with the Anglo-Saxons socially, politically and linguistically. This association and the outsider representation of Mannering all adds to Boldrewood's depiction of the Kāinga as alluring but ultimately alien, so only an unconventional person would willingly choose the place.

While Wiśniowski does not feature a Pākehā-Māori per se, he does depict a failed example. Tikera's father, a runaway from Australia, is a contrast to Mannering. Despite his attempts at integrating himself into the Kāinga, he is rejected by the community: "He lived with this tribe, sometimes here, more often nearer the sea. He was a blacksmith and taught us his trade" (Wiśniowski 90).

However, due to his desire to sleep with the chief's wife, he fled before he could be punished. In this instance, Wiśniowski is pessimistic about the Pākehā fathers of indigenous maidens, who rather than acting out of a desire to live among Māori, are seeking Māori women out of lust. Wiśniowski sees the men as little more than criminals (as many settlers travelling from Australia were). Wiśniowski projects his narrator's fears of miscegenation with his view that the Pākehā who father mixed children are not heroic adventurers but petty criminals who are unable to attract a European wife.

The Perils of the Bush

The third sphere of the early novels is the Bush, the New Zealand wilderness/boundary space. This sphere is the most important for the New Zealand Wars romance as it is where conflict emerges. As demonstrated in the previous sections, both the Kāinga and the Town are, on occasion, omitted from the story, but the Bush is always essential. It is the area of influence where the Town presses on the Kāinga. The Bush is where battle pā such as Ōrākau and Gate Pā are located and where most of the military conflicts take place. This contact zone is not just a place of conquest, however, it is also one where the social interactions between different groups truly commences and where they come into contact with the 'un-Europeanised'/'non-Māori' environment. In the case of Pākehā travellers the cultural contact does extend into the Kāinga and in the case of Wiśniowski, the Town. In order to access many of these spaces, however they first travel through or encounter the Bush, as it is the main point of contact between Pākehā and Māori. The Bush is also conceived differently by the writers. To the likes of Verne and Boldrewood it is an exotic place of adventure. To Stoney and Wiśniowski it is where conflict is found between Māori and Pākehā. The Bush exists in two parts, it is the place of geographic contact and a space of conflict-based contact.

Jules Verne favours detailed descriptions of the landscape to provide his audience with a thoroughly exotic locale for adventure. Verne's description both heightens the sense of the alien environment for European explorers and presents the difficulty of the journey with the density of the foliage in the Bush.

In the distance appeared to be immense prairies, which stretched far out of sight and promised easy walking. But when the travellers reached the borders of this field of verdure they were sadly undeceived. Instead of green pastures, they found a copse of brushwood, covered with white flowers mixed with the tall and innumerable ferns that grow so luxuriantly in New Zealand (Verne 67-8).

Verne takes time to quote the botanist Hooker in describing the flora and fauna of the country. Some of the comments his geographer, Paganel, makes are somewhat absurd.

“This ‘tui,’ ” said Paganel to the major, “becomes so fat in the winter that it is quite ill, and cannot fly. Then it tears open its breast with its beak in order to relieve itself of some of the fat, and so make itself lighter” (Verne 71).

This assertion, in addition to being blatantly false, exhibits the alien nature of the New Zealand being presented in *Among the Cannibals*. The land is a strange and dangerous place where flora and fauna, wholly unlike those of Europe can be found.

While his descriptions do border on exaggeration, the descriptions of flora and fauna presents a distinct feel for the environment of Aotearoa within the course of the narrative. As Moffat comments:

Verne spends considerable time communicating Paganel's excited wonder at the botanical and animal treasures he encounters in the Waikato... Verne's Waikato is a fantastical exotic paradise that is not limited to the realm of the

actual or possible, yet is paradoxically more recognisably New Zealand for all its flights of fancy and invention (“Five Imperial Adventures” 49).

Moffat argues that for Verne, the untamed space of the Waikato is “to be admired precisely because it has yet to be touched by the detrimental forces of Empire” (“Five Imperial Adventures” 49). Where Boldrewood and Stoney see the environment as opportunity for British imperial expansion, Verne sees it as a paradise and criticises the destruction of natural beauty and wonder to suit a colonising agenda. The closest to conflict that the narrative covers is the Glenarven party’s first encounter with the anthropophagic chief Kai-Koumou in the Bush. Unlike the other authors, Verne does not feature the Bush as a place of conflict as unlike the other authors his conflict takes place in the Kāinga. His obsession is rather with the exotic world of Aotearoa.

The contact with Kai-Koumou is still accompanied by further experiences with the environment of the Bush. Verne’s travellers pass through a volcanic and geothermal area on their way to Taupo by following the Waikato river, likely Lake Ohakuri. This environment reinforces the alien dangers of Aotearoa.

[A] narrow valley, where the water boiled and eddied round numerous islets.

To capsize would have been fatal, for to step on the boiling mud of the banks was certain death. In fact, this river, flowing from hot springs has at all times excited the curiosity of tourists (Verne 84).

Verne uses authorial licence to exaggerate the facts and provide his audience with an environment that is unfamiliar and alien to them geographically as well as botanically. The environment of the Bush is an exaggerated, alien place, used to reinforce Verne’s desire to peddle the exotic to his readers and to provide an exaggerated criticism of the natural wonders at risk of British imperial expansion which serves to feed the Empire at the expense of the colony.

In contrast to Verne, Stoney predominantly speaks of the Bush as a place of conflict. There is no discussion of the environment and peaceful contact with people in this liminal space, only the set up for the despatches and the discussion of military action. Stoney is deliberate with his use of the word “bush”. In the first third of the novel the word “bush” is used in association with various points of settlement. Stoney notes: “numerous clearings and homesteads have sprung up within this continuous belt of wooded bush land” (Stoney 13). St Pierre’s Aunt encourages him “to make some trips with Charles into the bush land and see my own romantic glens and vales” (Stoney 32). This language quickly changes to refer to conflict: “I pushed Lieutenant Hurst forward to endeavour to occupy the bush in the Waireka gully, under cover of which the natives were swarming” (Stoney 62). Perhaps the best example of Stoney’s attitude to this sphere is in one of the quoted despatches: “Almost every little eminence, and the edges of the bush, were occupied by the enemy” (96). Stoney’s use of the word “bush” is coded to relate to conflict for the remainder of the novel. It places the reader under no illusions of how the area is perceived. This bias is understandable in that Stoney is writing what he knows, he was a Major in the New Zealand Wars so he would look at the Bush from the perspective of a soldier who sees it as a place of violence and death.

Stoney’s entire engagement with the Bush is quite detached, he presents his discussion of the events in the form of military dispatches. He admits his motives of doing so directly to the reader:

As our opinion may be faulty, or that expressed by the characters of our tale may be considered as prejudiced, we will not follow the usual custom in story, and we trust our readers will excuse us copying largely from the despatches before us, in order that we may have at least a truthful account to lay before them (Stoney 60).

Arguably, his justification of impartiality found in despatches, compared to his perspective, is suspect considering the amount of fiction that went into reporting the battles during the New Zealand Wars. Furthermore, the use of military despatches would still have an inherent bias, regardless of who in the military was the source. As Belich comments: “There was a tendency to exaggerate Maori numbers at all times, but immediately after British defeats it suddenly became acute” (Belich, *The New Zealand Wars* 314). This warping of facts has dogged the New Zealand Wars for decades and it was not until the second half of the twentieth century that it was being openly challenged.

Like Verne, Wiśniowski engages with the Bush as a foreign place, but not one that is so outside of his knowledge as to be considered alien. While the narrator shows some survival skills, Schaeffer is less savvy and ends up eating berries which make him sick, forcing the narrator to seek the help of local Māori. That Wiśniowski’s narrator deliberately seeks out the help of Māori, rather than avoiding them shows the author’s desire to present nuance. The Māori are not vicious barbarians, but people with whom negotiation can be achieved. This incident is what brings them to the Kāinga.

Wiśniowski’s initial description of the Bush concerns itself with a very realistic description of travel from Manukau to the Waikato.

Our chief occupations during that time were pricking our blisters, treating boils, climbing steep hills, filling our stomachs, and sleeping under the open sky or in a tent, depending on whether we camped in a field or the bush (Wiśniowski 32).

The narrator does not extol the perils or the wonders of the environment. He instead makes an observation of the experience in the Bush for a person in reality as well as fiction, the steep hills, the blisters, and where camp was fixed. This description

shows Wiśniowski's real-life experience and contact with others who have experience with the New Zealand Bush compared to his contemporaries who act as arm-chair speculators such as Verne and Boldrewood.

Some of his experience with the Bush is as a tourist, he deliberately mentions a special detour to see an "active mud crater, which regularly discharges an evil-smelling slime" (Wiśniowski 32). The narrator also discusses another reality of the New Zealand Bush, he professes that of the mosquitoes in the various other countries he visited "None of them compare with their New Zealand cousins" (Wiśniowski 34). This is a realist dimension that Wiśniowski brings to the New Zealand Bush, he compares it to existing places and focuses on the reality of the place. He is not seeking blatant exoticism, instead where the European meets Aotearoa he focuses on the commonality not the difference, much like his depiction of the Kāinga. This seeing of similarities is likely due to Wiśniowski's being better travelled than Stoney, Boldrewood, or Verne.

Although Wiśniowski does not depict the same violence in the Bush, it is still a place of conflict, but to a lesser extent than the others. For instance, the narrator is never presented as being in any real danger in the Bush. He encounters various groups, both Māori and Pākehā, but neither are aiming to cause him harm. Nor does he feel the land itself as a hostile environment (unlike Verne). The trip through the Bush presents a contact zone for the narrator, Schaeffer and the colonial military. Furthermore, the Bush is not just a contact zone between himself and Māori, but also between him and Pākehā from Anglophone countries, particularly the colonial militia. Following an incident with the Forest Rangers attempting to conscript him, the narrator and his companion press onwards into the Bush.

Unlike Stoney's very clear setting of New Plymouth in the First Taranaki War, *Tikera* takes place in an amalgamated space mixing several conflicts of the

1860s (three separate conflicts in Taranaki plus the Waikato Invasion). Some of the events transpiring in the Bush are from different years blended together. This camp incident with the Forest Rangers, however, connotes to Government forces fighting in the Waikato as it is in a former pā along the Waikato River:

The camp teemed with regular soldiers, sailors transformed into artillerymen, settlers who had volunteered after their farms had been seized by the enemy, and native militiamen recruited from among the loyal Maori tribes. A new formation of forest rangers part soldiers, part farmers was being organized. This group was composed of men who had enlisted in Australia shortly before my departure from that country (Wiśniowski 41).

Wiśniowski openly talks about the diversity of Government forces, as opposed to the other writers who speak mainly in terms of militia and soldiers but with little mentioning of their origins. The narrator's encounter with the Forest Rangers, in particular, shows the divergent views between a Polish traveller and the British fighting for the colonial government. He compares the actions and proposed plan of military settlers on confiscated lands as similar to the actions of the Austrian frontier guards and the Russian Cossacks. The rangers' reaction shows the difference in perspectives: "My dear sir, how can you make such a comparison?" (Wiśniowski 42). To Wiśniowski's narrator, oppressive colonisation is oppressive colonisation wherever it takes place, and he makes no attempt to justify it regardless of ethnicity or pigmentation.

The narrator's approval of armed resistance to colonisers reflects the Polish support for Napoleon, aiding the French leader in his wars against the Prussians, Austro-Hungarians, and the Russians. To Wiśniowski fighting to preserve a culture and nation-state is an honourable action. So he would not support a regime attempting to inflict a similar fate suffered by his country. The narrator even calls

the Forest Rangers “a gang of freebooters” (Wiśniowski 43). It is only the timely intervention of Tempski that prevents an outbreak of violence and the narrator’s arrest.

The Bush’s role as a place of violent conflict, rather than encounter, does not occur until later in the novel where the narrator has signed on with the militia as a pioneer, due to forced conscription in New Plymouth rather than by choice like Schaeffer, and Massinger in *War to the Knife*. Here he truly becomes embroiled in the New Zealand Wars and starts to look at the Bush in a more military sense.

The Maoris were masters at choosing and fortifying strategic points, and as brave as the Montenegrin highlanders; and they were sustained by their new religion known as ‘Pai Marire’. I should add that cutting roads through these forests was a hard task, and that all the reinforcements and supplies for the British army were transferred from ships to shore without any port installations (Wiśniowski 132).

The reality of Bush warfare is accurately treated as one of the obstacles of the New Zealand Wars to European forces. Wiśniowski does not gloss over an inexorable British march to victory or treat it as an after-the-fact incident like Verne. He is honest about the nature of the conflict, the effectiveness of the modern pā, and the army’s logistical issues.

The establishment of the military engagements in the Bush, are as mentioned prior, far more fictionalised compared to Stoney. Even so, what Wiśniowski does do with greater accuracy than Major Stoney, is point out the internationality of the British army in New Zealand.

There were as many different nationalities represented as there were occupations. Each European country and each calling had contributed to the motley contingent. The officers were on extremely easy terms with the

humble privates. I shall never forget the sight of a small gathering of men of all complexions, languages, and ranks when I once paid a fleeting visit to a camp canteen (Wiśniowski 133).

This depiction of the Government troops is a far cry from the fairly homogenous representation they are often given, placed under a generic banner of ‘British’ which is often reduced to mean English, with the occasional Scot or Irish soldier, such as in Stoney and Verne.

Wiśniowski acknowledges the various continental Europeans as well as Americans and others from around the world who came to Aotearoa. The military presence in the Bush precipitates contact, not solely between Māori and Pākehā, but also the different groups of Pākehā. Wiśniowski provides a more realistic spread of cultures in New Zealand by acknowledging the non-British and Irish migrants which are often omitted in depictions of Pākehā. For Wiśniowski the conflict that takes place within the Bush is a means for him to present and discuss his ideas about imperial warfare and colonialism, ideas which differ greatly from the depictions of such subject matter by Stoney.

The Bush also becomes a contact zone for Pākehā with Pai Mārire, a religion that has formed from the transculturation of Christianity with traditional Māori belief. Pai Mārire is syncretic religion founded by the prophet Te Ua Haumene in 1864 (Walker, *Ka Whawhai Tonu Matou* 130). Though Haumene preached pacifism, many of his followers twisted his words to promote conflict. The negative portrayal of Pai Mārire is a contrast to the novel’s previously positive treatment of Māori.

“Since the last war, in 1860, the natives in these parts have renounced Christianity and taken up a new religion, Pai Marire, or, as we call it, Hau Hau. Even some friendly Maoris have adopted it. It’s simply a return to their

old paganism. They disguise the pagan element with a sham Judaism, paying greater respect to the Old Testament than to the New. But all of this is simply make-believe. Some who publicly revere the Old Testament have reverted to their cannibalistic ways” (Wiśniowski 163).

This negative portrayal of Pai Mārire shows that the characters on the side of the Government (and possibly Wiśniowski himself) are heavily biased in their perspective of religion from a Christian background.

Contact with any religion other than Catholic or Protestant Christianity, and worse conversion from Christianity to another religion (particularly one seen as pagan) is a reviled action. It is also ridiculed with one soldier considering the ministers who follow Pai Mārire as charlatans, in a dismissal similar to those given towards tohunga.

“The old fool took the oracles of the prophet Te Ua Haumene too much to heart, and now he believes that he is immortal. It would be a good thing to hang him, just to prove that the prophet’s words and amulets have less effect than our bullets and ropes. Our own allies who are contaminated with the faith would profit from the lesson” (Wiśniowski 168).

This religious difference provides a further dimension for conflict, though it does not change the narrator’s sympathy towards the plight of the local Māori. While he is negative towards Pai Mārire as a religion, he is not damning in the followers of the faith. “Don’t you know that many of our Maori allies are of the same religion as you?” (Wiśniowski 168). The condemnation is on the religion rather than upon its practitioners. Wiśniowski even refers to a devout Christian’s negative comments upon Pai Mārire as “cheap moralizing” (Wiśniowski 171). The allied Māori who follow Pai Mārire are treated as misguided, rather than heretics.

Wiśniowski also sees the Bush as a place of meeting, of cultures and people. He does not look at the difference as much as Verne and instead focuses on the points of sameness. He presents a cosmopolitan possibility to New Zealand; he does not see the Māori as a constant danger to be avoided, nor does he see Pākehā as a homogenous group. The Bush is a place of contact and possibility, though not devoid of danger, as the Land Wars are transpiring during his time in that sphere. However, there is potential for more there, there is the potential for a better place to develop.

Boldrewood's Massinger engages with the Bush initially as a tourist, but much of his relationship with it is also coloured by war. One part of the war is Massinger's service among the Forest Rangers, while the other is fleeing from Ngarara and Kereopa Te Rau. Boldrewood does not, however, include any of Kereopa Te Rau's motivations that supply some justification for his actions. Boldrewood omits Te Rau's family's deaths at Rangiaowhia, a massacre where, as previously mentioned, von Tempsky's Forest Rangers were present (Walker, *Ka Whawhai Tonu Matou* 131). Given Massinger's service with the Rangers, this arguably gives Te Rau a motivation to pursue him, though Boldrewood does not make any reference to it.

Boldrewood has roughly seventy pages devoted to Massinger's service in the military. He talks about the battles Massinger has been in and how the protagonist felt in the militia. However, while Boldrewood constructs the clash of cultures in a more stylised depiction than Stoney's dry military despatches, Moffat argues:

Boldrewood is interested in the Waikato's possibilities as a frontier landscape. He carefully researched the history of the region in the 1860s and refers to the battles at Orakau and Gate Pa and to historic figures such as

General Cameron and Bishop Selwyn. However, apart from references to geographic landmarks such as the Waikato River, Lake Taupo, and the Pink and White Terraces, there is little that is distinctively New Zealand about Boldrewood's descriptions of place ("Five Imperial Adventures" 44).

For Boldrewood the Bush is a place of conflict and encounter, but some alterations could quite easily change the setting to James Fenimore Cooper's *The Last of the Mohicans* or possibly Sir Walter Scott's *Waverley*. This is particularly apparent with the Magua-esque foe Ngarara, and the relatively light detail for Ōrākau and Gate Pā. He mentions several days passing and the cries of defiance, but gives no detail on the lack of water, ammunition, or the manner in which the defenders of Ōrākau escaped.

Boldrewood has created a contact zone that is a generic frontier space with a bit of New Zealand flavour and does not grapple with any of the core issues of the New Zealand Wars. Just as his protagonist refuses to look closer at the conflict, so too does Boldrewood. The lack of engagement about why Māori are resisting loss of land, and why some Māori might side with the colonial government shows Boldrewood's attraction to New Zealand for its scenery, but not its reality.

Two stock characters are associated with the Bush: the Māori militiaman and the Māori maiden. Where the other stock characters were clearly defined by the place they fit—either the Town or the Kāinga—these final two are caught between these places, not fitting wholly with one or the other. Therefore, they are aligned with the liminal sphere of the Bush. In addition to being caught between spheres, these characters are also caught between cultures, as many examples of these characters are of both Māori and Pākehā descent.

The Māori militiaman is usually fighting for personal reasons, rather than out of loyalty to the Crown, be it a desire for revenge, past history of conflict with

a particular tribe or fulfilling a debt. To have Māori fighting Māori is not unusual.

As historian Danny Keenan states:

In the later years of the wars, Māori forces assumed a greater burden of the fighting, and the reasons for doing so were probably only understood by those who participated (*Wars Without End* 39).

Despite his motivations, however, this character will generally be labelled as kūpapa, a word that is controversial and varied in its meaning.

These days, amongst Māori, the connotation ‘kupapa’ is used in different contexts, and its meaning varies greatly, from ‘one who does not rise to the debate or fray’ (a neutral) to ‘one who crawls on all fours (a traitor) (Keenan, *Wars Without End* 233).

Many historical figures serve as inspiration for such characters and can feasibly feature within the novels as well. These historical figures are generally Te Keepa, Ropata Wahawaha, and Tāmami Wāka Nene, all of whom achieved prominence in the nineteenth century.

Regardless of historical motivations, the Māori militiaman in the early novels represents a change and desire to live in the European world, taking advantage of conveniences such as European clothing, jewellery, and weapons. They are the ‘friendly natives’ as they accept and in many cases embrace the civilisation of settlement, despite the alienation from their traditional cultures. Some will outright reject te ao Māori changing their name and making light of their heritage. Others will look for a way to exist between the Europeanised world pressing in on them and te ao Maori of their tūpuna by picking and choosing which traditions to keep and which to jettison. While the Māori militiaman is not always an ally to the protagonist, he often has cordial relationship to those he serves alongside. His relationship with imperial officials also conforms to the rules for the

traveller who enlists in the militia, albeit with less congeniality on the official's part. Furthermore, due to a shared freedom to move between spheres he may be a romantic rival for the Māori maiden.

In *War to the Knife*, Massinger's loyal companion in his travels in Aotearoa is Albert Warwick, a man of both Māori and Pākehā descent. Warwick remains a loyal friend to Massinger throughout their travels, including accompanying Massinger into the militia. In this role he is shown to be very aggressive. In fact he is far more competent than Massinger in combat.

The war-demon which had possessed his Maori ancestors had temporarily taken up its abode with him, for, as the campaign progressed, he seemed day by day to be more resolute and unflinching, in action or out of it (Boldrewood 287-288).

This war-like tendency ascribed to Warwick is unsurprising, given the representation of indigenous men in fiction compared to women, especially those of mixed ethnicity.

Terry Goldie states: "Violence is yet one more of the standard commodities through which the indigene as imaginative textual creation is valorized" (Goldie 86). Given Warwick's mixed ethnicity his propensity for combat is heightened. While indigenous maidens with a European parent are portrayed as loving and peaceful, "her male counterpart is usually violent" (Goldie 105). The racial politics are on full display, where savagery comes from indigenous heritage but Warwick is "steadfast, and trustworthy...as became his Anglo-Saxon descent" (Boldrewood 261). This mixed ethnicity is held up as what makes Warwick a sensible and capable soldier. He channels his propensity for violence solely into combat, and while he does revel in it, he is not consumed by it. In this case Bodrewood is arguing the

merits of soldiers of indigenous descent, though it is notable that he does not go as far as stating they should have command.

Yet Warwick's skill at arms is not his only attribute, he also gives an indigenous context to locations, allowing for a greater amount of contact and understanding between cultures. Massinger is warned by Warwick in the Rotorua area to "not step away from the path, or into any water that you have not tried. One traveller did so, and, as it was at boiling heat, died next day, poor fellow!" (Boldrewood 141-2). On being shown a boiling mud pool Massinger learns that Māori in their old tales would tell of people thrown into the pool. However, Warwick adds:

These people were no worse than others long ago. The Druids with their wicker cages filled with roasting victims, were as well up to date as my Maori ancestors (Boldrewood 144-5).

Warwick is clear to point out the cultural similarities, and firm that Massinger should not judge Māori with any sense of superiority. Warwick acts as a voice of reason to Massinger, explaining Māori practices and providing the history of the places as well as context. As a voice of exposition, Warwick is far less problematic in explaining Māori to a European than Verne's Paganel. Warwick is also a character who, due to his liminal status makes use of his easy ability to move between the spheres to act as a guide and intermediary for those who venture into the Bush.

Another Māori militiaman is Te Ti in *Tikera*. Also called by the English name George Sunray, he is presented as a good, honest man, who goes out of his way to be heroic. Te Ti serves first as a merchant marine and then in the militia, yet unlike Boldrewood's Albert Warwick, Te Ti is not treated as having an excessive propensity for violence. Even when the narrator appears as a rival or obstacle to

him, Te Ti treats the man fairly. On the other hand, he is in direct opposition to Schaeffer. Although, considering the type of person Schaeffer is, such a stance is understandable. Wiśniowski also makes sure to give Te Ti motivation for serving in the militia beyond blind loyalty or mercenary behaviour. Te Ti's tribe are hated by the Taranaki Māori due to actions during the Musket Wars: "Since that time there has been constant fighting. They say that the Kawhai people are worse than the pakehas, who are natural land grabbers and accepted as such" (Wiśniowski 164). In this regard, Wiśniowski has managed to present a more accurate picture of a Māori militiaman than Boldrewood. Te Ti is unusual, however, as unlike Albert Warwick he uses two names.

The pakehas call me George Sunray, which is a translation of my Maori name. I don't use that in town because I am ashamed that although I am a chief of an ancient tribe I have to serve on a white man's ship (Wiśniowski 21).

This duality of his naming creates a conundrum of where he feels he belongs. He seeks out the Town, but also tries to fit in to the Kāinga. He is unable to truly be himself in the Town and so has to conceal a part of who he is.

The last (and one of the most important) of the characters is the Māori maiden. Like the Māori militiaman, she is capable of moving between all three spheres quite freely (unique as unlike the traveller and Māori militiaman, she is rarely featured as a combatant). Significantly, in all of these novels the Māori maiden is of mixed heritage, with a Pākehā father and Māori mother. Her ties to two worlds can often be a source of internal conflict, however the novels ultimately connect the Māori maiden to the Māori world and thus throughout this section I will be referring to her as a 'Māori maiden'.

In these novels a Māori maiden's parentage technically is mixed, as she has a Pākehā father and a Māori mother. Yet despite this parentage, within the narrative she is considered for all intents and purposes Māori. As Goldie argues

regardless of suggestions of internal quandaries, it is her external role that earns her a place as object of the white male subject. And as object she remains the indigene maiden (70).

Such classification is not unusual. Angela Wanhalla states: "Under native land legislation, a 'Native' was defined as anyone of 50% or more 'blood'. A person of less than 50% Māori 'blood' was enumerated as European" ("The Politics of Periodical Counting" 204). By the racialised colonial mathematics of the period, a European parent still classifies the maiden as Māori. However, the presence of a European father was seen to ameliorate some of the protagonist's fears of miscegenation, that offspring of such a union would be far less atavistic than if the maiden were of wholly Māori descent. Her indigeneity is apparent, but it is contained by her paternal lineage.

The Māori maiden is frequently a love interest and usually paired with the traveller (though it is no guarantee that she will remain with him). In terms of character type and lineage, the Māori maiden conforms to the role of what Terry Goldie terms the indigene maiden character: "She represents the attractions of the land but in a form which seems to request domination, unlike her violent male counterpart who resists it" (Goldie 65). For the male protagonists of these colonial narratives, the indigene maiden, and by extension the Māori maiden, is a representative of the land of which they might take possession. Her role as an embodiment of the land, and the conflict for possession of her, is a microcosm of the struggle over Aotearoa. The indigene maiden is also a character with fixed personal attributes: "She can best be understood as a series of absolutes: absolute

purity, absolute beauty, and absolute devotion” (Goldie 68). In contrast to Goldie’s comments, however, the writers of these texts associate the Māori maidens not with purity but passion and sexuality. The Māori maiden is far more likely to be active in her romantic pursuit of the protagonist, than to be drawn to him innocently.

In this regard the Māori maiden strikes out her own position distinct from the typical indigene maiden character, unfortunately it does not allow her to break fully from the convention.

While these Maori heroines are usually more fully rounded characters than their one-dimensional European rivals, the authors invariably retreat from allowing a permanent commitment between the racial other and the hero, reflecting European attitudes of racial superiority and fears of miscegenation (Moffat, “Five Imperial Adventures” 38).

The fears of miscegenation are also not excised by the Pakeha heritage of the Māori maiden. In fact the fears can be amplified as the mixed descent proves that a commingling of race is possible and complicates binaries of difference.

As discussed earlier, the maiden is often fought over as a representation of the land between the traveller and a Māori male figure. Their romantic struggle serves a microcosm for the wider struggle over the land. She the prize in which to be won, but should the traveller emerge victorious, this does not mean that she will live happily. “Maori *must* suffer civilisation or extermination, cultural or actual genocide, so that the settler might *be*, that is to say, come to be at home” (Turner 48). As the Māori maiden is a representation of the land, to make the land a Europeanised pastoral paradise, she cannot persist in the place. While she is of European descent, she is also tangata whenua. To make the land ready for settlement she must die, or at the very least be removed from the equation, rendering the land as terra nullius. Her departure is necessary so the land is free for all takers

and free to become a wholly Europeanised settlement as envisaged by figures such as Governor George Grey.

The Māori maiden of *War to the Knife* is Erena. The daughter of a Pākehā-Māori and a Māori woman who, while she has little presence in the novel, was of high rank. Boldrewood spends a noticeable amount of time comparing Erena to figures of classical mythology. “Massinger thought he had never before seen a more perfect presentment of the nymph of the legends of Hellas” (Boldrewood 122-3). There are further such comments made, particularly towards the nymph-like qualities reinforcing her status as typical Māori maiden symbolic of the land while also emphasising her European heritage.

In addition to the nature and land connotations, Erena’s journey is representative of the typical narrative arc of the Māori maiden character, falling in love with Massinger, saving his life on two occasions, and ultimately sacrificing herself for him, taking a bullet for him when he is shot by Ngarara. Boldrewood is explicit about the link between her blood and her actions: “She died for the man she loved, as only a daughter of her race can love” (Boldrewood 403). Significantly Massinger initially chooses Erena over her rival Hypatia, showing that he had a genuine attraction to the Māori world. Even so, this nuance, does not save her from the typical maiden’s fate. Hypatia expresses the view that had Massinger married Erena, it would be socially unacceptable. “She well knew what a death-in-life it would be considered by his English friends” (Boldrewood 320). The death of Erena allows Massinger to avoid this “death-in-life” and instead make a match considered far more palatable to nineteenth-century sensibilities. Massinger does not mourn Erena terribly long following his return to England. For

after spending a quiet year on his estate, in the management of which he took great interest, it was announced that he was about to be married to the

beautiful, distinguished, fascinating, eccentric Hypatia Tollemache (Boldrewood 411).

The expulsion of the non-English maiden is much like the choice made in Sir Walter Scott's *Waverley* and *Ivanhoe*, where, despite the protagonist's romance with a non-English lady, by the end of the story he ends up with a socially acceptable match.

Tikera, the eponymous heroine of Wisniewski's novel finds more success than Erena. Tikera endures the same duality of naming as Te Ti. In this case, however, it is at her father's insistence. Her given name is Tikera, but when she lives among Pākehā she is called Jenny Williams. Unlike the other Māori maiden characters, Tikera's father does not live in the Kāinga. He is "a former convict turned out of our village for his crimes" (Wiśniewski 89). As her father does not live as a Māori, she faces a division of heritage. Her dual naming serves to de-emphasise her Māori heritage when among Pākehā, to help her to better fit in (Wiśniewski 96). This shifting of identity to suit environment is a stark difference to Erena, who sees no need to change her name, likely as her father is a welcomed and respected member of the Kāinga.

As Tikera's father aligns himself with the Town, while her mother's people reside in the Kāinga, her roles and identities need to shift to fit the sphere. Tikera of course faces discrimination in Town for her heritage, so the name only softens what is still considerable bigotry. Even within the space of the Kāinga, however, she is still ostracised. This is due to her descent from 'Pokerakahu' or 'Black Kumara' who were formerly slaves. The missionary describes them negatively: "We utterly despise them, although we have granted them their freedom because our new religion forbids us to enslave men" (Wiśniewski 89). Even living among her mother's people Tikera is unable to fit in. This places her into a more liminal state than Erena, as there is nowhere that Tikera is truly accepted.

Tikera is also notable in her various relationships throughout the novel, many characters treat her as a figure of desire, not just one protagonist and one rival as previously shown. Her relationships with Schaeffer, the narrator and Te Ti all highlight the story's preoccupation with miscegenation.

For much of the narrative Tikera is criticised by the narrator as the embodiment of what he regards as an endemic 'half-caste' ambition to marry a European, or at least acquire a Pakeha lover (Moffat, "Five Imperial Adventures" 56).

While McEldowney describes Wiśniowski himself as being ambivalent towards the subject (xviii), the narrator himself is highly critical of her desires and ambitions. The violent restitution that ensues upon Schaeffer, the earlier unrelated death of Te Ti and the narrator's recusal from the contest for Tikera's hand results in a radical and unconventional resolution.

The only viable suitor for Tikera is a French doctor, Abrabat. He is particularly notable in his dismissal of racialized ideas of romance that surround the other suitors: "The man who marries Miss Jenny even without a dowry will make a better choice than someone marrying Miss Whittmore, even if she had the wealth of the Rothschilds" (Wiśniowski 272). Of all of the suitors he wishes to marry her for who she is rather than what she has or represents. The couple are still dogged by colonial bigotry, however, and travel to Martinique where such a relationship is not considered scandalous. McEldowney comments that "it saved her from the *gaucherie* of colonial Anglo-Saxon life" (xix). It is satisfying at the end of the novel to see her end up with Albrabat, who of all her suitors loves her as a person and does not seek to use her to advance socially (like Te Ti), for her inheritance (like Schaeffer), or to escape captivity (like the narrator).

A crucial point of difference to Erena is that Tikera survives the story. Given her entire treatment in the novel and ostracization in both the Town and the Kāinga, it is no wonder that she is happy to relocate to Martinique with Albrabat. For Tikera this is a success, she has escaped the fate of Erena, and Erena's literary predecessor Cora Munro. The daughter of two worlds is able to travel a place where her heritage is not denigrated, but openly accepted. Her journey to Martinique with a kind young doctor is by no means an escape from her narrative role, however. Tikera is still gone, the land has still been rendered terra nullius for settlement. While her removal from the land is not as violent as Erena's, it still fulfils the purpose of symbolically rendering Aotearoa free for settlement.

Conclusion

The New Zealand Wars romance novels of the nineteenth century establish a literary whakapapa that reaches into the twentieth and twenty-first century. Whenever the representation depicts the New Zealand Wars as a finished point in time (as opposed to the Land Wars), the narrative and character types, particularly those used by Pākehā authors, are influenced by prior authors and novels. The daring European men involved in colonial conflict, the women (both Māori and European) who are drawn to them, and some stereotypical depictions of indigenous violence remain existent for over a century. While some later novels do complicate the conventions (such as Witi Ihimaera's *The Matriarch*), many novels fit a mould of imperial adventure or war novel and therefore follow the established conventions, whether intentionally or not. These novels are crucial in the development of later representations of the New Zealand Wars, and while the later depictions may not directly acknowledge these texts the parallels are apparent. The imported heritage from Sir Walter Scott and James Fenimore Cooper continues beyond the nineteenth century. Many of the conventions established by the New Zealand Wars romance

in the nineteenth century are perpetuated into the twenty-first in both literature and film, although the subsequent representation by no means adhere blindly to tradition. As the next chapter will show, the conventions do have alternative interpretations depending on the tone or perspective of the author, though they will still be evident within the narrative.

Chapter Two: Complicating the Narrative: The Novel from 1914 – 1967

The first half of the twentieth century was marked by many significant events in Aotearoa New Zealand history. These ranged from the Boer War (1899-1902), declining union with Australia (1901), and Dominion status (1907), to the First World War (1914-1918), and the Second World War (1939-1945). It was a period of burgeoning nationalism for Aotearoa. In “1886 – for the first time the majority of non-Māori people living here were New Zealand-born rather than immigrants” (Ministry for Culture and Heritage, “Overview of NZ in the 19th Century 1870-1900”). This led to a growing sense of identification with New Zealand as the place of belonging. Unsurprisingly, the New Zealand Wars novel encountered changes during this period as well. This new century needed a new hero to embody a growing identity, the traveller was replaced with the settler protagonist, someone with strong ties to New Zealand as both a physical place and a cultural, social community. This chapter examines four novelists from the twentieth century who develop the New Zealand Wars novels from where Boldrewood left off in 1899. Some of these writers took the genre conventions of the historical romances and added their own interpretations. The focuses changed to highlight the plight of Māori and the experience of women, and to apply more detail to interpretations of the Wars.

Compared to the final decades of the nineteenth century, few New Zealand Wars novels were published during the first decades of the twentieth century, perhaps due to a perception that the conflict had been resolved. Once again, there are no Māori published voices during this period, but the European writers finding inspiration in the Wars do offer a greater range of perspectives. The two novels of note during the early twentieth century are *Rifle and Tomahawk* (1927) by Mona

Tracy and *The Greenstone Door* (1914) by William Satchell. Tracy's *Rifle and Tomahawk* continues the style of the romances and their heritage from Sir Walter Scott and James Fenimore Cooper. In contrast to the novels considered in Chapter One, *The Greenstone Door* has attracted greater critical attention and has been reprinted and republished several times (in 1930, 1936, 1937, 1938, 1950, 1957, 1961, 1973, 1987, 2018) garnering fresh interest and readership. William Satchell's novel is the earliest of these twentieth-century novels, but complicates and interrogates the romance conventions to which Tracy adheres. Satchell is positioned as part of the Maoriland literary era and grapples with concepts like perceiving Māori as a "dying race". Satchell's thinking is shaped by contemporaneous Social Darwinist ideas, leading him to replicate depictions current at the time about Maori as a dying race. However, he also found this idea tragic, hence Satchell's novel is a great lament for Māori, rather than a rollicking adventure story, so his novel places far greater attention on Māori and the detrimental effects of European settlement.

Due to a number of historical factors, the New Zealand Wars novel experienced a resurgence in the late 1950s and 1960s. Until this period much of Pākehā identity was tied heavily to Britain, in fact New Zealand did not accept separate citizenship from the British Empire until 1947 when the Statute of Westminster was ratified (Ministry for Culture and Heritage "Statute of Westminster Passed"). The mid-twentieth century meant a reassessing of New Zealand-ness, and so necessitated a re-engagement with the New Zealand Wars. Philip Steer's work on New Zealand Wars fiction is helpful in understanding the context in which the authors of this period were writing:

Britain's announcement in 1961 that it wished to enter the European Economic Community not only marked the beginning of the end of

Britain's preferential treatment of New Zealand's agricultural exports, but it also marked a rupture in the close political and cultural dependency that had hitherto marked the Pakeha relationship to the mother country. This was the social and political context for a remarkable upsurge in fictional treatments of the New Zealand wars between 1959 and 1968 (Steer 120).

These social, political and cultural changes had an impact on literature. As a result, the New Zealand Wars fiction written during this period approached the conflict in new and distinctive ways, while still bearing the imprint of some of the genre conventions of the preceding era. Of these authors, I will examine Olga Stringfellow and Errol Braithwaite.

In contrast to all the preceding authors, both male and female, Stringfellow's *Mary Bravender* examines the plight of the European lady in significant detail. Her protagonist is not a bold young man from Britain (or Poland), but an unwed Scottish woman. Stringfellow examines the life of a European woman caught up in the New Zealand Wars in far greater detail than authors discussed earlier in this thesis. The titular character arguably becomes the archetype for the New Zealand Wars heroine protagonist. Braithwaite's *The Flying Fish* trilogy, however, is a return to Aotearoa as the proving ground of colonial masculinity. The trilogy comprises *The Flying Fish* (1964), *The Needle's Eye* (1965), and *The Evil Day* (1967), with each taking place in a different part of the New Zealand Wars. Braithwaite's work maintains the twentieth-century settler hero, but orientates the narrative to focus more heavily on fighting and battles. Braithwaite's fiction also critiques the officers of the British Army, while valourising the colonial settler recruits, reflecting a changing view of New Zealand's identity. Though Stringfellow, Braithwaite and Satchell signified changes from the nineteenth-century representations of the New Zealand Wars,

their narratives do recycle many of the conventions and tropes of nineteenth-century fiction.

Mona Tracy and Perpetuating the Colonial Myths

Though Mona Tracy's *Rifle and Tomahawk* was written thirteen years after Satchell's *The Greenstone Door*, her novel better resembles the nineteenth-century New Zealand Wars romances. The title of the novel is a clear evocation of the frontier romances of James Fenimore Cooper. Tracy also maintains the style and genre conventions of the nineteenth-century romances. A young hero who has travelled to Aotearoa tests himself against the perils of the country by joining the militia.⁵ The young protagonist Ron serves alongside a Māori militiaman named Renata, and achieves acclaim in fighting during the pursuit of Te Kooti. Like Verne and Emilia Marryat (the English children's author who was the first woman to pen a New Zealand Wars fiction in 1874), Tracy writes for a young audience. A November 1927 review of the novel in the *New Zealand Herald* declared that *Rifle and Tomahawk* was "a story such as will delight every healthy boy and girl" ("A New Zealand Story. 'Rifle and Tomahawk'").

Much of the novel's engagement with conflict is typical of writers like Boldrewood, but the novel does feature a point of difference from convention. The presence of Ron's childhood friend Hori fighting on the side of Te Kooti complicates the loyalties of Ron and Hori. Hori must choose between his people and his friends.

The cause of Te Kooti has, perhaps, justice. He may be, as the messages he is sending over the countryside say, the saviour of his people. But I do

⁵ In this novel they are erroneously referred to as Forest Rangers when they are just a generic militia group. The Forest Rangers refers to a specific militia unit during the New Zealand Wars.

not like this slaying of women and children, and have sworn, by the gods of my fathers, and by your God to have no part in it (Tracy 63-63).

The novel shows Hori's loyalty to Te Kooti is not out of devotion to the cause but to his family, who have sided with the prophet. Tracy does not delve into significant detail about Te Kooti's cause (understandable given the style of novel). However, that Hori acknowledges the legitimacy of the the prophet's grievances is a step forward from nineteenth-century writers such as Stoney and Boldrewood who omit any justice in Māori resistance to colonial control. The quote about "gods of my fathers, and by your God" is unusual, however, as by 1868 Christianity was heavily entrenched in Māori society.

Unlike Cedric and Rangiora, Ron and Hori's friendship is not compromised during the course of the conflict. Instead, Hori is easily convinced to aid Ron while pretending to support Te Kooti. Hori saves Ron's sister on multiple occasions, passes information on the movements of Te Kooti's followers, and even shows them a secret passage into the stronghold of Ngātapa. Tracy skims over the potential divide of loyalties by having Hori turn double agent. Despite glossing over the issue, Tracy's acknowledgement of Hori choosing between his friends and his family reflects a reality of the New Zealand Wars not covered by the novels discussed in Chapter One.

Although *Rifle and Tomahawk* is penned by a female author there is no real diminution of the primary preoccupation with masculine endeavour. One of the central characters is a European woman, Ron's sister Isabel (often called Isbel). This marks a shift from the nineteenth-century use of the European lady as love interest, and some of the early chapters describe events from Isabel's viewpoint, giving her a little more individuality. However, none of her perspective is shown following Ron's enlistment in the militia. She is reduced to a damsel in

distress in need of rescue. Furthermore, the capture and imprisonment of a European lady plot is not without its own precedent. Mary Grant and Lady Glenarven had a similar experience with Lord Glenarven among Kai-Koumou's people in Jules Verne's *Among the Cannibals*.

Tracy also continues the romance authors' tradition of muddling history. Past discussion of Tracy has praised her engagement with history, for instance Betty Gilderdale describes *Rifle and Tomahawk* as having a "well-researched background" (Gilderdale). Much of her depiction of the pursuit of Te Kooti is correct, such as the attack on Matawhero (which I discuss further in Chapter Three), as well as the involvement of the government's Ngāti Porou allies. However, some aspects of history are not just manipulated or blended, in many cases they are just plain wrong. Tracy depicts Kereopa Te Rau on the side of Te Kooti (Tracy 199). This allegiance is highly illogical as the two were from distinct religious groups, each engaged in their own resistance to colonial authority. The only point of comparison is that both men took refuge among the Tūhoe people in Te Urewera. However, as they were leaders of different religious groups it is unlikely Te Rau would have accepted Te Kooti's authority.

Tracy also claims Te Kooti took refuge in Te Urewera when his pursuit ended, which is also not the case as he is recorded as having received refuge among the Kīngitanga following a vow of non-violence. The prophet's refuge in Te Urewera was much earlier during the pursuit. The novel also erroneously calls Māori militia members "pupapa" (Tracy 174), rather than kūpapa, though this may be a typographical error rather than Tracy specifically. While these errors are not as blatant as Jules Verne's, Tracy has fewer excuses than her French predecessor as she had actual experience of New Zealand, had the advantage of the many histories of the events published in the late nineteenth and early

twentieth centuries) including the work of James Cowan and William Pember Reeves), and had a fictional model in *The Greenstone Door* that coupled fictional flair with greater historical accuracy. The many factual errors point to sloppiness on the part of the author, but also highlight an even more fundamental problem with this kind of fiction: the privileging of derring-do and heroism over accuracy. This in turn reinforces just how much of a stranglehold the adventure romance continued to exert. It was a popular form and contemporary reviews highlighted the “romantic and thrilling” nature of Tracy’s narrative, the “hair-raising perils” guaranteed to appeal to readers (“A New Zealand Story. “Rifle and Tomahawk”).

Rifle and Tomahawk is a recreation of the nineteenth-century New Zealand Wars romance, which places it in stark contrast to the other three novels of this chapter, all of which interrogate or reframe the conventions of the New Zealand Wars romance. Tracy demonstrates that while many of the nineteenth-century New Zealand Wars romanticists were male, the narrative of historical romance is not a genre exclusive to male authors. She is a female author writing a novel that is very masculine in its focus.

Ronald Cameron came back from his campaigning a man in everything but years. The keen air of the mountain-passes had filled him out. He was bronzed, strong as a young lion, and wore an air of quiet self-reliance that promised him a splendid manhood (Tracy 247).

The description of Ron at the end of the novel demonstrates that Tracy is just as engaged in the romance conventions as writers such as Rolf Boldrewood and G. A. Henty. Her hero is shaped out of the same manly clay as those in the nineteenth century, exhibiting typical virtues of physical strength and bravery, integrity and conviction, and British backbone.

William Satchell Deconstructs and Reaffirms the Romance

William Satchell is more distinct from the novelists of Chapter One than Tracy.

While Satchell, like Stoney, is an immigrant, his novel *The Greenstone Door* (1914) is a contrast to *Taranaki* and all the other early writers, in both time and tone. Writing fifteen years later (and in a different century) from Boldrewood, Satchell shows a development of the New Zealand Wars romance. A man of English and Swiss German descent, who studied abroad in Heidelberg, Satchell migrated to New Zealand from England in 1886, five years after Tawhiao had declared peace in the Waikato. Satchell's perspective differs from the nineteenth-century authors and melds ideas of both the Anglophone and non-Anglophone authors. Like Sygurd Wiśniowski he draws on lived experience and professes reservations towards the settlement of the country. He is not critical of the British Empire as a whole (unlike Verne and Wiśniowski), but he is more jaded than Boldrewood and Stoney. In Satchell's novel the seeds for the interrogation of the New Zealand Wars in the late twentieth century are visible with unease at aspects of settlement starting to encroach on the Pākehā psyche.

Satchell is not entirely divorced from the style of the nineteenth-century romances, however. Alex Calder argues that *The Greenstone Door* extends the popularity of the imperial and colonial adventure into the early twentieth century. "Satchell wanted it to be a New Zealand take on *The Last of the Mohicans*, which in turn was modelled on the historical novels of Sir Walter Scott" (Calder 98). This style of Fenimore Cooper is clearly evident in the character and specific genre conventions of both the New Zealand Wars romance and the wider genre.

Both *The Greenstone Door* and *The Last of the Mohicans* have noble warriors and beautiful half-caste maidens; Hawkeye, the white

frontiersman, fights alongside his Indian brothers much as Purcell, the Pakeha Maori, fights for his adopted tribe against the Crown; both books lament the vanishing wilderness and the closing of the cross-cultural frontier (Calder 98-99).

Part of the lament is that Cedric narrates the entire story from an unknown point in the future. His narration consistently remarks upon how New Zealand has changed since his youth, particularly the environment and Māori society. However, Satchell is not just a writer drawing on the conventions of the frontier and imperial-adventure romance like Rolf Boldrewood, Satchell is defined by Jane Stafford and Mark Williams as a Maoriland writer.

Stafford and Williams argue that in the later nineteenth and early twentieth centuries much New Zealand fiction was preoccupied with the land and questions of legitimacy and belonging. The work of Maoriland writers is characterised by Stafford and Williams as being

late colonial and early Dominion New Zealand attempts to provide settlers with authenticity and ownership in a place where they have lived only a few generations, thus adhering to the idea of Māori as a “dying race” (Stafford and Williams 11).

These cluster of writers in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries used “Maori sources to provide descendants of settlers with a history peculiar to themselves” (Stafford and Williams 11).

Another key feature of the Maoriland writers was a “habit of appropriation” which “occurs in a period when Māori are conveniently figured as a ‘dying race’” (Stafford and Williams 11). In this regard, Satchell does have similar thoughts on the “dying race” narrative present in many of the Maoriland writings. As Lawrence Jones states:

Pakeha greed for land, the disparity between the societies, the pace of change, and the ecological effect of the introduction of Pakeha plants, animals, and diseases meant that ‘the Maori was doomed; that his best hope was extinction in the blood of the conqueror’, for in the Darwinian workings of ‘the Inevitable’, the less developed culture would be overcome (“The Novel” 122).

The depiction of Māori as a “dying race” was not limited to literature either. The idea of romanticised Māori who were “dying out” was also peddled by historians such as William Pember Reeves. He stated: “Partial civilisation has been a blight to their national life” (61). While this depiction of Māori did admit the role of Pākehā in their supposed fate, it also absolved the government from blame.

Author A.A. Grace articulates these sentiments in his 1901 collection *Tales of a Dying Race*, the title of which encapsulates this perception of Māori: “In spite of the sincerest efforts of a paternal Government, it is the sad belief of those who know the race best that the Maoris are doomed to be extinguished or absorbed” (vii). Satchell’s depiction of Māori as a “dying race” is problematic for a twenty-first-century audience, yet his articulation of Social Darwinist ideas is framed very much as a lament and he is fuelled by a desire to capture Maori traditions, beliefs and language and thus to some measure preserve them from what he regards as the fatal and destruction march of Empire.

Satchell’s view of the displacement (and absorption) of Māori, stands in stark contrast to Boldrewood and Stoney who consider Māori displacement from land and culture to be an inevitable and necessary endeavour and the rightful progress of the world. While Satchell’s presentation of this “dying race” ideology as a great lament does not remove the problematic nature of the imperialist thinking, it does shift the tone. I would also argue that Satchell complicates the

definition of Maoriland. *The Greenstone Door* serves as the genre's only example of a New Zealand Wars novel amongst them. It forces an engagement with Māori before sweeping them aside, as opposed to marginalising them from the outset like other examples of the genre, such as Clara Cheeseman's *A Rolling Stone* (1886) or Edith Searle Grossman's *The Heart of the Bush* (1910).

In addition to Maoriland influences, Satchell's writing includes features of German Romanticism. Specifically, the novel is a *bildungsroman*, which "deals with the maturation process, with how and why the protagonist develops as he does, both morally and psychologically" (Encyclopaedia Britannica). *The Greenstone Door* follows the growth and development of his protagonist Cedric Tregarthen and his life in Aotearoa during the mid-nineteenth century. This development means that the novel does not depict a singular moment in the New Zealand Wars, but instead constructs the overall contexts around which they were fought. These points of difference make Satchell's changes and reinterpretations of the genre conventions in terms of characters and narrative understandable.

Cedric is unlike the earlier traveller protagonists, as he does not arrive from elsewhere but was born and raised in Aotearoa. In this regard he is less of a traveller and more of a settler. He is still akin to a Walter Scott neutral protagonist, however, as he is "a protagonist who stands between two conflicting parties and is bound to both of them by relationship and sympathy" (Wattie, "The New Zealand Wars" 435). When commanded to choose a side Cedric responds: "I cannot fight against the men of my own race...I will not fight against the men of yours" (Satchell 324). This neutrality is a significant contrast to the nineteenth-century writers, as even Wiśniowski's narrator, who openly agrees with Māori resistance, sides with the militia. Another crucial point of difference is that Cedric

is adopted by a Pākehā-Māori and raised among Māori in the Waikato. This places a greater level of attention on Māori spaces within the narrative.

Cedric describes his kāinga as a place of both wonder and danger. The “awe-inspiring” whare of the supreme chief and the entertaining whare-matoro are contrasted with the “the mysterious whare-kura, fronting the rising sun in the midst of the holy enclosure, where stood the sinister graven image of the Rainbow god” (Satchell 30). Cedric notes how the store house carvings are “threatening, pearl-eyed images glaring from the outward walls” (Satchell 30). While the description of the place is vivid, it is told from Cedric’s memory, with the implication that it is gone, never to return.

This treatment of the Māori world feeds into Satchell’s treatment of Māori as an admirable group but one of an old world that will eventually move aside for the incoming European civilisation. As Calder argues:

It is his way of declaring a part of history to be over: the tide was not only against the old Maori, it was also taking with it the effervescence of two cultures meeting in a brief but inventive moment before the more powerful inevitably swamped the weaker (103).

In this respect the kāinga is shown in much the same fashion as Satchell’s literary predecessors. It is a place that is still Māori, but is (despite the efforts of conservative elements) being transformed either rapidly through conflict, or slowly through transculturation. Though Satchell does not necessarily consider this progress to be a positive outcome (as shown by his comments regarding Māori development), he is resigned to it as inevitable. Cedric narrates that

even if war had not intervened to blot from the land the last traces of his labours and ambitions, it is doubtful if he would ever again have essayed the road (Satchell 242).

Though Māori experienced rapid progress in the nineteenth century with the construction of mills and agricultural industry, the sheer number of settlers dooms their plans from the outset. For Satchell, the changes for Māori feed into their decline.

Te ao Māori serves as a formation of Cedric's identity as even his interactions with the Pākehā world are influenced by his upbringing in the kāinga. Despite his upbringing in a Māori-dominated environment, however, Cedric is not totally integrated like Purcell. He feels a sense of alienation within this place knowing he does not truly belong.

I remember to this hour the sense of loss and degradation that overwhelmed me with the knowledge that I was not of the Ngatimaniapoto, not even a Maori but a member of a distant and alien race (Satchell 42).

Cedric's lack of ties to his kāinga are not solely due to his ethnicity. His role in the narrative as the neutral protagonist stops him from fully embracing life in the kāinga. Were he to be happy among his Māori family and truly integrate, there would be a very different story as Cedric would not be caught between the two sides of the Waikato Invasion. Furthermore, this quote indicates the opposite from typical depictions of settlement. Cedric openly acknowledges his alien nature in a land that is fundamentally Māori. He does not try to justify his presence through feeling some connection to the place, he acknowledges that in this country he is out of place.

Cedric's difference from earlier protagonists also applies to his engagement with the Pākehā world. Due to his upbringing among the Waikato Māori his arrival in Auckland is not only his first experience with a New Zealand city, but with any city or settlement with a majority European population.

Auckland is larger now, but it does not seem to me quite so fine nor so densely populated as it did then. Its single or two-storied shops, with their small windows, its verandahed residences, its public houses—I think I counted eight in Queen Street alone—represented to me the last word in civilisation. I wondered at the people, men and women, boys and girls, military and civilian, who passed me without a word and with only here and there, among the younger folk, a look of inquiry (Satchell 149).

Cedric comes to Auckland with a sense of wonder, not towards the environment or country (as he is already familiar with them); instead he looks upon the Pākehā world with awe. All of his prior experience with Aotearoa has been in a kāinga in the Waikato, and while he is familiar with the Pākehā world in theory, he has not experienced it first-hand.

Satchell's protagonist is marked out from previous heroes in that he feels genuine investment in and ties to the country, not only through financial but also emotional bonds. Massinger was content to depart back to England despite owning land in New Zealand, and both Verne's and Wiśniowski's protagonists easily depart Aotearoa. Even the looming departure of Helenora Wylde is not enough to convince Cedric to leave New Zealand:

I could not gladly contemplate the idea of leaving New Zealand for ever, and the thought of a final abandonment of my foster-father and sister raised a mist in my eyes" (Satchell 186).

Previous protagonists came to Aotearoa from somewhere else, be it Scotland, England, France, or Poland. The turn of the century showed a change as the structures and settlement of Aotearoa became more fixed. By the early twentieth century multiple generations of Pākehā had lived in New Zealand, as opposed to first generations and initial migrants. The tonal and ideological difference in

Cedric's character also stand out from the other texts, which mesh with Turner's words on what it means to be a settler: "The settler needs to understand *colonial being* not simply possessing a place, but being possessed by a place, by a history you can't fully know" (Turner 42). Cedric's unease wherever he dwells and inability to truly settle is what marks his internal unsettlement as a result of colonial settlement.

One of the most crucial points about Satchell is his pacifism, which is evident in the anti-war comments made throughout the novel such as "War...is a disease" (Satchell 297). Satchell's reservations about war and his refusal to valourise or glamourise it mark out his difference from the previous novelists. Satchell was a pacifist and in perpetuating these ideas, Cedric does not actively participate in the New Zealand Wars. Unlike protagonists such as Massinger, St Pierre, and Wiśniowski's narrator, Cedric does not join the militia. Cedric neither wishes to nor has any need to fight to prove his masculinity. Instead he remains neutral as he finds himself caught in between the two sides of the conflict. While the outbreak of the Waikato War challenges this neutrality and Cedric is forced by Te Atua Mangu at musket point to side with Duncan Cameron, Cedric still refuses to participate in the fighting. At the climax of the novel, Cedric has joined with General Cameron, at the Battle of Ōrākau. The battle leads to the deaths of Cedric's foster sister Puhi-Huia and her lover Rangiora. Yet even then Cedric does not participate in the conflict.

A common motif featuring in the novel that is associated with Satchell's pacifism is the tatau pounamu, the eponymous Greenstone Door: "This figurative expression was used to denote the making of a lasting peace" (Satchell 400). The Greenstone Door symbolises Cedric's desire for peace between Māori and Pākehā and is a phrase used more than once between Rangiora and Cedric. The tatau

pounamu represents the idea of reconciliation and harmony emerging in spite of past conflict. Though it is used on a small scale with Cedric and Rangiora, it can be extrapolated to apply to settlers and Māori. The image is one of a lasting peace. The image of the closed “tatau pounamu” at the end of the novel depicts the idea of positive race relations in twentieth-century Aotearoa. The New Zealand Wars had ended, in 1881 King Tawhiao declared peace, now Māori and Pākehā can look forward to the future as a single nation. Satchell arrived in Aotearoa just after the declaration of peace and issuing of pardons. In this regard the image of the tatau pounamu would be attractive. The use of this image is also reflection of Satchell’s incorporation of Māori culture and tradition that is absent from his predecessors and shows a desire to situate Māori in a place of greater visibility than past depictions. It becomes problematic, however, when coupled with Satchell’s emphasis on the fatal impact of colonisation on Māori. The closing of the door can be read as shutting Māori out from a future dominated by Pākehā in which assimilation is the only way to survive.

Satchell is far more detailed with his examination of Māori characters than earlier writers and presents a far greater and broader representation of Māori. This degree of representation is potentially due to the time of the novel’s writing where many European or Pākehā authors were looking to memorialise what was considered to be a “dying race”. It is also indicative of his reworking and altering the earlier New Zealand Wars romance tropes.

One character type from the nineteenth century who receives greater attention is the Pākehā-Māori, exemplified by Cedric’s foster father Purcell. Like many Pākehā-Māori in New Zealand, Purcell is a respected member of the community who serves as their local trader. Trevor Bentley states: “some one hundred and thirty traders settled among the tribes between 1827 and 1840” (143).

Purcell would not have been considered a unique figure in terms of contact with Māori.

Compared to past versions of Pākehā-Māori, he is more historically plausible than Boldrewood's Pākehā war chief Mannering. Purcell is a man who has accumulated status within Māori society and has made a great effort to integrate himself into the tribe.

Bentley supports this assertion of integration: "They lived among Maori on Maori terms and being dependent upon the tribe for protection and prosperity were obliged to demonstrate at least an outward conformity" (Bentley 149). In particular, Purcell makes specific overtures to tribal allegiance as he had

built his store and organised his band of workers and so rooted himself that...he had become indispensable to the tribe. True to his word, he had called no white man to his assistance, relying entirely on a carefully selected staff of natives for the conducting of his affairs and the safeguarding of his possessions (Satchell 45).

Purcell as a Pākehā-Māori shows his allegiance is with the Māori rather than among the settlers. This integration shows a forsaking of the Pākehā world, as while he does briefly visit Auckland in the narrative, these visits are glossed over and Purcell shows no sign of spending a significant amount of time there. By becoming a part of the tribe, his allegiances are with them and not the government.

Satchell's desire to present a greater understanding of Māori life within the narrative means that the Māori maiden ceases to be a liminal figure. In contrast to her foster-brother, Cedric, Puhī-Huia feels an acceptance in the community with both her father Purcell and her Māori mother, Roma. Even though Roma is of a different tribe and possibly taurekareka (Satchell 37), she and Puhī-Huia still fit in

more than Cedric. Puhi-Huia also differs from other Māori maidens; she is not a love interest towards the protagonist – she is Cedric’s sister. He explicitly states that “no sister could have been dearer to me than Puhi-Huia” (Satchell 245). The difference in Puhi-Huia’s relationship to the protagonist is an indication of Cedric’s views towards settlement. Cedric feels no desire for Puhi-Huia, and so does not fight with Rangiora for her hand. As Cedric does not suffer from the same “land hunger” as other settlers, he does not take part in the war as an active combatant. In both the literal and metaphorical war for the land and the representation of the land, Cedric chooses to stand aside.

Puhi-Huia’s difference compared to earlier Māori maidens is also due to her father. Purcell’s allegiance to the tribe rather than the Crown also keeps her from feeling divided. Unlike Tikera and Erena, Puhi-Huia does not feel a desire to deny her Māori identity. In contrast to Tikera, Puhi-Huia does not attempt to use a Pākehā name, and unlike Erena, Puhi-Huia does not speak disparagingly of Māori cultural practices. Her father happily integrates into the tribe, and while he does advocate for Christianity and Christian beliefs, he identifies a kinship with the local Māori. Because Purcell accepts her Māori-ness, Puhi-Huia is free to embrace it. Where Tikera and Erena feel an internal conflict based upon their father’s allegiances to the settlers, Puhi-Huia does not. Puhi-Huia is free to align herself with her tribe alongside her father and her lover Rangiora against the British army invading the Waikato.

The Māori warrior character also sees a tonal shift within the novel through both Rangiora (Cedric’s childhood friend) and Te Huata (a conservative chief). Both of these characters represent the displaced world of Māori. Te Huata, as mentioned earlier, lives in the mountains and still (inaccurately, as discussed in regards to Verne) practices cannibalism, this sets him up as a conservative

antagonist. Compared to Te Huata, Rangiora is a more positive example of Māori as a young progressive. Calder highlights the bond between Cedric and Rangiora:

In the world of this novel, Cedric and his friend Rangiora, though different, though far from equal, can be imagined as brothers partly through a contrast between them and a group of degenerate natives over yonder in a zone of absolute otherness (Calder 101).

These characters both act as secular authorities (Rangiora being the scion of two aristocratic Māori lineages) and Te Huata as a chief in his own right. Yet they are also contrasts in the two different kinds of Māori worlds present in the novel, as argued earlier by Calder: the one that accepts some change on their terms and the ones that resist all change. However by the end of the novel, both are dead in order for the change in the land to be complete.

The chiefs represent secular authority, and for the land to be settled and the Pākehā pastoral paradise to be realised, their authority must be broken. As their authority is in part hereditary, their bloodlines must also end. Stoney and Boldrewood are disinterested with the fate of Māori leaders, they have only brief interactions, and even Verne is not interested in the fate of Māori sovereignty.

Where earlier novels glossed over this annihilation of tino rangatiratanga, Satchell depicts it as a tragic consequence of settlement. The death of Rangiora feeds into the lament for the Māori world that Satchell depicts. Rangiora even relates to Cedric the inevitability of war for the land:

“you and I sought to close the Greenstone Door with a bond of love—that will always remain to us in our honour; but it is in blood that the sealing will be done” (Satchell 370).

Much as the Māori maiden is representative of the land, here the two chiefs represent the mana whenua, the authority that comes from being of the land. For

Pākehā to take possession and Europeanise the space, not only must the representative of the land die, but also the Māori authority over the land.

Unlike nineteenth-century writers discussed in Chapter One, who treat tohunga as educated men without examining their associations with mysticism seriously, Satchell ascribes tangible powers to his tohunga. During a confrontation between Te Atua Mangu and a missionary, Te Atua Mangu briefly revives a dead tree “with all the vigour and luxuriance of its prime” (Satchell 101). This does grant some legitimacy to the character, but as Stafford and Williams comment Satchell falls into the stereotypes that I was unable to address in Chapter One. “He grants them power, but tends to see them as an evil and pernicious influence on Maori life” (248). Satchell’s depiction of the tohunga’s abilities has more in common with witchcraft and pacts with evil spirits than expressions of a different faith’s miracles. Goldie comments that some depictions of the indigene treat “mysticism as evil through denying the value of the mysticism both within and without the indigenous culture” (139). Satchell codes the associations between the tohunga and the Devil, thus legitimising the eventual erosion of Māori culture in favour of Christianity and British practices as part of the Empire.

While there were many varieties of tohunga, Satchell’s novel concerns itself principally with the practices of tohunga ahurewa and tohunga makutu. Unlike nineteenth-century authors, Satchell is also quick to clarify which tohunga he is denouncing in his novel:

I am not now speaking of the artists and men of learning in astronomy, agriculture, genealogy, and such like, who, through the terrible centuries of Maori history, had kept the lamp of knowledge burning undimmed, but of those followers of black magic with whom the name of tohunga is more popularly associated (Satchell 34).

His reference to men of learning acknowledges the educated role of all tohunga, but specifically refers to aspects of the tohunga ahurewa, while his comments of “black magic” refer to tohunga makutu. As Walker notes:

The highest grade of tohunga was the tohunga ahurewa, who was trained in a whare wananga that met in the winter months over a period of up to seven years. The curriculum included astronomy, genealogy, faith-healing and a large repertoire of chants and karakia (*Ka Whawhai Tonu Matou* 67).

This clarification does at least acknowledge the learned role of the tohunga class, though Satchell then conflates aspects of tohunga ahurewa with tohunga makutu. As tohunga ahurewa also learned to “command the elements and call up supernatural forces” (Walker, *Ka Whawhai Tonu Matou* 67). Unfortunately they therefore fall victim to the stereotype of indigenous sorcerers.

Satchell’s visible tohunga, particularly Te Atua Mangu, have more in common with tohunga makutu than tohunga ahurewa. These tohunga are the form most known in popular culture, their narrative role often reduced by writers like Satchell to problematic evil indigenous sorcerer stereotypes:

Tohunga makutu were the counterparts of tohunga ahurewa. They trained in a lower grade school known as the whare maire (house of black arts). They were often rejects from the whare wananga. Tohunga makutu were greatly feared for their ability to makutu, that is, cast spells to make people sick or kill them (Walker, *Ka Whawhai Tonu Matou* 67).

The associations with supernatural forces and spirits are treated as the sole purview of the tohunga makutu, and while Satchell does acknowledge the existence of other tohunga, he chooses not to have any present in the narrative. Instead he treats all associations with indigenous pre-contact belief systems in a

broad homogenised way, a distinct difference to the politically active and helpful healer Wiśniowski depicts in *Tikera*.

Satchell's broader depiction of Māori does not end with the pā and kāinga. The expanded depiction of Māori life also extends to the urbanised Māori of the nineteenth century, omitting Māori militiamen. While writers such as Boldrewood and Wiśniowski include some positive depictions of Māori in the city, such as Albert Warwick and Te Ti respectively, Satchell is wholly negative towards Māori who live in Auckland. "The men were boisterous and tricky, the women bold and worse. Their lack of pride angered me" (Satchell 149). Compared to the Māori of the Waikato with whom Cedric is familiar, the appearance of the Māori living in Auckland is a shock.

Satchell's patronising interpretation of Māori living in Auckland is unusual, as while some Māori might have undergone a social change due to the shift to urban living, it would not be true for all Māori living in Auckland. The ariki Te Wherowhero (later to be crowned the first Māori king, Potatau I) established a residence at Māngere as a sign of solidarity and protection to the people of Auckland during the Northern War at the time Cedric arrives in Auckland. "Te Wherowhero's residence in central Auckland was of immense symbolic significance" (O'Malley 48). The Māori of Auckland were not separated from traditional leadership, and by extension much of their way of life. Additionally, a Māori garrison was established following the Northern War.

They were required to train for twelve days of each year, and might be called out on active duty at any time. In return, an area of 486 acres at Māngere was marked out for a group of seventy-two families in all, to be headed by nine senior chiefs, among them Tamati Ngapora, who was to act as lay preacher to the group (O'Malley 50-1).

For all Māori in Auckland to have become “tricky men” and “bold women” is a false assertion that seems to lament a bygone people due to their interaction with Pākehā. To Satchell, the Māori have been corrupted by civilisation from their pure state in the Kāinga. The Town and, by extension, colonialism, are destructive to Māori. To Cedric, by forsaking the rural Māori world and embracing the urban Pākehā world, urban Māori no longer exist as what Cedric perceives as Māori.

This depiction of the urban Māori who have heavily interacted with Pākehā serves as Satchell’s explanation for the settler occupation of Māori land. The Māori who have become corrupted by the world of the Pākehā are no longer fit to manage their land, so it is up to the settlers to make proper use of it.

At a time of increased settlement and competition for land, this stance is employed to justify further land alienation, and works as an alternative to the dying race topos. Either Maori are not here – they have died out, and now exist only historically or mythically, so are not competitors for land – or they are here but must forfeit their land due to poor stewardship, yielding it up to the superior farming skills of the settler (Stafford and Williams 244).

However, while the justification that Satchell gives follows from other Maoriland writers, he is also very critical of expansion. The settlers are not bold expanders of Empire seen in Stoney or Boldrewood, his opinion is more in line with Wiśniowski. Satchell refers to many of the early New Zealand settlers as

mostly untrained and undisciplined white men; the majority of whom, moreover, had not yet developed any affection for the country, and merely desired to make money rapidly in order that they might leave it (203).

Tregarthen’s experience in Auckland is to show the supplanting of the old Aotearoa with New Zealand. The encroachment and Europeanisation of New

Zealand is something that will transpire and, though Satchell does not like the idea he is resigned to the fate of Māori at the hands of the settlers.

Where Boldrewood treated the Europeanisation of Māori as a positive effect of colonisation, Satchell's depiction of urban Māori is a continuation of his lament towards the people they once were. The omission of the Māori militiaman is due to this tone in the novel. Satchell wants to depict the Māori as a dying race who have fallen victim to the inevitable march of settlement, to have a Māori character who embraces and prospers from settlement would undermine his message.

Satchell's reassessment of character types is not limited to Māori, Pākehā characters are also altered in their depiction. One example is Cedric's relationship with the European lady character, Helenora Wylde. Cedric's courtship of Helenora differs greatly from Massinger, St Pierre and Schaeffer in Chapter One. At first glance, Wylde is similar to the other Pākehā ladies. Cedric notes to her:

“your eyes were blue—ah, how blue! and your hair a cloak of gold.

Neither of these colours had I so seen before; nor had I beheld a skin like yours, nor lips so dainty and so red” (Satchell 131).

The key difference between Cedric and characters like St Pierre from *Taranaki* or Massinger from *War to the Knife* is that Cedric is unfamiliar with these physical characteristics. Satchell makes use of the same tropes but with a different focal point. Before meeting Helenora, Cedric had not met a Pākehā lady before, especially not one with blonde hair and blue eyes. While Cedric would have encountered descriptions of idealised European beauty given that he is well read in European literature, he has no experience with such appearance. To him Helenora is the exotic. In Cedric's mind, therefore, there is twice as much reason to consider Helenora to be attractive. She is both an exotic beauty outside his

usual frame of experience and, according to the books he would have read, conforms to the standards of beauty he, as a Pākehā, is meant to laud. She is also unique in being a European lady who willingly ventures beyond the comforts of civilisation into the bush, as discussed later in the chapter.

Since *The Greenstone Door* is a coming of age narrative, the hero also requires a wise mentor to help in his development, Cedric finds this mentor in an imperial official. However, unlike officials from the earlier novels who were military officers, here the official is the politician Governor George Grey. Historically Grey is the Governor most emblematic of the New Zealand Wars, serving two terms during their height, the first from 1845-1853 and the second from 1861-1868. In this regard George Grey can be considered the ultimate representative of imperial power in nineteenth-century New Zealand.

Cedric's interaction with Grey is one of a mentor and pupil. The novel depicts Grey in a positive light, as Satchell describes him as possessing a "kindly manner and good nature" (Satchell 173). The relationship is not wholly one sided of teacher imparting knowledge to pupil since Cedric also assists Grey in his documenting of Māori waiata and customs (a real life hobby of Grey's). During the narrative's initial mid-1840s setting Grey is a major influence upon Cedric. "Of his goodness to me words are inadequate to tell" (Satchell 192). This is a very positive depiction of Grey, though it does show hints towards some of his less savoury reputation, particularly upon his return in the 1860s. When Cedric encounters Grey again he states: "I am the stormy petrel of the Empire. Where the clouds gather, there must you seek for Grey" (Satchell 288). This ominous statement hints at Grey's more controversial current status, the Governor dubbed by Ranginui Walker as "the hit-man of colonisation" (*Ka Whawhai Tonu Matou* 103). Despite these hints, however, Grey leaves the narrative as Satchell's kindly

mentor who helps in his courtship of Helenora. The implications is that while Grey has an awful job, it is a necessary one.

The changes in convention also apply to environment. Satchell's novel differs from other narratives as it does not begin in the Europeanised space, but deep within the New Zealand bush. This bush is not a place of absolute warfare (as shown by Stoney), and though he does express wonder at the place Cedric does not look at it as a tourist.

Around me, tangling its fronds above my head, is high fern, shutting out the hot rays of the March sun. There are strange creatures moving in the soil, whizzing past among the leaves, filling me with emotions at once fearful and delightful (Satchell 1).

This passage from the first page of the novel shows Cedric's relationship with the bush. It is a place of wonder with strange and interesting creatures, a place of nature both attractive and dangerous. Yet this freedom in the bush is tempered by the fact that his father had just been killed and Cedric has been hidden from the war party. The unconventional storyline does not end there, rather than be raised in a town by settlers, he is adopted by the Pākehā-Māori Purcell and raised in a kāinga or pā. This upbringing means that for Cedric, the European world is as different for him as the Māori world is for earlier protagonists. Furthermore, Cedric's status as the lost noble heir found in the woods and raised by a foster father unaware of his heritage is a common fairy tale trope, such as with the Germanic hero Sygurd, signifying more features of German Romance, incorporating elements of folktale and legend.

The bush is also akin to the woods of Europe where a person leaves reality and enters a fairy-tale space, where it is clear (particularly to the settler) that they do not belong. Satchell depicts the bush as a place of mystery and mortal danger,

in part from Cedric's near death at infancy. As Cedric grows older his perspective of the bush does not change. While out exploring with his childhood friend Rangiora and his foster sister Puhī-Huia he almost drowns: "I have been near to death before and since, but that stands out as the moment of my life when the Grim Spectre drew nearest" (Satchell 69). Once again, he needs rescuing from the perils of the bush. The first time by Purcell, and now by Rangiora. This rescue leads to the cementing of Cedric and Rangiora's friendship and the two making "the compact of the Tatau Pounamu" (Satchell 71). Following the compact between Cedric and Rangiora, the bush becomes a place of refuge for Cedric. Here he is able to retreat when the rest of the country does not allow a stance of neutrality.

For Cedric, his neutrality requires a retreat from the European and urban world. Following the execution of Purcell, Cedric dwells solely within the bush (only occasionally venturing back to his foster-mother Roma) "the wild birds alone knew my sleeping place" (Satchell 391). Cedric is broken by the events in the Waikato, unlike heroes of the nineteenth-century romances. Satchell shows that the war has a human cost, and even those who survive are affected. This altered state of being also changes the nature of the narrative from an adventure in the New Zealand Wars into a different example of the imperial romance, a quest. In this quest Helenora spends her time searching for Cedric in the bush. Calder comments:

Cedric becomes the feminised object of Helenora's quest, and her share in the novel's plot, if we were to represent it visually would be a line joining London to a distant colonial port, and from there following a river inland (Calder 104)

While the novel does not follow Helenora's quest in the same detail that Boldrewood presented Hypathia's story, the search for a man missing in the wilds of a colony is as Calder comments in the vein of Joseph Conrad's *Heart of Darkness* (1899). Given the popularity of the story, Satchell was likely familiar with the narrative. Cedric spends nine months roaming the wilds near Pirongia until he is finally found and pulled from his daze by Helenora.

This particular aspect of the narrative is where more of Satchell's influence from German Romanticism becomes apparent. As mentioned prior, the bush is a woodland fairy-tale space. Satchell's version of the bush draws upon many of the folk stories that Jacob and Wilhelm Grimm, as well as many others, had made widely available in the nineteenth century.

Romantic writers cultivated the appeal of the exotic, the bizarre, or the macabre; almost all showed a new interest in the irrational realms of dream and delirium or of folk superstition and legend (Baldick "Romanticism").

The folk tale of the young woman seeking her lost lover out in a hostile wilderness is a common motif, like in the story *East of the Sun, West of the Moon* recorded by Peter Christen Asbjørnsen and Jørgen Moe. Another feature is the association of the wild space of the woods with the folktale (of which the bush occupies a similar role). In his treatment of the bush Satchell draws upon a variety of literary traditions from the nineteenth century that still held sway in the early twentieth century.

The conclusion of the search is where the story ends: "The day was well advanced as hand in hand we turned our backs on Pirongia and followed the trail for home through the golden lights and leafy shadows of the bush" (Satchell 398). The ending of the novel is left ambiguous. Satchell does not state whether

Helenora and Cedric return to Auckland or remain in the bush away from the forces that require Cedric to choose a side. While they turn for home and start travelling in that direction there is no evidence to say whether or not they return.

Unlike nineteenth-century traveller protagonists, there is no clarity as to whether Cedric leaves the colony, the novel concluding with his reunion with Helenora near Pirongia. He is a polar opposite to Boldrewood's Roland Massinger who is not emotionally invested in Aotearoa and only appeared to stay due to his attraction to Erena. While both characters are of noble birth, have close ties abroad, and become heavily involved in conflict, they are highly contrasted. Cedric is not a fighter and has close and enduring ties with the Māori world, Massinger fights and decides to leave. Where Massinger has a clearly defined start and end in the heart of Empire, there is a greater ambiguity in Cedric's fate as he begins and ends his story in the bush.

Cedric is caught between the two worlds, unable to side with either, and in the end that is where the novel leaves him, in a liminal space with no certainty to his fate. Cedric remarks "the war is at an end" (Satchell 398). His statement is not totally false, the Battle of Ōrākau leads to the final erasure of all of the novel's Māori characters and the overwhelming of the novel's Māori spaces by Pākehā. This erasure of Māori authority follows a similar style to the American frontier, where the authority of First Nations peoples was stolen by incoming settlers. At the close of the novel Satchell uses his metaphor for lasting peace to apply only between Cedric and Helenora: "And so at last for us two the Greenstone Door was closed" (Satchell 398). The two have made a compact to have their peace. However, while their everlasting peace has emerged, it came at the annihilation of Satchell's characters tied to te ao Māori. The happy ending is only for the Pākehā characters. Yet, while Cedric believes the conflict in the Waikato has ceased,

historically, the Kīngitanga still stand as a movement and would remain apart from Government control until 1881.

The closing of the door in a wholly Pākehā space implies the European way was the only way forward and that Māori culture could only survive in the presence of the European settler. However, this dominance over the land does not mean a true connection to the land. While Cedric and Helenora turn their backs on Pirongia, leaving the Māori world behind, they are still in a liminal space outside of Pākehā civilisation, they have not returned to the world of settlement. They end the story in the bush and though they are on the trail home there is no clarity as to where “home” is situated and no guarantee that they will get there (Satchell 398). This ambiguity shows Satchell’s own unease with the settlement of New Zealand. Despite Cedric’s words of the war ending, the characters’ place in the bush at the end of the narrative implies that the story of the New Zealand Wars is not over.

Olga Stringfellow Feminises the Narrative

Despite the reassessment of genre conventions, Satchell’s story is still a male-focused narrative. In contrast, Olga Stringfellow provides a settler heroine rather than a settler hero. As mentioned earlier, the mid-twentieth century showed a greater movement away from the earlier romances, and Olga Stringfellow constructs one of the most radical departures. Rather than focus on the heroic endeavours of a man proving himself against the dangers of the environment and war, she focuses principally on the oft-neglected European lady.

The eponymous protagonist, Mary Bravender, is very different from typical representations of European ladies in New Zealand Wars novels. In certain respects Bravender is like Lady Glenarven — Scottish and genteel — but that is where the comparisons cease. Bravender, unlike all other European ladies in the

texts examined, does several remarkable things in a New Zealand Wars novel. She journeys to Aotearoa from abroad following the death of her aunt, and finds herself embroiled in a complicated love triangle between a European man and a man of Māori and American descent. In many respects, she is like the male traveller character of the nineteenth century, though she marries early in the story (rather than as a conclusion to the story like her male counterpart). Unlike the travellers, Bravender also becomes a parent. This occurs on two occasions, the first to her initial husband the farmer Edward Grey (no relation to Governor George Grey), and the second to her next husband the shipping magnate Chase Pendennis.

This novel makes a truly radical departure from earlier texts. Many of the nineteenth-century texts, particularly Boldrewood's novel, were rich in rhetoric surrounding cultural anxieties about the body of the European woman being possessed by the racial other. An example of this anxiety is in Verne's *Among the Cannibals* when Lady Glenarven pleads with her husband to kill her rather than face "a fate worse than death": "neither Mary Grant nor I must fall alive into the hands of these savages!" (Verne 93). *Mary Bravender*, however, is positive in its depiction of a Pākehā woman marrying and having a child with a man of Māori descent: "I found my chief reaction to be one of delight. Now, I felt, I was more nearly one with my husband's people" (Stringfellow 306). Stringfellow's comfort with a European woman marrying and carrying the child of a Māori man is significant as it challenges miscegenistic perceptions. She overturns the double standard of intermarriage and the anxieties over these mixed unions that existed in the nineteenth-century texts and which continued to exert a cultural and social influence well into the twentieth century.

As a female protagonist in the Whanganui, Mary Bravender is a precursor to the more well-known Sarah O'Brien, the Irish protagonist of the film *River Queen* (2005). Both are of Celtic ancestry, are mothers, and are caught in love triangles with Māori and Pākehā suitors. Both characters are also separated from family ties. Lastly, both are swept up in conflicts around the Whanganui River. However, Bravender is in many ways more integrated into the Maori community than her cinematic counterpart, which does not come at the cost of ongoing relationships with Pākehā. Sarah is not shown as speaking Māori, a skill that Mary acquires. Nor does Sarah show any friendship or comradeship with other women, while Mary has several female Pākehā friends, such as Mrs. Waddell and Mrs. Bullen, in addition to her close Māori friend Kararaina.

Another difference between the Mary and Sarah is significant level of character development Bravender undergoes. Mary arrives in Aotearoa at the start of the character and her initial view of Māori is loaded with racial bigotry, partly from her first husband's influence: "Mr. Grey says they all live like animals, even the chiefs, in thatched huts with no furnishing but roughly-woven mats" (Stringfellow 28). Over the course of the narrative, however, Bravender comes to understand Aotearoa New Zealand much better and her character development drives the story almost as much as the New Zealand Wars themselves. Like *The Greenstone Door*, the novel has characteristics of a *bildungsroman*. It shows the development and growth of Mary in becoming a mother and learning about her new home, particularly the people in New Zealand. While the time covered is much shorter than Cedric's own story, Mary Bravender shows as much development as Cedric Tregarthen over the course of the narrative.

Part of this development is from Mary's friendship with Kararaina, Pendennis' cousin and Mary's highly competent companion. Kararaina acts as

Mary's guide and support throughout the novel, actively protecting her from harm and working as a healer. Kararaina initially appears as a stereotype speaking in pidgin "You plenty good, by'm'by" (Stringfellow 112). However, Kararaina's command of English improves over the course of the novel, and she becomes more eloquent: "Penetena would not like you to walk by the harbour" (274). This development in fluency is only partly due to her friendship with Mary, as Kararaina's fiancée Matiu also helps with her speech. The development of the female characters and their friendship stands in a strong contrast to earlier depictions of both Māori and Pākehā women in the New Zealand Wars romances.

This change in protagonist from male to female significantly alters the narrative function and dynamic between the European lady and Māori maiden. Both care for one another during illness and injury, and Kararaina provides Mary with support for courting Pendennis. Mary even declares to Kararaina: "You have become a sister to me and I cannot think of a life where you are not there" (Stringfellow 249). Unlike Wiśniowski's *Arabella* and Tikera or Boldrewood's *Erena* and *Hypathia*, these women are not rivals but close, supportive friends.

Bravender's relationship with Kararaina's cousin Chase Pendennis is a radical departure from both previous narratives and prevailing nineteenth- and early twentieth-century attitudes. Relationships between Pākehā women and Māori men did not receive the same level of acceptance as Pākehā men and Māori women. Annabel Cooper states, "instances of European women marrying Māori were rare, and the women were commonly regarded as having been degraded by such a marriage" (Cooper 238). Pendennis' mixed heritage and comparatively fair skin (particularly compared to his cousin Kararaina and his son) would mitigate some of the discrimination, as well as his status as a wealthy shipping magnate. Even

so, the relationship is a romanticised ideal rather than an accurate depiction of reality in 1860s Aotearoa.

Stringfellow's depiction of a loving, happy, and enduring relationship between a Māori man and European woman is radical, but not unprecedented in the annals of New Zealand literature. As Chapter One highlighted, early New Zealand fiction is rich in relationships between Māori women and European men, but the inverse is rare and, as is the case with Eric Baume's *Half-Caste* 1933, most instances of Māori women marrying European men end either in disaster or full integration into a European world. Like Jean Devanny's *Lenore Divine* (1926) — which features a relationship between the title character and Kowhatu Ngatoro — Stringfellow challenges prevailing “European bigotry and fears of miscegenation” (Moffat “Introduction” xxxvii).

Bravender's interactions with other Māori characters and her romance with the Māori-American Chase Pendennis shows a process of indigenisation much like her earlier male counterparts. The male traveller like Boldrewood's Massinger acquires a form of indigenization through his relationship with Māori woman Erena, although in the end Massinger rejects Aotearoa after Erena's death. Bravender's female traveller finds the same indigenization with Pendennis, though one that is more successful as she remains in New Zealand. “The new indigenous incubus, like the old succubus, has the power to confer indigenization” (Goldie 80). In many narratives the dynamics of gender are subsumed by the dynamics of race. As Goldie argues:

The female white invader may become an invadee in terms of the sexual metaphor, but the balance of power remains a racial one. These male indigenes are more indigene than male in the economies of the texts (81).

To follow Goldie's examination of the female heroine's position, her indigenisation, like her male counterpart's is a means towards the acquisition of the land. There is a common fictional tendency for characters of Celtic heritage (such as Scottish) to indigenise easily. Goldie argues that "the process of indigenization is easier for the Celts, because of their own association with an unstructured free nature" (27). This argument can be made for Mary Bravender. Yet the character development of Bravender complicates this easy explanation. The crucial point that breaks from the easy indigenisation leading to acquisition of the land is Bravender's engagement with the Māori world. The level of engagement with te ao Māori on Bravender's part increases rather than decreases over the course of the narrative.

A significant part of Bravender's character development is her learning of te reo Māori from Kararaina. This novel was written at a time when the Māori language was not widely accepted in Pākehā society, and many years before the language revival efforts gained wide spread support. For Stringfellow to include lines of untranslated te reo is remarkable. For the character to learn te reo is even more impressive. Though the words are occasionally translated for the reader's benefit, there are many segments of dialogue throughout the novel that are untranslated, to show Mary's lack of knowledge. On hearing of Mary's first son's death, Kararaina responds without translation: "Te potiki a te tokuta a Mihi Watera?"⁶ (Stringfellow 169). Other lines of dialogue are also written entirely in te reo prior to Mary fully learning the language showcasing her lack of familiarity with the language. Though as her fluency develops, more of the language is translated. The last words of the novel (though translated into English) from Mary to Chase are indicative of this push towards te reo. "My beloved,' I began,

⁶ The baby drowned?

speaking softly in Māori. ‘There is a something I would tell you’” (Stringfellow 384). The end passage is clearly indicative of Mary as a second language learner. The use of “a something” shows that Mary is still learning the language, though she has come a long way from repeating her first husband’s bigotry. Stringfellow presents the learning of Māori as an admirable endeavour to integrate in Aotearoa, a radical concept as during the 1950s and 1960s the language was still neglected and use of it was denigrated by the Pākehā establishment.

The New Zealand Wars are an acknowledged reality in *Mary Bravender*. The titular character is present for (though does not participate in) two significant events in the mid-1860s during the government’s conflict with Pai Mārire dissidents. The first is the battle at Moutoa Island in the Whanganui, and the second is during Kereopa Te Rau’s killing of Carl Völkner at Opotiki. Mary is a direct witness to both of these instances in the New Zealand Wars and acts as such as she provides commentary on the conflict. These comments include the revelation that leaders such as Kereopa Te Rau were not acting according to the wishes of the prophet Te Ua Haumene. Two other characters directly involved in the New Zealand Wars are Matiu and Chase Pendennis. Both are allied with the government but are not official members of the colonial militia. Instead they are Te Arawa allies. Due to the alliance many Te Arawa had with the New Zealand government, this allows Stringfellow to avoid any uncertainty regarding Chase or Matiu’s loyalty to the Crown. At the same time, it indicates that Chase, despite having an American father, identifies equally (or more favourably) as Māori.

Stringfellow’s engagement with the New Zealand Wars is not just remarkable in terms of her interrogation and reworking of the core romance tropes, but also with the historicity of the work. In contrast to Mona Tracy, Stringfellow has done her research. While under attack by extremist followers of

Pai Mārire in Whanganui, Kararaina informs Bravender that the Māori resisting government control have some strong motives and that the Pākehā soldiers are not blameless: “*Pakeha* do bad things at Waitara, do bad things at Rangiaowhia” (172). Likewise, while Stringfellow depicts the followers of Pai Mārire, like Wiśniowski, she is far more accurate. Stringfellow is clear in the novel that Te Ua Haumēne was a man of peace whose disciples at times perverted his teachings to suit their own agendas. Stringfellow states in the Author’s Note: “as the prophet’s apostles travelled across the country to spread his gospel many of them acted in direct defiance of his peaceful intentions” (Stringfellow 8). The greater degree of historical accuracy is understandable, Sinclair’s *Origin of the Maori Wars* (1957) was published two years before *Mary Bravender*.

The principle Pai Mārire antagonist is the historical Kereopa Te Rau though he does not truly enter the narrative until much later. Much like his appearance in *War to the Knife*, Te Rau’s motives are occluded with only his ties with Pai Marire evident. Despite the light touch with the depiction of Te Rau, the novel does not ignore negative actions by the settlers or the army during the New Zealand Wars. Kararaina’s words on negative actions by soldiers at Rangiaowhia and the unethical land grab at Waitara differ from earlier narratives. The novel’s focus on anti government Māori fighting government allied Māori acknowledges the tragedy and complexity of internecine fighting that characterises civil wars. Mary remarks the parallels of when “the Clan Chattan and the Clan fought each other to the death in a battle for the honour of their clans” (Stringfellow 219). This is particularly obvious in the Whanganui where tribes up river had been friends and neighbours with tribes down river, often related to one another and now on opposite sides of a conflict. She goes on to reflect that “Moutoa, I knew in that moment, would be just such a tragedy” (Stringfellow 219). Stringfellow

acknowledges the complexities of war and the position many Māori found themselves in during the conflict. In contrast to previous writers she presented the pain of relatives forced into conflict with one another, while contextualising from a Scottish perspective.

Stringfellow presents a narrative unlike previous texts, particularly in terms of her treatment of women. She provides individuated representation of both Māori and Pākehā women. These women are active throughout the narrative. While at the start of the novel both races seem to suffer from a recycling of familiar stereotypes—Mary's as a racially bigoted colonial woman and Kararaina as an indigenous woman—these stereotypes are increasingly rejected as the characters grow and learn, becoming well rounded and complex. Mary overcomes her fears and prejudices, and learns empathy and understanding as a result of the pain she suffers at the hands of an abusive husband and the loss of her first child. She comes to understand both *te reo Māori* and *te ao Māori*, even expressing joy at her second child's dark complexion.

Kararaina learns English, building from communicating in pidgin to a facility with language befitting a rangatira. She also defies the nineteenth-century convention by being solely enamoured with her Māori fiancée Matiu, showing disinterest in all other men. What Stringfellow accomplishes is remarkable for her time and no other novel examined in this thesis achieves the degree of representation for women that Stringfellow managed in the late 1950s. The focus on relationships and internal growth means that actual combat features little in Stringfellow's novel, the next author, however, made combat the central focus of his representations.

Errol Braithwaite Sides with Settlement against Empire

While depictions of battle had a reduced role in the novels by Satchell and Stringfellow, with Braithwaite a focused engagement with the war itself returns. Indeed, the conflict is much more central to Braithwaite's narratives than in any preceding text. One of Braithwaite's most striking contributions to the New Zealand Wars novel is his construction of the novel trilogy. Previous novels either looked at one single aspect of the conflict (such as *Stoney*, Satchell and Tracy), or meshed a bunch of disparate conflicts together (such as *Wiśniowski* and *Boldrewood*). Compartmentalising the series into a trilogy allows each novel to focus on a different period of the New Zealand Wars in detail, and enables the author to better engage with the history while still examining the wider conflict. This method would later be replicated by Maurice Shadbolt in the 1980s and early 1990s.

Errol Braithwaite's trilogy of novels is the first series to solely focus on the New Zealand Wars. Unlike Shadbolt, however, Braithwaite's trilogy is a tighter construction focusing on his fictional mounted militia unit, the eponymous Flying Fish, rather than a loose array of novels tied mostly by history. Writing in the 1960s, Braithwaite enacts his own changes from the romance conventions, though unlike Stringfellow he is less concerned with unheard voices and representation, and more focused on action. This trilogy depicts three major theatres of the New Zealand Wars. It commences in 1861 Taranaki, with *The Flying Fish* (1964), follows on to the Waikato Invasion, in particular the Pāterangi line and Rangiaowhia in *The Needle's Eye* (1965), and finally turns to Taranaki and Whanganui for *The Evil Day* (1967). While many of the New Zealand Wars romance elements persist, Braithwaite's novels, like *Mary Bravender* also represents a major turning point with significant changes to the formula.

Braithwaite's settler hero does not just move around the perimeters of the conflict, he actively grabs a rifle and joins the fighting whole heartedly. The novels place greater attention on the fighting ability of settler men and why they are better inheritors of the land than the European soldiers. Braithwaite's novels are less concerned with the New Zealand Wars as a shared history and more as a foundation for settler identity.

The style of Braithwaite's work most resembles Stoney's *Taranaki: A Tale of War*. A fictional settler character gets caught up in the New Zealand Wars and fights for the defence of the colony. He has a European lady love interest who is of little contribution to the narrative and whose main function is to emphasise the protagonist's masculinity. Although the novels occasionally depict Māori characters, until *The Evil Day* almost all are antagonists. Steer argues:

The majority of Maori combatants are depicted as happy-go-lucky characters innately at home in the landscape, who are easily misled by their megalomaniac chiefs, thus displacing the question of unjustified dispossession onto the terrain of individual criminality (121).

Yet these Māori characters do have greater visibility than in Stoney's *Taranaki*. In further contrast to Stoney, Braithwaite makes greater use of fictional characters in his representations of the New Zealand Wars. Historical figures get the occasional name drop and cameo but the attention is predominantly on characters of Braithwaite's invention who aid his myth-building of settler bravery and legitimacy.

Braithwaite's war novels present a mythos of dashing settler heroes, the ideal Pākehā ancestors that their 1960s descendants could be proud of, and these novels let his readers share in the mythologised adventures. This is in line with Steer's assessment of the 1960s novels:

In this environment, Pakeha are strongly differentiated from British characters and are shown to be morally and physically superior to them, especially by way of contrast between colonial and imperial soldiers (Steer 121).

The superiority to British soldiers is shown from the first novel in the series.

Williams makes a clear point between how the army trains soldiers and how his militia will train: “Colonel Gold and the Regulars have fought the Maori...But I, Des Voeux, have fought *with* the Maori” (Braithwaite, *The Flying Fish* 227).

Because Williams and his militia unit use Maori tactics and unorthodox warfare they are more successful than those constrained by the conventional methods used by the British Army.

Braithwaite rejects the aristocratic European traveller hero in favour of a farmer settler. This settler character is one who has made his life in New Zealand and is not simply passing through, much in the same vein as Satchell’s protagonist Cedric Tregarthen sans the aristocratic heritage. Unlike Tregarthen, however, the character takes a very active role in the conflict. The reason for the change is that, like Satchell, Braithwaite is forming a distinctly New Zealand character identity. Braithwaite, however, does not share Satchell’s pacifist ideas and so his character still adheres to the formula of testing and proving his masculinity in the arena of war as depicted by writers like Stoney, Boldrewood, and Tracy.

There is a shift in protagonist between the three novels, though to a lesser extent than Shadbolt’s trilogy. In *The Flying Fish* the protagonist is Phipps, a widowed farmer who joins the militia in Taranaki. The subsequent novels have his commanding officer Hugh Williams as the protagonist instead. The novels shift from following a simple settler caught up in the New Zealand Wars to

following an exaggerated figure who out von Tempsky's von Tempsky, particularly as Williams does not get killed.

The reason for this character shift is that Braithwaite, like Tracy and Satchell, depicts a friendship caught on opposite sides of the conflict. Phipps (the protagonist of *The Flying Fish*) and Matiu, however, face a more dire situation than Ron and Hori. Phipps is unable to sway his friend to turn against his own people during the war in Taranaki. Phipps pleads: "Turn your back, Matiu, and I'll turn mine. We never saw each other" (Braithwaite, *The Flying Fish* 361). Yet Matiu's response is "My duty is to kill you, yours is to kill me...We are not the High Chiefs. Theirs to be wise or foolish Whipiti. Yours and mine to be brave" (Braithwaite, *The Flying Fish* 361). Their inability to resolve their differences in the conflict culminates in both dying during the war. Braithwaite's first novel shows a dramatic end to his protagonist, which is why it is the novel's hero, Hugh Williams, who takes over the role of protagonist in *The Needle's Eye* and *Evil Day*.

Like von Tempsky, Williams leads a mobile unit of irregulars and fights for acclaim. Yet in spite of his foreign mercenary inspiration and his Welsh name, Williams' sole identity is as a New Zealander. This choice of identification is unsurprising given Chapter One's discussion of the homogenisation of Pākehā identity. Williams' New Zealand settler identity demonstrates parallels with the historic militia Captain Gilbert Mair. In this fashion Williams can also be considered a precursor to Lieutenant Scott, the militia leader from Geoff Murphy's film *Utū* (1983). Within the trilogy the only cultural difference permitted for a settler is if they are Scottish. Apart from that, they are all New Zealanders with little variation. Braithwaite uses the New Zealand Wars as a

means of fostering a singular Pākehā New Zealand identity, wholly divorced from Britain.

Williams is depicted with a different form of the pseudo indigenisation shown with nineteenth-century romance protagonists such as Massinger, and has some further parallels to Cedric Tregarthen. Williams is effective at fighting Māori as he grew up in and was adopted by a Māori tribe: “I’m a member of the Ngati-Toa” (Braithwaite, *The Flying Fish* 104). This upbringing among Māori, however, does not give Williams the same sentiments as Tregarthen. Rather than be caught between two worlds and abstain from fighting, Williams rejects the world of his upbringing, preferring to identify by the colour of his skin. He reassures his friend Des Voeux with the claim “I’m as white as you are” (Braithwaite, *The Flying Fish* 203). The connection to Ngāti Toa does not instil Williams with any question regarding the morality of the conflict, it just makes him a more effective fighter. Braithwaite does not want to inject any moral ambiguity into the conflict over the land. The only time Williams shows any kind of conscience is with the methods he ends up utilising.

As the series continues, Williams employs the increasingly brutal methods in order to achieve victory: “I’m not playing by any set of rules. I’m not playing at all. This is a bad, dangerous state of affairs and I intend to do everything in my power to end it” (Braithwaite, *The Evil Day* 76). His tactics by the third novel have developed into a ruthlessness that echoes the Vietnam War, which New Zealand joined three years prior to the *The Evil Day*’s publication. Annabel Cooper comments that several novels written in the 1960s were inspired by the “background of the increasing ferocity of colonial wars in Indochina” (16). In *The Evil Day* Williams strings up and hangs chiefs while burning their cultivations and homes. He threatens to kill children if he is not told the location of Riwha

Titokowaru. He describes war as a fire: “It has to be stopped by sheer savagery, so that it burns itself out” (Braithwaite, *The Evil Day* 110). Even so, this acknowledgement of the horrors of war is only exhibited in the third novel. *The Flying Fish* is glowing in its depiction of noble settlers. Meanwhile, *The Needle’s Eye* avoids any mention of Colonel Marmaduke’s forces at Rangiaowhia, despite the narrative taking place in the neighbouring settlement of Harini.

Potentially the Vietnam War pushed representations of the New Zealand Wars to confront the controversial actions of the army, colonial government and militia. Stringfellow makes allusions to infamous actions by the militia in *Mary Bravender*, but Braithwaite is blatant in *The Evil Day*. The novel also draws from another story, *Heart of Darkness*, which was adapted into the Vietnam War film *Apocalypse Now* (1979). Cooper comments that *The Evil Day* evokes Conrad’s novel “with its rendition of a ‘horror emanating from violent colonial encounter and attaching to a white man gone native’” (236). A similar depiction of savagery by soldiers appears in the film *Utu* sixteen years later. The only difference with Braithwaite’s savagery is that it is performed by the novel’s protagonist whose actions are presented as being justified in the narrative. Kepa reassures Williams: “What you did was foul, perhaps, but if so, so was the thing it was aimed at” (Braithwaite, *The Evil Day* 371).

The third novel of the trilogy marks a shift, not just in Williams but the dynamic of the novel. The time period skips from 1864 to 1869, the arena of war also returns to Taranaki. Unlike the first novel, however, the battles against Riwha Titokowaru are solely in the hands of militia and allied Maori. The desire to show settler prowess against the incompetence of Empire is no longer possible due to the novel’s setting of 1868-1869, as the British Army withdrew from Aotearoa in 1867. *Evil Day* was written prior to the revisions of the conflict.

The form of representation is quite different from later depictions such as *Monday's Warriors* (1990) and *River Queen* (2005). Braithwaite depicts Titokowaru as a fanatical madman. After some of his supporters are raided he became more and more pitiable, for when he snarled at [his followers] and showed his teeth like an old dog, they were frightened, but he himself was hurt, and he would creep back to the fire in his *whare* and withdraw into himself, sitting for hours wrapped in a blanket of self-recrimination (Braithwaite, *The Evil Day* 136).

This representation is of a rabid and dangerous foe, but one who is quite different from the confident and tactically inspired Riwha Titokowaru. This representation of Titokowaru is to serve as a counterpart to Williams. Both are fanatical in the pursuit of one another. Williams is built up as the only military leader who Titokowaru fears and becomes a mythologised nemesis for Titokowaru, the Māori leader who historically embarrassed and outwitted multiple militia officers during his war. The novel even goes so far as to give Williams the credit for instigating the desertion of much of Titokowaru's support at Tauranga Ika.

Riwha Titokowaru had not yet received the revising of his history, so much of the history published about him was slanted or downplayed his significance to keep his memory at bay. Braithwaite tries a different tactic, he constructs an imaginary friend to battle the government's colonial bogeyman. The reconstruction of history for Titokowaru had grounding in the available history, however Braithwaite borders on denigration in how he discusses Pai Mārire.

Braithwaite's depiction of Pai Mārire is a surprise. Compared to the thoughtful and considered depiction of the faith and Te Ua Haumene presented by Olga Stringfellow, Braithwaite resorts to the stereotypes of the nineteenth century. The prophet Haumene is described as being "half-demented" and the implication

is that the Pai Mārire was never non-violent (Braithwaite, *The Evil Day* 83). Māori who convert to Pai Mārire are similarly treated with disdain, even by other Māori characters. One Māori youth says of the converts that it is “a bad thing, and very bad luck, to mock the mad” (Braithwaite, *The Evil Day* 59). For Braithwaite, Pai Mārire is a kind of cult where gullible Māori have been duped into following a mad man into war. The contrast to Stringfellow is marked, as her own novel showed a clear understanding of the Pai Mārire movement and how its teachings were twisted. For Braithwaite to depict the religion in such a manner is a deliberate choice and a misrepresentation of how the religion had been acknowledged by James Cowan and Keith Sinclair.

In general Braithwaite’s relationship with history is quite mixed. Aspects of history are well researched, such as the factions involved in Taranaki. Braithwaite even includes the presence of Ngāti Maniapoto and names Wiremu Kingi accurately as the paramount Atiawa chief. Yet Braithwaite deliberately avoids controversial aspects of history, such as his novel *The Needle’s Eye* which takes place in the settlement of Hairini in 1864, directly adjacent to Rangiaowhia, yet the novel omits the massacre at Rangiaowhia. Braithwaite is not as concerned with a clear representation of history as with development of settler identity through the New Zealand Wars.

Braithwaite differs from Stringfellow and Satchell as he strips back many of the romance conventions in his novels. Many of the nineteenth-century characters are left on the cutting room floor, and plot elements have also been cut out to orientate the focus on war in detail (though not so much detail as to harm the image of heroic settlers that he wishes to present). He has extricated the Māori maiden, the tohunga, the Pākehā-Māori, the genteel background of the traveller, and downplayed the European lady from her already marginal role. He is more

attentive to historical record than Tracey, but only to set up his settler heroes. When it comes to depicting his antagonists, Braithwaite shows far less interest in accuracy.

Due to his sole focus on warfare, Braithwaite also neglects women in his novels. The European ladies are throwbacks to the nineteenth century, passive characters whose roles are to remain back in the town and receive their dashing man on return. In *The Flying Fish*, Rachel Calthorpe does little apart from look into Phipps' background as a possible suitor while in *The Needle's Eye* and *The Evil Day*, Emmeline's role is to wait for Williams to return from war. Her only expansion of role in *The Evil Day* is that she is now Williams' wife and the mother of his child waiting, rather than a love interest. The only significant depiction of a Māori woman is the beautiful Ruihi, whose only role in *The Evil Day* is to seduce Titokowaru. Satchell and Stringfellow were careful and considered in how they showed the two sides of the conflict, while Stringfellow made progress in the representation of nineteenth-century women in Aotearoa. In contrast, for Braithwaite the mythology of the settler hero is more important than a balanced representation of the conflict.

Conclusion

Of the three authors considered in detail in this chapter, Satchell lays the groundwork towards what would eventually become the post-colonial novel following the 1970s and the crucial wave of revisionist history and Māori activism. Although Satchell's thinking was shaped by contemporary ideas about the fatal impact of colonisation on Māori, he gives Māori a genuine voice in his novel and is scathing of many aspects of European land hunger and greed. Of all the authors considered in this thesis, Satchell is the most critical of war and the damage it does to both victors and victims and his novel can be read as a great lament for the tragic results of settlement and the inevitability of war as a result of

imperialism. What Stringfellow achieves in 1959 is the development of a wholly different voice and style to the New Zealand Wars, enabling a heroine to properly take centre stage, rather than be reduced to serving as either a damsel in distress at best or a glorified ornament at worst. Stringfellow plays with the style of the romance more than Satchell and makes heavy use of its conventions, but she presents a new paradigm for the European lady and the Māori maiden. Her depiction of Pai Mārire shows that the New Zealand Wars were not always two sided, but that proponents of peaceful resistance can also disagree with those advocating armed resistance. Stringfellow also complicates the questions of race and racial interaction, depicting the romance between Mary and Pendennis as wholly positive. These two authors are indicative of the tonal shifts and changing focus, highlighting women and conscientious objection to the conflict.

Errol Braithwaite's *Flying Fish Trilogy* made significant alterations to the formula and style of the New Zealand Wars novel (to a greater extent than Satchell and Stringfellow), expanding the heroic home-grown settler to completely supplant the traveller hero from elsewhere. Braithwaite also places more focus on specific military engagements: Taranaki in *The Flying Fish*, the Waikato Invasion in *The Needle's Eye*, and Titokowaru's War in *The Evil Day*. Yet Braithwaite still keeps the New Zealand Wars romance conventions recognisable, particularly with his depiction of Māori antagonists and European ladies. Braithwaite's main contribution to the genre is the construction of the trilogy, and his settler heroes who are indicative of a period of burgeoning nationalism. As the next chapter will demonstrate the influence of the New Zealand Wars romance persisted throughout the twentieth century into Maurice Shadbolt's *New Zealand Wars Trilogy*.

Chapter Three: The New Zealand Wars Get Postcolonial

This chapter will discuss Maurice Shadbolt's *New Zealand Wars Trilogy* (1986, 1990, 1993) alongside Witi Ihimaera's *The Matriarch* (1986) and *Sleeps Standing Moetū* (2017), and compare how they represent the New Zealand Wars and the Land Wars. Of all the novels I discuss in this thesis, these two authors have received the most critical attention, particularly their novels *The Matriarch* and *Season of the Jew*, the first volume of *The New Zealand Wars Trilogy*. In essence, this chapter compares the New Zealand Wars novel with what I term the Land Wars novel. To reiterate my definitions of the New Zealand Wars and the Land Wars: what I call the New Zealand Wars relates to the period from 1843 to 1881, while the Land Wars are the wider ongoing struggle over the land in Aotearoa encompassing the political, legal, social, as well as military struggle. With these definitions in mind, the New Zealand Wars novel is one which engages solely within the space of the conflict and leaves it in the past, while the Land Wars novel projects these ideas into the present.

My analysis of Shadbolt adds to the current conversation regarding his work and expands upon points that I feel require further analysis. I draw, in particular, on several of the points raised by Nelson Wattie in "The New Zealand Land Wars in the Novels by Shadbolt and Ihimaera" and Ralph Crane's scholarship in his article "Tickling History: Maurice Shadbolt and the New Zealand Wars" and his edited collection of essays *Ending the Silences: Critical Essays on the Works of Maurice Shadbolt* (1995). Both scholars provide analysis of Shadbolt as part of the historical romance tradition of Sir Walter Scott, particularly his use of the "neutral protagonist." Wattie and Crane compare Shadbolt's novels to *The Greenstone Door*, principally in terms of the protagonist and this method can be expanded upon.

Wattie and Crane indicate that *The Greenstone Door* is written in the style of the historical romance, which Shadbolt also draws upon in his novels. I aim to also compare *The New Zealand Wars Trilogy* to other New Zealand Wars romances such as *War to the Knife*. This comparison to the historical romances is particularly apparent with Shadbolt's treatment of Māori women and the presence of stereotypes of indigenous savagery in his depiction of allied Māori (ideas which are mentioned by Crane or Wattie but have scope for expansion).

Crane also comments on Shadbolt's engagement with history, a point also examined by Ken Arvidson and Lawrence Jones. Of the three, Crane examines the trilogy, Jones the entire body of Shadbolt's literary work, while Arvidson only two chapters from *Season of the Jew*. These differing approaches provide a range of insights into Shadbolt's writing. Drawing on this scholarship and comparing Shadbolt to his predecessors, I look to demonstrate his transition from the conventions of earlier New Zealand Wars fiction to the post-colonial revisions of the period. While Shadbolt does not fully embrace change in historical perspectives of the conflict he gives hints of post-coloniality, metafictionality, and postmodernism. In this manner he is less engaged with the critical angle that his contemporary Ihimaera presents. Rather than confront history, Ralph Crane argues that Shadbolt "tickles history" ("Tickling History" 69).

Another aspect of Shadbolt that I explore is his use of historical figures which often fill the roles of stock characters in the New Zealand Wars romances. While historical figures only held minor roles in the early romances, Shadbolt makes more detailed use of them. Various people from the nineteenth century appear in a greater number and are given a far more prominent place in the narrative than previously. I examine the representation of the significant figures within the different narratives, in particular Te Kooti Arikirangi Te Turuki, Riwha Titokowaru,

and Gustavus von Tempsky. I also discuss depictions of other prominent people, such as George Stoddard Whitmore, Hone Heke, and Tāmāti Wāka Nene. My argument is that the construction of these characters is indicative of Shadbolt's uneven use of historical sources and demonstrate his belief that history should be subject to narrative. Another key point about Shadbolt is contextualising him within writing about the New Zealand Wars. Philip Steer's article "History (Never) Repeats" demonstrates how Shadbolt's novels fit into the scope of New Zealand Wars novels. Steer places Shadbolt's trilogy within the last cluster of New Zealand wars novels (1982-1993) placing him at the end of a long tradition, which informs my comparison to earlier novels of the nineteenth and twentieth century.

My analysis of *The Matriarch* and *Sleeps Standing Moetū* will examine how Ihimaera represents a moment of change. The way in which Ihimaera frames his examination of the Land Wars is a contrast to previous depictions of the New Zealand Wars. Due to the recent publication of *Sleeps Standing Moetū* however, the majority of Ihimaera scholarship only examines *The Matriarch*. Some scholars examine the style of narration used by Ihimaera in his writing in *The Matriach* such as Paul Sharrad in "Struggle and Strategy: Literature and New Zealand's Land Wars." Joanne Tompkins in her article "'It all depends on what story you hear': Historiographic Metafiction and Colin Johnson's *Dr. Wooreddy's Prescription for Enduring the Ending of the World* and Witi Ihimaera's *The Matriarch*" discusses the difference in voice from a Māori author compared to the preceding Pākehā narratives. Alistair Fox adds to the discussion of a Māori voice in "Hybridity and Indigeneity in Contemporary Maori Literature: Witi Ihimaera." However, Fox examines the influence of European high culture upon Māori such as Italian operas and Classical Studies. Other scholars help to place Ihimaera in literary context. Mark Williams compares his writing to other canonical New Zealand authors in

“On the Beach: Witi Ihimaera, Katherine Mansfield and the Treaty of Waitangi.” Meanwhile Michelle Keown in *Pacific Islands Writing: The Postcolonial Literatures of Aotearoa/New Zealand and Oceania* analyses Ihimaera’s place within the field of Maori and Pacific writers in terms of style and composition.

These scholars are also useful in formulating an approach when analysing *Sleeps Standing*. Keown’s scholarship examines a particular style of writing, which enables the application of her scholarship towards newer texts, such as *Sleeps Standing*. Meanwhile Tompkins’ work with metafiction assists with the other elements of Ihimaera’s novel such as the effect of the past upon issues of the present. Furthermore, there is scope to examine *Sleeps Standing* as both an individual text and in comparison with *The Matriarch*. By examining this text I am able to add to the corpus of critical material examining Ihimaera and the Land Wars. The added dimension of *Sleeps Standing* also allows for analysis in how Ihimaera demonstrates a distinct stylistic choice in depicting the Land Wars that is very different from Shadbolt and earlier writers.

Finally, in this chapter I examine the different approaches of the authors side by side. In terms of comparing Shadbolt to Ihimaera, Nelson Wattie provides some discussion of the texts, examining the form and structure as well as representation of historical events. However, with the addition of *Sleeps Standing* I can provide greater detail to this argument. Wattie limits his examination to *Season of the Jew* and “The Song of Te Kooti” chapter of *The Matriarch* and only looks at the attack on Matawhero textually rather than historiographically (440-446). Further analysis can be drawn between Ihimaera and Shadbolt in terms of style and the framing of the conflict, both in Matawhero but also Ōrākau. Each author presents and discusses the Battle of Ōrākau and Te Kooti’s attack on Matawhero in different ways. Shadbolt in *Season of the Jew* and Ihimaera in both *The Matriarch*

and *Sleeps Standing*. I therefore compare how Ōrākau is depicted by both novelists, as well as expanding Wattie's discussion of Matawhero to also include the historical account and a more detailed analysis of the choices made by each author in their representation of the event.

Lastly, the two novelists can both be examined and compared in the evolution of how they represent the New Zealand Wars and Land Wars. This is particularly important as both writers have produced more than one novel on the subject of the Land Wars and the New Zealand Wars. Shadbolt wrote his trilogy over the course of several years and Ihimaera revisited the subject after a thirty-year hiatus following *The Matriarch*. Each author demonstrates distinctive styles with each novel, these apply to each text and the novelists' significant differences from each other are also discussed.

In addition to the critical reception, the historical context in which these authors were writing is significant. Ihimaera and Shadbolt both initially wrote their novels during a time of change, particularly *The Matriarch* and *Season of the Jew*. The 1970s and 1980s were a turbulent period in both the political and academic landscape. The novels produced at this time featured experimentation with the oralised narrative by Ihimaera and a manipulation of history by Shadbolt. The two are also among the most acclaimed New Zealand writers of the twentieth (and in Ihimaera's case twenty-first) century. This transformative period and the stature of these authors is why the two of them are provided with a chapter to themselves. While others have featured the New Zealand Wars as a setting since then, none have done so as influentially.

Among the various factors influencing the writing of these novels are some key historical events. These were influential moments in Aotearoa New Zealand

history, both socially and politically. The first is the rapid urbanisation of Māori from the 1950s onwards. “By 1951 the number of Māori living in urban areas had doubled” (Ministry for Culture and Heritage, “The Second World War and Māori Urbanisation”). More Māori were moving to and living in New Zealand cities than ever before. The move to the cities saw a greater interaction between Māori and Pākehā than had previously been common. Ranginui Walker states:

In the decade before the Second World War, 90 per cent of the Maori population was rural. The war acted as a catalyst in stimulating people to abandon rural poverty, and sell their labour for wages in the factories of urban mileu (*Ka Whawhai Tonu Matou* 197).

The next major factor was a surge in Māori activism. The increase of Māori in urban areas led to a choice of lifestyle in these Pākehā dominated areas. “While some Maori chose cultural assimilation, the vast majority rejected it. That meant commitment to cultural continuity” (Walker, *Ka Whawhai Tonu Matou* 198-199). This commitment forced issues of Māori displacement and anti-Māori government practices into the foreground. Due to urbanisation and the greater visibility of Māori it was much harder to ignore the issues of Māori sovereignty and breaches of the Treaty of Waitangi. The addressing of these issues occurred under the guidance of important groups such as Ngā Tamatoa, an activist group inspired by African American political engagement. They pushed for acknowledging and resolving Māori grievances including issues of the language and the land.

In addition to the activist groups, two highly visible social events exemplify this period for Māori. The first is the Land Hikoi spearheaded by Dame Whina Cooper. “After six months of planning, the march, led by a hard core of fifty marchers, set off from Te Hauhau in the Far North on 14 September 1975” (Walker, *Ka Whawhai Tonu Matou* 214). This group gathered thousands of additional

followers as they made their way to Wellington as part of their protest against the alienation of Māori land and the historic confiscations and abuses towards Māori land ownership by the Native Land Courts. These courts had continued the concerted effort to dispossess Māori from their land long after the fighting of the New Zealand Wars had ended and were a source of much anger. “The marchers went under the slogan “not one more acre of Maori land” to be surrendered to the Pakeha” (Walker, *Ka Whawhai Tonu Matou* 214). This undertaking to bring the grievances over the land to the foreground reached the Houses of Parliament in Wellington but was not sufficient to sway opinion, and further action was required.

Another such action was the occupation of Bastion Point. The National Government of 1977 planned to subdivide twenty four acres of Crown land that had, through the courts, been alienated and forcibly taken from the people of Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei.

In January 1977 the Orakei Maori Action Group led by Joe Hawke occupied the land at Bastion Point to stop the subdivision going ahead. Tents, cooking facilities, caravans and a meeting house were put on the site for the 150 protestors who moved in to support the cause. The local populace opposed to the subdivision helped the protestors by supplying them with food, water and electricity (Walker, *Ka Whawhai Tonu Matou* 218).

In addition to help from local allies, Hawke and his fellow protestors received support from Ngā Tamatoa, Socialist Action, the Citizen’s Association for Racial Equality, and the trade unions. After more than five hundred days, the protest was broken up in the standard response towards peaceful protest in the 1970s and 80s, by overwhelming police invasion. On 25 May 1978, six hundred police invaded the encampment and cleared the protestors off the site. Walker is critical of the media reception towards the protest “the sensational treatment of it tended to bemuse

rather than inform the general public as the drama moved towards its inexorable climax” (Walker, *Ka Whawhai Tonu Matou* 218). This criticism is not unfounded, however, I feel that it did meet some success. While this protest did not reach the hearts and minds of all New Zealanders, the involvement of the different socialist, unionist and social justice groups is evidence that the voices of protest were being heard by more than just other Māori activists.

The political changes occurring in New Zealand were forcing a reassessment of previously established conventions. As Steer argues:

Internally, the cultural renaissance and increasing political presence of Maori challenged Pakeha assumptions about their own identity, while historical grievances against the Crown were given a new prominence when the Waitangi Tribunal was permitted to hear claims as far back as 1840 (129).

This significant change pushed back against the established Pākehā identity that dominated in the preceding decades and by extension the representations of the New Zealand Wars. The myths of positive race relations and peaceful coexistence were being deconstructed in reality, so it is a natural progression for this deconstruction to occur on the pages of fiction as well.

These historical events and challenges to the status quo were joined by two important academic voices. The first figure entered the mainstream in the 1970s. The writer and academic Ranginui Walker supplied a Māori perspective to historical discussions as a columnist in *The New Zealand Listener* and as a consequence reached a wider readership than just the academy or parliament.

Ranginui spoke out at a time when few Māori had a platform or the opportunity to step on to it. Syd Jackson was another. Both were well-educated, articulate and didn't suffer fools. They translated our world for

readers of magazines like the *Listener* and *Metro*. They were the lonely Māori voices in the hostile environment of the '70s and '80s. Both were vilified.

Back in those days, the Auckland mayor, Dove-Myer Robinson, once described Ranginui as the most dangerous man in New Zealand (Maniapoto paragraph 7 and 8).

Walker's comments on the events of the period are informed by history and he makes certain to present these comments in his articles. As I quoted in my introduction, Walker made very clear links between the present and the past: "Use of massive state power to crush the protestors at Bastion Point in 1979 indicates that little has changed in a hundred years" (Walker, *Nga Tau Tohetohe* 37).

The articles in the *Listener* presented the mainstream public with a different interpretation to the previously established historical narrative, but Walker also provides cultural context for his comments. For example, he explains inter-tribal conflict over land in pre-contact New Zealand.

Land seldom changed hands by right of conquest, because a defeated tribe could retire to its remote hinterland, there to whakatipu tangata (rear young warriors) to drive out interlopers (Walker, *Nga Tau Tohetohe* 44).

Walker's commentary is critical but also informative. His writing and public profile in the 1970s and 1980s helped to bring the Land Wars to a contemporary context. This contextualisation of the past is particularly apparent with his comparisons to more recent history in order to question the narrative of a total Government victory in the nineteenth century.

Had Cameron continued the campaign after Te Ranga, where British honour was salvaged by catching Maori in an uncompleted pa, Aotearoa may well have become Britain's Vietnam (Walker, *Nga Tau Tohetohe* 40).

This questioning of the established narrative presented by historians such as William Pember Reeves, James Cowan, and Keith Sinclair was also championed by the second major academic.

The challenging of the historical status quo was not the sole purview of Māori, as the Pākehā historian James Belich's work also reassessed the previous conventions on how the New Zealand Wars played out. Belich disagrees with many of the ideas presented in previous years. As Wattie comments:

James Belich's book *The New Zealand Wars* not only examines evidence relating to the wars (especially in their military aspect) but also asks how they were reported and have been described historiographically (Wattie, "The New Zealand Wars" 434).

Belich argued for a re-examining of the conflict, as many of the reports could not be wholly trusted and called for a way to reframe how the wars were examined. The New Zealand Wars were not the overwhelming subjugation of a native population who put up a token (but admirable) resistance, instead this was a conflict that is every bit as important to the formation of Aotearoa New Zealand as the First World War. These two academic titans are still highly influential in how the New Zealand Wars and the Land Wars are understood. While their words did not reach everyone's ears or decisively sway all opinions, they advanced the conversation into the mainstream. Ruth Brown notes:

Belich's re-mapping of the past might be seen as a timely response to a perceived new reality of power: restoring the Maori to prominence in the narrative of the past is the next logical step after affording them due consideration in the present. The same kind of thing was happening all over the post-colonial world. We might say that Belich's reassessment was not so much right or wrong, as inevitable (75).

In 1998, Belich even hosted a documentary series on New Zealand television based on his book *The New Zealand Wars and the Victorian Interpretation of Racial Conflict*, which was widely and positively received.

These domestic activities were not happening in isolation; however, they were also occurring in tandem with rapid global change. This fertile ground of international thought would affect the formation of the novels produced by Ihimaera and Shadbolt. The post-colonial movement with thinkers such as Edward Said and Homi K. Bhabha and their ideas had spread to and influenced work in New Zealand. Of particular importance are Said's comments that

resistance, far from being merely a reaction to imperialism, is an alternative way of conceiving human history. It is particularly important to see how much this alternative reconception is based on breaking down the barriers between cultures (216).

Hence these later works make a concerted effort to present the Māori perspective as equally valid as the Pākehā. This sentiment is particularly valid in terms of Ihimaera's work. As Alistair Fox comments a

consciously constructed hybridity serves to capture and represent the divided impulses and ambiguous situation of the postcolonial indigenous subject who wishes to participate in the contemporary world without losing his or her cultural identity ("Hybridity and Indigeneity" 100).

Ihimaera, as a Māori writer in Aotearoa, has direct experience of the interplay of colonising culture and (for much of recent New Zealand history) suppression of indigenous tradition. This division in his reality informs his writing and helps to express the ideas that I term as part of the Land Wars. This internal examination and depiction of a colonised culture's identity is not limited to the post-colonial lens, however.

The authors of the 1980s were not solely influenced by post-colonial thought and ideas. Another school that influenced the works of Shadbolt and, more keenly, Ihimaera is postmodernism. Linda Hutcheon states:

Postmodern intertextuality is a formal manifestation of both a desire to close the gap between past and present of the reader and a desire to rewrite the past in a new context (Hutcheon 118).

The novels take new or different understandings of the period and apply them to the narratives. With Shadbolt these effects are small, mostly evident through his tinkering with history as I discuss later in the chapter. In terms of Ihimaera's work the effect of postmodernism is more noticeable. As Tompkins argues in her analysis of *The Matriarch*:

It becomes apparent, in comparing indigenous postcolonial works which exhibit postmodern characteristics, that postmodernism is as political in nature as postcolonial literature: both contest the authority traditionally vested in univocal white history (484).

For Ihimaera, and to a lesser extent Shadbolt, the postmodern provides additional room to critique and reassess established ideas about the New Zealand Wars and the Land Wars. The influence of post-coloniality and postmodernism is apparent in different stylistic choices, from treating a fictional character as a real historical figure to having present day characters narrating the past and even addressing past characters are features in these novels.

Overall Shadbolt and Ihimaera both experiment with ideas of post-colonial thought and postmodernism as a means of examining and reassessing history. The Māori activism mentioned earlier was also a part of a wider movement of indigenous voices pressing forward with ideas. Whilst Ranginui Walker and Dame Whina Cooper were presenting the Māori perspective challenging a preconceived

colonial status quo, the same was taking place in the United States of America. Scholars such as Eduardo and Bonnie Duran, and Vine Deloria Jr were moving their arguments into the academy and imparting knowledge of colonial trauma and injustices inflicted upon indigenous populations to a wider audience. Shadbolt and Ihimaera were writing at a time when there was an increasing awareness of indigenous issues and questioning of colonial hegemony, not just in Aotearoa New Zealand, but worldwide.

Is History Ticklish?

Maurice Shadbolt's trilogy of novels serve as a mid-way point between full post-colonial revising of narratives and close adherence with the previous conventions of the New Zealand Wars novels. Paul Sharrad argues that Shadbolt's novels,

though they arise from the contemporary 'biculturalist' revisions of New Zealand history exemplified in the work of Anne Salmond and James Belich, ironically reproduce the functions of colonialist historical romances such as Rolf Boldrewood's *War to the Knife* (1899) and William Satchell's *The Greenstone Door* (1914) (Sharrad 11).

Shadbolt's novels therefore have many parallels with the older romances, which will be discussed further in this chapter. This heritage with the romances also ties to Shadbolt's complicated relationship with the histories that inspire his trilogy.

Though Maurice Shadbolt's *The New Zealand Wars Trilogy* is grounded in historical fact and record, Shadbolt has a tendency to wilfully manipulate history. The changes of details cannot be passed off as a lack of historical awareness as with many of the early writers; Shadbolt is writing at a time when there was a far greater level of historical sources available. During his time as the University of Waikato writer in residence in 1992 he was even known to visit battle sites for field research. Shadbolt admits that his adherence to the historical record is not absolute: "My first

loyalty is to the narrative, not to history” (Shadbolt, “Homer Nods Too” 55). He willingly moves characters (such as Major Reginald Newton Biggs in *Season of the Jew*) to different places from historical record and alters small details to better suit his story, such as reducing the number of fights in a particular period. “Again and again I had to trim truth of its excesses: to make events plausible while fighting to keep faith with history” (Shadbolt, “Homer Nods Too” 55). It is therefore important to state that while Shadbolt does engage with New Zealand history more than the early writers in the romance mode, he does not feel bound to the facts and will readily depart from them to form a more coherent narrative. The decisions are not made to fill gaps in his knowledge of the conflict but rather to fit the “aesthetic sensibilities” which he believes history lacks (Shadbolt, “Homer Nods Too” 56). In this regard the narrative constructs an “alternative history” to better understand the feel of the actual history.

With this idea in mind, while the novels do not depict the exact history as it happens, they do construct a mood of the period at the time. In *Season of the Jew*, Shadbolt does not limit himself to the manipulation of history but also dehistoricises his protagonist. George Fairweather, the novel’s principle character, is fictional, but he is inspired by people from New Zealand history. For instance, Crane argues that his “character owes much to the historical G. A. Preece” (Crane, “Tickling History” 61). Fairweather’s existence as a fictional character, however, is complicated by Shadbolt’s own “Fact and further” section following the novel. In this section Shadbolt provides biographical notes on various historical figures who appear in the novel such as Te Kooti, Colonel Whitmore and Major Ropata. Fairweather is present in these notes. While the man is referred to as a “composite character in these pages”, Shadbolt comments that he is “still far from fictional” (Shadbolt, *Season of the Jew* 382). Fairweather is given two full pages that construct a kind of

epilogue to the narrative while masquerading as a biographical note for the man. This postmodern approach to the narrative demonstrates Shadbolt's willingness to play with history and the historical record, rather than operate with an incomplete history and invent details for the purpose of narrative like Boldrewood and Sygurd Wiśniowski.

In contrast to *Season of the Jew*, the next novel, *Monday's Warriors* is far more historicised. In his "Author's Note", Shadbolt acknowledges well-known New Zealand historians such as James Belich and Christopher Pugsley. Shadbolt himself states: "Where this story seems mostly fiction, it is fact. Otherwise it is folklore, leaving a novelist with few liberties to take" (Shadbolt, *Monday's Warriors* "Author's note"). The historical notes titled "In Fact" only discuss Kimble Bent and Riwha Titokowaru and do so in detail over the course of eight pages. Shadbolt acknowledges James Cowan's own story *The Adventures of Kimble Bent* (1911), based upon Cowan's interviews with Bent in this section.

Shadbolt is openly critical of the accuracy of Cowan's work compared to the historical record, however. "Failing even to check the spelling of the subject's name, Cowan was bound to get much else wrong" (Shadbolt, *Monday's Warriors* 307). Some of the weaknesses in Cowan's account can be mitigated by Bent's fugitive status. The man was seeking a formal pardon at the time and would have twisted some of the facts to suit his own agenda when he met with Cowan. Crane makes an argument that the opening to the novel implies there is little for Shadbolt to manipulate:

does this strange opening actually suggest historical accuracy? Or does it suggest that much of the novel is folklore (or myth), and that folklore has already taken so many liberties with history that there are few left for Shadbolt to take? (Crane, "Tickling History" 69).

It is true that folklore could colour the facts enough that even Shadbolt himself is uncertain of their veracity. Regardless of the actuality of *Monday's Warriors* as being totally historical, it is still an attempt at greater historicity than Cowan's *The Adventures of Kimble Bent*. Shadbolt describes Cowan's work as "rather overwrought fancy in *Boy's Own* prose. Cowan, who would later write better could not have been especially proud of the book" (Shadbolt, *Monday's Warriors* 307). This novel also endeavours to present a far more historicised version of events than *Season of the Jew*, particularly as Shadbolt has not constructed his protagonist as a fictional amalgam. Rather, Shadbolt has taken a person within the historical record (and some folklore to fill in the gaps) and transcribed him to page, thus, there is less room to play with history in this regard.

The House of Strife turns in the opposite direction; the novel operates in reversing the chronology of the trilogy, moving backwards in time. While the prior two novels were occurring at roughly the same time (1864/1865-1869), this novel moves back in time twenty years to the 1840s. The formula is not changed too drastically however, as much like *Season*, Shadbolt uses a fictional protagonist, and again manipulates history to suit his narrative.

My Hone Heke ceases to be a slave of history from his first appearance in my fiction; I am setting him free as I similarly liberated Titokowaru in *Monday's Warriors* and Te Kooti in *Season of the Jew* (Shadbolt, "Homer Nods Too" 56).

Shadbolt's use of the word "free" is significant and opens up dual possibilities of interpretation. On the one hand, it could be argued that he implies that he is freeing these historical figures from the cage of history and the constraints of fact to make them live and breath as multi-dimensional fictional beings. Yes, given the moment when Shadbolt is writing, it is also tempting to speculate that he is also signally a

desire to free his characters from the distortions of a historical record that is partial and that has framed events through the eyes of the European ‘victors’ and has determinedly imprisoned Maori in the role of defeated antagonists.

This text shifts the focus from the late point of the New Zealand Wars to near its beginning, as the narrative follows the 1845 Northern War, involving Hone Heke and Kawiti’s resistance to the Crown. In this novel Shadbolt is deliberate in terms of the histories that he chooses to present. Lawrence Jones notes that while Shadbolt follows Belich’s lead on certain points he will differ when it suits him:

He accepts Maning’s story that Heke had temporarily deserted the fortified pa for a Sunday prayer meeting rather than Belich’s view that he and Kawiti were laying an ambush because the irony of the Christian Heke holding a worship service while the nominally Christian English troops invade his fortifications serves his purpose (Jones, “Out of the Rut and into the Swamp” 31).

Shadbolt picks and chooses from the smorgasbord of historical accounts to find the ones that best suit the story that he is trying to tell. In this case it is the one that provides Shadbolt/his narrator the greatest sense of irony. It is through the narrator that this novel is the most metafictional.

Through Ferdinand Wildblood, who recalls events from the safe distance of forty years, Shadbolt is able to present a late-Victorian perspective of events as well as the late-twentieth-century one provided by his own inescapable authorial presence. Thus there are three time frames operating in *The House of Strife*, the present of the 1990s (the author’s present), the present of the 1880s (the narrator’s present), and the present of the 1840s (Hone Heke’s present) (Crane, “Windows Onto History” 109).

This style highlights the artificiality of narrative. The reader cannot rely wholly upon Wildblood's word as he has narrativised his tale in much the same way as Shadbolt has narrativised the entire story.

As a result "in this novel the centre of interest has shifted somewhat away from the New Zealand Wars per se, towards his more complex narrator/hero" (Crane, "Windows Onto History" 111). Crane's assessment is particularly poignant, as of the three novels, *House of Strife* does not feature an appendix to attempt at historical legitimacy. This downplayed historicity is alluded to when Shadbolt acknowledges that historian Christopher Pugsley ensured that "at least I got the warfare right" (Shadbolt, *The House of Strife*). This novel moves itself further from history to focus more upon character. The appeal of a writer writing about a writer writing about the New Zealand Wars shows that over the course of the trilogy Shadbolt has fully embraced the metafictionality of his work and the progress of his experimentation with history. From the mild metafiction of *Season of the Jew* to the more historicised *Monday's Warriors* and now to the wholly postmodern *House of Strife*.

Shadbolt's novels feature characters who arrive from elsewhere to New Zealand and are swept up in the events of the New Zealand Wars. In this regard, these protagonists bear a great deal of similarity to the traveller characters of the romances, though there are enough key differences that I describe them as 'neutral protagonists'.

Like Sir Walter Scott's, Shadbolt's heroes are apolitical despite (or perhaps because of) their proximity to the imperial frontier. Indeed the processes of history work through them or around them without them ever participating as active players (Crane, "Windows onto history" 101).

Within *Season of the Jew*, Fairweather has some points of comparison with Boldrewood's Massinger of *War to the Knife*. Both have come to New Zealand from overseas, both fall in love with a Māori woman of mixed heritage, both serve in the militia, and both also are acquainted with the Ngāti Porou chief Major Ropata Wahawaha, well-known for his alliance with the Government during the late 1860s. Yet the two have significant differences. Massinger comes to New Zealand to seek profit, while Fairweather enters as a serving soldier in the British Army. While Massinger joins the militia with gusto, Fairweather is altogether more reluctant. Lastly, while Massinger is more than happy to leave Aotearoa, Fairweather chooses to stay. With these points in mind Fairweather, while related to the New Zealand Wars romance heroes, does show the change in New Zealand Wars protagonists, rather than solely being travellers, they transition to settler.

Fairweather also differs from the romance protagonists as he is established from the outset as having a close friendship with the novel's principle antagonist Te Kooti Arikirangi Te Turuki. Fairweather describes Te Kooti fondly as a "laugher. A drinker. And great talker. With the cheek of old Nick" (Shadbolt, *Season of the Jew* 38). The two meet in Auckland while Fairweather is recovering from a wound suffered during the Waikato Invasion. This friendship eventually adds nuance to their conflict which takes place some years later. In all of the historical romances that I have previously discussed, this friendship with the overall antagonist of the novel (as opposed to two friends caught on opposite sides) is unprecedented. Their friendship allows Fairweather to, in theory, function as a Scott-style neutral figure despite his service in the militia. This impartiality is questionable, however, as Nelson Wattie argues that since Fairweather "becomes an officer in the colonial army, his neutrality cannot possibly be maintained" ("The New Zealand Land Wars" 436). Rolf Boldrewood's nineteenth-century romance protagonist, Massinger, is

under similar scrutiny as he too becomes a soldier in the militia. In this regard, Shadbolt is two steps from Scott rather than one, since Boldrewood was inspired by *The Last of the Mohicans*. As Fenimore Cooper draws on the Scott tradition himself, rather than being an outright departure from the neutral protagonist, it is instead of the same lineage but further removed.

The neutral protagonist of *Monday's Warriors* is a very different character from convention. Kimble Bent is unusual as a protagonist for multiple reasons. First, he is not European, British or born in Aotearoa New Zealand, he is an American. The presence of Americans in Aotearoa is not unusual, many ships sailing into the Bay of Islands even before the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi were from the USA. This precedent also gave rise to Stringfellow's Chase Pendennis who was born of marriage between an American trader and a Maori woman. However, all prior protagonists mentioned in this thesis have been of European extraction. Next, Bent is a protagonist who is also a historical figure, as opposed to being inspired by historical figures. Not only is the principle character different in that regard, but unlike other neutral protagonists/European traveller characters, Bent also becomes a Pākeha-Māori.

Kimble Bent is perhaps the most famous of all Pākeha-Māori, an American who initially served in the British army and then deserted to join Riwaha Titokowaru.

In 1864 Kimble Bent, a soldier in the British 57th regiment, deserted to Ngāti Ruanui at Taranaki. An American, Bent had run away to sea aged seventeen and served three years in the American Navy before joining the 57th in Liverpool. At the time of his desertion the Taranaki tribes were engaged in a brutal guerrilla against the British and colonial troops (Bentley 58).

After this period of conflict, Bent stayed among the Ngāti Ruanui, gaining status. He later was on the opposite side of the war from the colonial militia in 1868-9

during what was known as Titokowaru's War. As a character, Bent is far more neutrally positioned than Fairweather. While Bent sides with the Māori, he is not an active combatant.

There are regular moments in the novel when it is clear that Bent does not entirely or unquestioningly support the Maori cause. Similarly, the unease that Toa feels about having Bent in the Maori camp also acts as a reminder of his position as a neutral hero in this novel (Crane, "Mediocre Heroes" 106-7).

Bent's status as an American also places him outside of the imperial British/Māori dynamic. He is not a subject of the British Empire, in fact as an American he feels even less support for it. "I hate the buggers" (Shadbolt, *Monday's Warriors* 27). His forced enlistment into the army further coloured his opinion, further influencing his decision to side with Titokowaru.

Bent's opinion of the British army parallels Wiśniowski's narrator in *Tikera*. In contrast though, Bent does not merely sympathise with Māori, but fully supports them over the colonial government, something that even Wiśniowski's narrator would not consider. Bent's treatment by the army and his lack of loyalty to the British Empire means he is not dissuaded by the actions of Titokowaru's followers. "The more terrible you are, the more you suit me" (Shadbolt *Monday's Warriors* 29). Bent's difference in perspective makes this character's choice a natural progression while also being historically accurate. Unlike Fairweather, Bent can also be better considered "indigenised". He lives among Titokowaru's people, he marries among them, in terms of allegiance he is much like Purcell from *The Greenstone Door*. He continues to live among Māori for the rest of his life. Shadbolt notes in the "In Fact" section, that after his wife Rihi's death, his third wife was also Māori. Bent even lived the remainder of his life with a "sympathetic family of

South Island Maori, kin of Titokowaru's people" (Shadbolt, *Monday's Warriors* 306). In this regard, Bent is far more attuned to the reality of being Māori, and is realistically more "indigenised" than Fairweather, Massinger, Tregarthen, or any of the other protagonists from Chapter One and Two.

The protagonist of *The House of Strife*, however, returns to a formula far closer to his romance predecessors than either Fairweather or Bent. The narrator protagonist, Ferdinand Wildblood, resembles the Walter Scott neutral protagonist, the other characters are far closer to the New Zealand Wars romance types, and the perspective is clearly from an imperial traveller rather than a settler. This status suits Wildblood, however, as among all of Shadbolt's trilogy protagonists, Wildblood is also the most neutral.

Not only does Wildblood act as an intermediary between the colonial and Maori sides of the conflict, he acts as a messenger between the different Maori camps and between the different factions on the colonial side, too (Crane, "Windows Onto History" 110).

Wildblood is a traveller passing through. While he is British, the man does not swear any kind of allegiance to the army or the militia, nor does he support the cause of Māori such as Hone Heke and Kawiti, unlike Bent with Titokowaru. He is principally concerned with his stories, while others, such as Heke and the missionary Henry Williams are concerned with his ability as a story teller. Henry Williams even asks Wildblood to compose a story for him, as "a tale of moral character could divert Heke's hot-heads" (Shadbolt, *The House of Strife* 95). Each has an agenda in utilising the fame and narrative abilities of his alter ego Henry Youngman to fulfil their own goals. In this regard he has much in common with the Scott hero inspired Cedric Tregarthen and *Tikera's* nameless narrator. This neutral protagonist's backstory and role is truer to the form of the romances, as also like

Cedric, Wildblood is not a man of action but a “man of letters” (Shadbolt, *The House of Strife*, 79).

Shadbolt’s adherence to nineteenth-century conventions is not only apparent in his protagonists, but also their love interests. Meriana Smith is the primary love interest for Fairweather in *Season of the Jew*. For all intents and purposes she fulfils the exact same role as earlier Māori maiden characters, in particular Erena from *War to the Knife*. “Meriana is presented in a way that epitomises the nineteenth-century Eurocentric view of native women as sexually skilled, exotic Other” (Crane, “Windows Onto History” 104). From her first appearance on page she engages in a sexual relationship with Fairweather. The narrative jumps from Te Kooti at the end of page 20 agreeing to introduce them to Fairweather and Meriana engaging in foreplay and then intercourse. “He was soon most exquisitely liberated; her amorous skills permitted no modesty” (Shadbolt, *Season of the Jew* 21). This aspect of her character is unsurprising given the Shadbolt’s adherence to Sir Walter Scott’s conventions. “Shadbolt’s female characters, both European and Maori, in this and the other novels in the trilogy, lack complexity in much the same way that Scott’s heroines do” (Crane, “Windows Onto History” 104). Aside from her part as lustful love-interest, Meriana’s only active role is to introduce Fairweather to the Kāinga when they travel Te Urewera. Once the pursuit of Te Kooti begins in earnest, Shadbolt needs a reason to remove her from the narrative action for a time to allow Fairweather to truly show his mettle in the militia.

To give Fairweather this motivation to leave the home and fight in earnest, Shadbolt resorts to the stereotypical convention of the helpless maiden attacked in the homestead while her lover is away. The murder of her brothers and her own sexual assault leaves Meriana catatonic for much of the narrative following the

attack on Matawhero. There is no evidence given of her even fighting back. This inaction is a stark contrast to her comments in the opening chapters where she claims that Shakespeare's Juliet is "too feeble" and that woman born of Montagues or Capulets would be made of sterner stuff (Shadbolt, *Season of the Jew* 22-3). When questioned what she knows of the subject Meriana replies "Maoris are all Montagues and Capulets" (Shadbolt, *Season of the Jew* 23). Shadbolt does not provide the opportunity to show Meriana as the strong Māori woman he initially implied her to be, instead Meriana is just a reason for Fairweather to seek retribution against Te Kooti and fully commit to the militia. She exists as a reinforcement of Fairweather's masculinity and also his means of indigenisation, enabling himself to be considered as Stephen Turner describes "of the land".

Fairweather's process of indigenisation requires him to gain an understanding of the Māori way of life and tikanga. Before Fairweather can possess the land, he must understand it and be considered Māori. Crane states that it is

the journey into the Ureweras in the company of Meriana which cements his relationship with the Maori. He is portrayed as a character who has been indigenised (in so far as he has been claimed/accepted by the Maori) and can thus be trusted by both sides, and through whom the Maori perspective can be voiced at regular intervals in the novel ("Windows Onto History" 104).

Rather than allow Meriana to speak outside of her relationship with her lover (and later husband), Shadbolt has Fairweather present much of the Māori perspective to the settlers instead.

While there is some depth applied to Meriana compared to the romances, it is kept to the periphery of the novel. Wattie states that Meriana sees her relationship with Fairweather as an opportunity "to give European sanction to a piece of land"

(Wattie, “The New Zealand Wars” 437). Her use of a relationship with a settler as an opportunity to preserve Māori possession of land provides Meriana with some motives beyond the generic love interest. Unfortunately this aspect of her character is given little detail and for most of the narrative Meriana exists to show Fairweather’s noble and understanding nature. It presents an unfortunate implication that Fairweather cannot possibly be biased towards the Pākehā in the struggle for land as his wife is Māori.

The depiction of a Māori lover conforming to uncomplicated romance heroine conventions is present in the other novels as well. In *Monday’s Warriors*, Rihi is barely explored in any detail, her role in the narrative is dictated by her connection to Bent and that she is related to Titokowaru, hence tying Bent to his leader with a marriage. In all other respects she contributes little to the narrative and is an even less developed character than Meriana in *Season of the Jew*. While Shadbolt does off-handedly mention potentially more interesting characters stating that there are fighting women amongst Titokowaru’s forces (Shadbolt, *Monday’s Warriors* 139), none of the women present in the narrative touch a musket or join in the fighting. He instead perpetuates the exoticised indigenous Other, much like the romances. His young Māori women serve as a means of indigenising the protagonist to reinforce his status as a neutral protagonist, and are unable to break from their assigned mould.

House of Strife does offer some change from convention. While the missionary Williams’ adopted daughter Angela plays the stereotypical Māori maiden character almost to the hilt, she manages to subvert the role in the conclusion of *The House of Strife*. Rather than be left in Aotearoa while her lover departs, or more commonly, be killed before the end of the story, Angela departs for London with Wildblood. Overseas she thrives as a character, starting her own

fashion store. “When she finished bedecking herself regally, she found pleasure and profit in costuming others of her sex in high fashion” (Shadbolt, *The House of Strife* 293). More to the point, Angela is not a character who sees herself as bound for eternity with her dashing traveller paramour. She further defies expectation by, in a manner similar to Tikera, falling in love with and marrying a Frenchman. “My understanding is that she and the marquis live in a chilly castle in the vicinity of Fontainebleu with a litter of grandchildren” (Shadbolt, *The House of Strife* 293). This ending defies most conventions, much like the precedent set in Wiśniowski’s *Tikera*.

Angela and Tikera’s similar fates do however seem a convention as well. A Māori maiden who becomes a glamorous and popular figure and marries a French man that treats her better than her previous suitors, seems to be a coded response for a radical change from the norm. Furthermore, also like Tikera, the narrative function of the indigenous maiden is still fulfilled by removing the Māori maiden from the land to symbolise its availability for settlement and, in the case of Angela, the Europeanisation of the cultural Other.

The New Zealand Wars romance character who receives a great deal of attention in Shadbolt’s novels is the imperial official. This character is always represented as an historical figure in the *The New Zealand Wars Trilogy*. Generally a militia or an army officer, in contrast to the early romances this character is almost exclusively negative. He is a means for Shadbolt to express post-colonial sentiment and dissatisfaction with the settlement of Aotearoa. These characters will often be racist, belligerent, and dismissive of Māori (though considering the actual historical figures this is not much of a stretch).

The principle imperial official character within *Season of the Jew* and to an extent *Monday's Warriors* is Colonel George Stoddard Whitmore. This man has a complicated history in New Zealand and one of service in the New Zealand Wars throughout much of the 1860s.

Not surprisingly, Whitmore was extremely unpopular in many quarters. He was variously described as 'the great tyrant', 'that chip of the Devil', a 'diminutive beast', and 'a little conceited, egotistical, self-sufficient ass' (Belich, *The New Zealand Wars* 221)

Whitmore's classist, racist, and all around unlikeable attitude are on full display within the novel. He is even happy to voice "his contempt for the colonists of Poverty Bay" (Shadbolt, *Season of the Jew* 117).

Shadbolt's Whitmore is shown to treat allies and foes alike with disdain, confident in his superior military capability. However, as Crane states, Whitmore is out-Whitmored on page compared to reality:

Shadbolt is accurate about Whitmore's ability to attract dislike, but he deliberately undermines Whitmore's great military skills throughout the novel. Whitmore overcame great odds (difficult terrain, freezing weather, obstinate troops) to catch Te Kooti at Ruakituri, defeated him at the battle of Ngatapa, and then succeeded in keeping Te Kooti on the move, never allowing him to settle and establish another strong following. This bears little resemblance to Shadbolt's Whitmore (Crane, "Tickling History" 65).

Shadbolt's treatment of Whitmore is as a whipping boy to show the post-coloniality of the novel. Shadbolt is presenting a criticism of Colonial authority and to truly force the point across he tends towards exaggeration.

Crane further criticises the portrayal by stating that: "Shadbolt's treatment of this historical figure is considerably at odds with the documented evidence

accepted by most historians including James Belich and Ranginui Walker” (65). That the two principle revisionist historians of the period were of a different mind to the author shows how far Shadbolt had strayed from the historical record in this depiction, his “play” with history here falls close to complete fabrication. Even so, Whitmore is exaggerated not by accentuating his negatives but rather by omitting his positives. Shadbolt passes Whitmore’s achievements onto Ropata Wahawaha as the man to take the pā of Ngātapa. Whitmore’s determination and singlemindedness in his pursuit of Te Kooti are also passed on to Ropata Wahaha, who despite his successes is treated more problematically than Whitmore, as will be discussed below.

There are three imperial official characters who feature within *Monday’s Warriors* (mostly due to the shuffling of command at the time). Because the narrative follows the resisting Māori, they are only perceived through the few sections narrated from the militia perspective. They are not therefore shown in great detail. The first is a familiar character from the New Zealand Wars romances, the (in)famous Gustavus von Tempsky, often referred to in this novel as Many Birds, as he was known by his Māori enemies. “Many Birds” is based upon von Tempsky’s real-life nickname, though as a literal translation, it lacks the full nuance. More specifically von Tempsky “was known to the Maori as Manurau, ‘the bird that flits everywhere’” (McMillan). Von Tempsky’s appearance is significant as this novel, like *Tikera*, depicts the death of the Major at Te Ngutu o te Manu. Von Tempsky is treated as a worthy opponent, described as Titokowaru’s “most willing foe” (Shadbolt, *Monday’s Warriors* 113). This role is even more evident in Titokowaru’s letter challenging him to fight at Te Ngutu o te Manu (Shadbolt, *Monday’s Warriors* 160). The last point that shows the esteem in which Titokowaru holds Many Birds is saving him from being consumed following his death at Te

Ngutu o te Manu: “He will burn on the pyre...One warrior’s favour to another” (Shadbolt, *Monday’s Warriors* 189). This is also in line with the historical record, as while some of the soldiers who died at Te Ngutu were used in ritual cannibalism following the battle, von Tempsky was spared this fate.

It is also notable though that von Tempsky is still not tied to any of the military activities of the colonial militia that might be considered war crimes. His acts in burning cultivations and killing civilians are ignored, as are the facts that when a small boy was killed at Te Ngutu o te Manu by an allied Māori, von Tempsky was likely present and the act was carried out with his assent. As Belich states: “Von Tempsky did not do the deed, but he did not stop it either” (*I Shall Not Die* 121). Shadbolt continues to peddle and perpetuate the myth of von Tempsky rather than the reality of the brutal mercenary; that reputation is saved for the allied Māori leader Te Keepa, who Shadbolt refers to as Kepa.

Also appearing in the novel is von Tempsky’s friend and rival Thomas McDonnell. McDonnell’s role in the narrative is as an incompetent commander, to serve as a contrast to von Tempsky. The man’s paranoia is on full display.

You have decided our soldier of fortune will finish this day a hero. You also see him as your next commander. Kepa surely does too. Where is the confounded fellow? I am not deceived, Flukes. To speed von Tempsky’s promotion you are all conspiring to foul my reputation (Shadbolt, *Monday’s Warriors* 185).

While von Tempsky is to function as the worthy foe who never-the-less is defeated, McDonnell’s role is to show Titokowaru’s skill and exist as the emblem of Colonial incompetence. This is not McDonnell’s only representation showcasing his paranoia, his controversial reputation is discussed in further detail in Chapter Four.

The third official who appears is a familiar face from *Season of the Jew*. Whitmore returns, and is still considered incompetent. Titokowaru states that “Whitmore...may give me the win I want” (Shadbolt *Monday’s Warriors* 206). Colonel Whitmore is a man with a better reputation than McDonnell, though no less bombastic than his appearance in *Season of the Jew* as he is “seen on a parapet bellowing at his frustrated marksmen” (Shadbolt, *Monday’s Warriors* 207). Titokowaru is cautious in choosing his foe, which is why he tells his marksmen to not fire on Whitmore—“I fear not fighting fools” (*Monday’s Warriors* 214). While McDonnell is shown as the height of incompetence, Shadbolt continues to depict Whitmore as his favoured whipping boy for the colonial establishment.

The imperial official of *The House of Strife*, Colonel Despard, also serves as a representation of imperial incompetence. Despard is shown to expound the “belief that renegade whites must be responsible for the Maori successes against his forces, and that the Maori themselves would not have been capable of such skilled warfare” (Crane, “Windows onto History” 112). This delusion is similar to the belief that was applied to Kimble Bent in *Monday’s Warriors*. In this regard, at least, Shadbolt is following the Belich criticism of the newspaper reporting of the time period regarding Māori military capability. An important note is that with the exception of von Tempsky, across the three novels the imperial official characters are quite similar and interchangeable: bombastic egotistical, incompetent leaders with more effective underlings and allies. In contrast, Gustavus von Tempsky’s more positive reception indicates that while Shadbolt is perfectly happy to show the flaws of other officials, the memory of von Tempsky is sacrosanct.

As seen with Whitmore, any competence on the part of imperial officials is passed on to the Māori militiamen who are also historical figures. In the depiction of these characters, however, Shadbolt does little to convey the motives of these

leaders. He resorts to typical representations of indigenous men present in the romances: they are violent and somewhat mercenary. The iwi-centric motives of the groups are side-lined to show how the colonial government decided the only way to defeat Māori savagery was to match it with equal Māori savagery. These characters are not simple rank and file members, however, the roles are filled by famous Māori leaders: Major Ropata Wahawaha, Major Te Keepa, and Tāmāti Wāka Nene.

In *Season of the Jew* the Ngāti Porou battle leader Ropata Wahawaha plays a crucial role in the Pursuit of Te Kooti. Major Ropata Wahawaha has a complicated reception within Aotearoa New Zealand history.⁷ As a military leader, his reputation often depends upon the perspective of the person writing about him, whether the work be fiction or non-fiction. At all times though, his reputation is fearsome. *Season of the Jew* is not the first novel to feature Ropata Wahawaha in fiction.

Though he has only a small role to play in Boldrewood's *War to the Knife*, it is still quite significant. Wahawaha is in command of the men pursuing Kereopa Te Rau, and by extension, the protagonist's personal antagonist Ngarara. Within the novel Wahawaha is described as the "most dreaded warrior in all New Zealand" (Boldrewood 390). He is shown to fight callously and is devastating in his punishment of enemies. Wahawaha is also the one to bring the villain Ngarara to justice, rather than Massinger the protagonist, albeit his own version of justice. Upon capturing Ngarara, Ropata has the man tossed into a boiling mudpool.

⁷ While his name was initially Rāpata, the spelling Ropata is based on a mispronunciation influenced by Hawke's Bay MHR Donald McLean's Scottish accent but also partly from Wahawaha's personal preference (Soutar 88).

For one moment he emerged, with a face expressive of unutterable anguish, madness, and despair, then raising his fettered arms to the level of his head, fell backward into the depths of the raging and impure waves (Boldrewood 407).

Wahawaha's reputation is such that he was also fictionalised by G. A. Henty and Mona Tracy in a similar role. In this regard, Wahawaha can be considered the iconic Māori militia leader in New Zealand Wars fiction.

Within *Season of the Jew*, Wahawaha's reputation is no less powerful. "Ropata fights by no book, and certainly never the Bible" (Shadbolt *Season of the Jew* 242). Shadbolt's Ropata is treated as a savage and cunning ally, though not a friend. He is considered a necessary evil to defeat Te Kooti. His brutal actions, such as the killing of prisoners at Ngātapa, are treated as necessities to winning the war. Wattie comments:

The impression left on the reader is that no Englishman can be as savage as a Maori, but that the English are able to use the savagery of others for their own purposes ("The New Zealand Wars" 437).

Wahawaha is used by the colonists as an attack dog. Very little is discussed about his motives apart from a hatred for the tribes of Poverty Bay from his time as a slave amongst them as a child. There is no real examination of Wahawaha and his motives, instead he is shown to be the dangerous yet effective weapon of the Crown. Not only does he receive credit for Whitmore's victory at Ngātapa, but he also shoulders the blame for actions that would be considered unsavoury such as the killing of prisoners.

Historically, Wahawaha was a powerful leader both militarily and politically, and his reputation and influence spread beyond his own lifetime. Pember Reeves describes him as "the most valuable Maori ally the Government had...who

went through the wars without anything that could be called a defeat” (217). He was also highly influential on the later leadership of Ngāti Porou as he was a mentor to his great-nephew the famed Māori statesman Āpirana Ngata (Soutar 67). Shadbolt is correct in the novel where he states that as a child Wahawaha was taken as a slave during the Musket Wars and this event had an enormous influence on his life. “He is of old tribal enemies to the north and was once enslaved” (Shadbolt *Season of the Jew* 242). As Monty Soutar writes:

It could be argued that the experience of servitude may have developed within Wahawaha an attitude of ambivalence — one where he constantly entertained thoughts of revenge but also the desire to please people. This notion of servant, implicit in his name, comes through strongly in his later life (*Ngāti Porou Leadership* 87-88).

Following his ransom back to his people, Wahawaha began acquiring a reputation for combat during the Musket Wars which progressed to his rising in esteem among his own tribe. Later Wahawaha acquired positions of command.

Even so, the fictional representations of Wahawaha fail to take into account many of his motives. Shadbolt describes Wahawaha as fighting solely to get revenge on Poverty Bay Māori. “Any excuse for a Poverty Bay corpse is a good excuse” (Shadbolt, *Season of the Jew* 242). However, some of Wahawaha’s conflicts with Pai Mārire (Hauhau) and Te Kooti’s Ringatū, were as equally about religion as they were about politics or historic restitution. Ngāti Porou were committed Anglicans and the involvement of men like Ropata placed it closer to a “clash of rival faiths” (Soutar, “He Iwi Piri Pono” 302). More specifically Soutar argues that Ngāti Porou leaders

felt it wise to stop the Hauhau influence before it spread to their region and got out of hand. Added to their antagonism was the insult the new faith

rendered to their Christian values and the Anglican allegiance (*Ngāti Porou Leadership* 236-7).

This piety towards Anglicanism is completely absent from Shadbolt's depiction of Wahawaha, and the leader is instead associated with pre-contact religious practices. The association with pre-contact religious practices is unusual as even the tohunga of Ngāti Porou, the custodians of indigenous knowledge and practices "were now prepared to see it for what it could offer" (Soutar, "He iwi piri pono" 295). Shadbolt instead relies on sensationalist indigenous stereotypes of paganism and rejection of Christianity and Christian values to differentiate Wahawaha from his settler allies.

It was during the conflict with Pai Mārire groups in the mid-1860s that Wahawaha's reputation as a military leader became apparent. He was the military mind within Ngāti Porou, acting on behalf of the hereditary leadership, but as the one in direct command.

Wahawaha soon had the tactical appreciation to direct the campaigns himself. Although he continued to act in concert with hereditary leaders, they eventually allowed him full and autonomous leadership and "loyally supported him" in all the fighting that followed (Soutar, *Ngāti Porou Leadership* 283).

Wahawaha was a leader with a stalwart reputation. Though in many cases his motives for allying with the Crown against other Māori groups during the nineteenth century are misrepresented.

Allied Māori participation is treated as patriotism at best and petty grievances at worst. Neither fully express the motives of Wahawaha or the Ngāti Porou he represents. Soutar comments:

Ngāti Porou service to the Crown in the nineteenth century wars was less a matter of blind loyalty to a settler Government than a deliberate and

strategic decision to retain both land and as much independence as the new order could withstand (*Ngāti Porou Leadership* 317).

Shadbolt's (and Boldrewood's) portrayal of Wahawaha is quite reductive and does not take into account any of the nuance involved in the loyalties of Māori siding with the Crown. Shadbolt continued instead to perpetuate the erroneous view of Māori militiamen as either mercenary or solely seeking out revenge without any care to examine a potential wider motive or the complexities of these alliances, as was meditated upon in the film *Utu* (1983), released three years prior to *Season of the Jew's* publication. In this regard Shadbolt is still stuck in the nineteenth century.

The Māori militia leader in *Monday's Warriors*, Kepa, is as equally biased as *Season of the Jew's* Ropata. Based upon Major Te Keepa te Rangihwinui of Te Ati Haunui a Paparangi and Muaupoko tribes of the South Whanganui, Kepa is treated as a bloodthirsty mercenary whose only motives in the war are money from the Crown for his service and seeking personal glory. "For three British shillings a day...Loot, women and land. They have long wished our territory. Now they can storm it behind British guns" (Shadbolt, *Monday's Warriors* 64). To add to his mercenary attitude, in the novel Kepa is also noted as regularly pressuring the colonial government for greater command and greater pay. This pressure for pay was an important issue in the 1860s as for Māori "the rates of pay were certainly not always equal to those paid to European militia" (Crosby, *Kūpapa* 263). The issue of wages was significant during Titokowaru's War as it was at this time that the South Whanganui received equal pay with militia (Crosby, *Kūpapa* 324). The extortionist mercenary attitude given to Kepa lacks the context that he was not arguing to be paid more, but rather for equal pay and equal treatment.

As with Wahawaha, Shadbolt is not the first to depict Te Keepa in fiction, and the representation is a different choice to his earlier appearances. In Errol

Braithwaite's *The Evil Day*, Te Keepa is a leader who is happy to support the militia with his own soldiers. He feels a soldier should do whatever he can to achieve victory. In response to his friend Williams' concerns about controversial acts in fighting Titokowaru he says: "Why discriminate against one act in a business made up of bad acts?" (Braithwaite, *The Evil Day* 370). Te Keepa is also a supportive friend to the protagonist Williams and a polite and eloquent leader possessing "graceful manners and beautiful English" (Braithwaite, *The Evil Day* 369). In contrast to Shadbolt's mercenary, Braithwaite's version of Te Keepa is an effective, charismatic leader who is worthy of taking over the operational command of colonial forces in the New Zealand Wars.

Historically, in terms of command, Te Keepa was a more successful leader than some of his Pākehā contemporaries. During the defence of Te Ngutu o te Manu, officially the south Whanganui "were led by William McDonnell; in practice the colonists accepted that they were led by Kapa (Belich, *I Shall Not Die* 116). Te Keepa's ability as a leader led to his eventual military ranks of Captain, and later Major. Another significantly underplayed point of Te Keepa's motives was that he initially entered the New Zealand Wars when members of the Pai Mārire movement threatened the settlement of Wanganui which had brought Te Keepa and his people prosperity, so they were protecting their own tribal interests (Keenan, "Saints or Sinners" 79). Titokowaru's actions had endangered the Pākehā settlement which neighboured South Whanganui lands.

Yet the concern for tribal prosperity (rather than just his own) is not present in the novel, despite Te Keepa's present day reputation among his own people. "Today Te Keepa is still revered by Wanganui Maori as a great warrior chief" (Keenan, "Saints or Sinners" 79). Rather than use *Monday's Warriors* to further disrupt the status quo regarding allied Māori, Shadbolt instead presents the

perspective of Titokowaru's forces towards Kepa and his soldiers. While Shadbolt is providing a different perspective on allied Māori (by looking at them from an anti-Government view rather than pro-Government), he falls into the habits of the romances by leaving out the nuance in these characters.

The last Māori militia figure to appear in Shadbolt's novels is Tāmati Wāka Nene. Like Wahawaha, Wāka Nene features in *Boldrewood*, though his role is entirely as a non-combatant who has retired from fighting as the novel is set during the mid 1860s rather than 1840s during Wāka Nene's prime. Instead of serving as a Māori militia leader, he is a figure of benign authority in Māori lands. In *The House of Strife* the historical complexity of his character also lacks nuance and exists mostly as a genericised Maori leader allied with the Crown who is dismissive of imperial incompetence. "Nene wishes a triumph to show that British soldiers are not needed; that Maori is better fitted to vanquish Maori" (Shadbolt, *The House of Strife* 130). Wāka Nene is also dismissive of Heke saying for his impertinence Heke "must be made to eat turd" (Shadbolt, *The House of Strife* 135).

Though Wāka Nene is acknowledged as having ensured "that rebellious fellow Maori were treated fairly" (Shadbolt, *The House of Strife* 290), Shadbolt is downplaying Wāka Nene's role. He did not just intercede with Governor Grey on behalf of the followers, but on behalf of Kawiti and Heke as well (Crosby, *Kūpapa* 86). Yet Wāka Nene's role as a peace-maker is omitted from his character in the novel and instead is a benevolent victor. The historical characters of allied Māori within Shadbolt's novels are partially based upon historical account, but appear to have more in common with negative stereotyping of allied Māori that has persisted throughout representations of the New Zealand Wars.

Shadbolt's main point of difference in his depiction of historical figures relates to his representation of Māori leaders who resist colonial control. Te Kooti is the first of these, appearing in *Season of the Jew*. Within the novel Te Kooti is the threat that forces the colonial militia to enlist the aid of Ropata. Te Kooti's legacy, however, is even more complicated and controversial than Wahawaha's. Judith Binney writes: "There can be no single truth about such a man" (Binney 1). A former militia member, betrayed and imprisoned, turned leader and prophet, Te Kooti has a complicated and varied history.

Within Shadbolt's novel, Te Kooti is often referred to by his Anglicised name, Coates. He strikes up a friendship with Fairweather while both are in Auckland where Fairweather paints a portrait of Te Kooti. This initial friendship and affable nature shown by Te Kooti contrasts with the later hardened fugitive. The man's actions are tempered with the historically sympathetic motive. Te Kooti was wrongfully imprisoned by local enemies and transported to the Chatham Islands (much how the novel shows him). Even Pember Reeves, a definitively imperialist historian acknowledges this injustice.

The charge against him was that he was in communication with Hau-Hau insurgents in 1865. His real offense seems to have been that he was regarded by some of the Poverty Bay settlers as a disagreeable, thievish, disaffected fellow, and there is uncomfortable doubt as to whether he deserved his punishment (Reeves 220).

What the novel glosses over, however, is Te Kooti's position as a religious leader. While he was imprisoned, Te Kooti had a vision and following this experience became a prophet to many Māori; he then founded his own syncretic religion quite different from Pai Mārire, known as Ringatū. This faith, still practiced on the East

Coast and in Te Urewera was at the core of his influence and hence he is equally a figure of faith as much as of historical record.

Shadbolt, rather than delve into this particular aspect of Te Kooti and his faithful instead plays up the association the prophet drew with the Israelites: “Our work is Jehovah’s will” (Shadbolt, *Season of the Jew* 88). So Shadbolt maintains the motif of Jewish biblical history (particularly the flight of the Israelites) without delving into the differing practices and articles of faith that set Ringatū apart from earlier Abrahamic religions. As well as the tenets of Ringatū, Shadbolt also neglects detail on Te Kooti’s role as a prophet (despite this role as potentially part of Wahawaha’s motives in opposing him).

Te Kooti is shown as an affable, friendly, but still dangerous foe. He leaves a cordial message to Fairweather at the Smith house after he and his men ransack the homestead, rape Meriana and kill her brothers. “*I would have been better for the drinking of your liquor with you. We might have had one last and long korero*” (Shadbolt, *Season of the Jew* 225). Te Kooti’s friendly tone is maintained, even when giving warning about his intentions to retaliate against his pursuers and even signing the letter as “*from your enemy*”, the character still shows his belief that he and Fairweather are friends. His complicated relationship with Fairweather as a friend yet foe plays up much of the drama of the novel, as well as reinforcing Shadbolt’s attempt at presenting Fairweather as “neutral”.

For much of the narrative Shadbolt does attempt to paint Te Kooti sympathetically. Unfortunately, as noted by Ralph J. Crane, his “Fact and Further” post-script undoes much of his endeavour when he compares Te Kooti and his followers to the Khmer Rouge. “In a single sentence this alarming comparison, which equates Te Kooti with Pol Pot, does much to destroy Shadbolt’s attempt to reverse colonial hegemonic views of Te Kooti as evil” (Crane, “Tickling History”

66). In this regard, Te Kooti is less a post-colonial sympathetic antagonist (like Te Wheke in the 1983 film *Utū* which drew some inspiration from the man), but instead another stock Māori warrior antagonist from the romances. The Te Kooti evident here is still weighed down with much of the colonial baggage of the nineteenth century and beyond, showing that *Season of the Jew* is not a wholly post-colonial novel, but rather an attempt at one.

In contrast, Riwha Titokowaru, the Māori leader of *Monday's Warriors* is presented far more sympathetically than Te Kooti. Titokowaru's words, motivations, and his actions are clearly depicted. This clearer depiction is likely due to the source material the Shadbolt draws upon, so Titokowaru appears as a more well-rounded character. Through Bent it is possible to better understand Titokowaru and his motives. As Crane notes:

The relationship established between Shadbolt's mediocre hero, Bent, and his real hero, Titokowaru, leads to the latter using his adopted grandson as a means of revealing his thoughts ("Windows Onto History" 107).

Titokowaru can show what he is thinking through conversation with Bent, and hence the reader is better able to understand the character. The roundabout way of seeing Titokowaru is crucial as in this fashion

the reader is able to see into Titokowaru's mind without him losing any of his mystery or mana that might have been the result of too-ready access by the omniscient narrator (Crane, "Windows Onto History" 108).

Titokowaru treats Bent as his confidante, even using him as a sounding board for his ideas. "I have thoughts to think. I need a listener when I speak them" (Shadbolt, *Monday's Warriors* 110). Even following the war, Bent and Titokowaru were close. "Informal history says that when the old warrior leader lay dying he summoned his adopted grandson to his side" (Shadbolt, *Monday's Warriors* 306). This closeness

between the protagonist and the “real hero” of the novel provides insight into Titokowaru’s motives and why he was fighting in the manner which he chose. This insight is crucial as in the past Titokowaru’s War had been neglected by earlier record in favour of Te Kooti, as both were in conflict with the colonial government at approximately the same time.

Titokowaru first battled the New Zealand Government alongside other Pai Mārire groups in 1865 and then fought what is called Titokowaru’s War in ‘68-’69, while Te Kooti was exiled in ’65, returning and pursued from ’68 to 1871. Belich comments on Titokowaru that “his enemies found his victories so stunning and so humiliating that they paid him the ultimate compliment of forgetting him, as a child does a nightmare” (*The New Zealand Wars* 235). This historical neglect was a motivation in Belich’s history of Riwia Titokowaru, and so Shadbolt is also serving to present a man who had previously been side-lined in representations of the New Zealand Wars.

The last novel in the trilogy, *The House of Strife*, features two significant chiefs resisting colonial rule, Hone Heke and Kawiti. Hone Heke Pokai, to give his full name, is a well-known chief from the Ngāpuhi. As Danny Keenan states “He’s the one who had the British flagpole cut down – and not once, but four times” (Keenan, “Hone Heke” 83). A leader who garnered a reputation fighting in his father in laws armies during the Musket Wars, Heke was also “one of the first Maori to go to an Anglican mission school” (Keenan, “Hone Heke” 84). Like Shadbolt’s other Māori resisting colonial government, Heke is literate and well educated, quite different from some of the historical romance equivalents.

Where Shadbolt changes his character though, is that Heke is a bit farcical. He is shown as being almost deluded with his faith and ego. For instance he is obsessed with his reputation and the story he will leave behind. “What are we, if

not our stories?” (Shadbolt *The House of Strife* 55). This desire for a legacy does have some merit, as he was also the first chief to sign the Treaty of Waitangi. Keenan states “he was a man who liked the limelight” (“Hone Heke” 85), though the novel pushes this desire for limelight to exaggeration. At one point Heke is described as having made an “unworldly fool of himself in war” (Shadbolt *The House of Strife* 179). This selective representation of Heke, accentuating his negative attributes makes Heke as much a deconstruction of Shadbolt’s previous sophisticated chiefs as a contrast to the historical romance characters.

Like Crane, Lawrence Jones states that Shadbolt was deliberately selective with which histories he drew from to develop his narrative. As stated earlier, Shadbolt

accepts Maning’s story that Heke had temporarily deserted the fortified pa for a Sunday prayer meeting rather than Belich’s view that he and Kawiti were laying an ambush because the irony of the Christian Heke holding a worship service while the nominally Christian English troops invade his fortifications serves his purpose (Jones, “Out of the Rut and Into the Swamp 30).

The irony is what drew Shadbolt and in his effort to present a constructed history, unfortunately Heke must come off as the clown (at least as much of a clown as the British officers) to make a point.

If Heke is the clownish character in an ironic comedy, then Kawiti plays the role of the straight man. Kawiti is a leader who, militarily, had a far greater influence upon Māori warfare than any other in the nineteenth century. Kawiti was the architect of the pā at Ōhaeawai. “In terms of construction, Ōhaeawai was the model of all future Maori defensive systems—the prototype of what we call the modern pa” (Belich, *The New Zealand Wars* 49). Kawiti was a chief who adapted

to the rapidly changing military world around him. It is disheartening to see that Shadbolt depicts Kawiti as a throw-back to the Musket Wars of the early nineteenth century.

Compared to Heke's desire to be seen a noble hero, Kawiti just gets on with the fighting. Shadbolt depicts his actions as tactical and ruthless. "The wretches are killing colonist livestock, and then looting and firing barns and dwellings" (Shadbolt, *The House of Strife* 96). For Kawiti this is a war to eliminate European presence within Northland, not one to win over the people to his cause. In a parallel to some of the villains of the historical romances, Kawiti "had in his entourage his favoured pagan priest or tohunga, an aged soothsayer whose talents had been little tried for a decade" (Shadbolt, *The House of Strife* 101). The inclusion of a tohunga as part of his army and implications of pre-contact religion (described as pagan) demonises Kawiti in the same manner that the tohunga of *The Greenstone Door* are demonised. This portrayal in the novel is unfair to Kawiti, however, as during the war "he too sought to protect the settlers and to prevent the looting of anything other than abandoned property" (Belich, *The New Zealand Wars* 32). Kawiti was the experienced warrior to Heke's younger, the former giving focus to the latter's energy. Kawiti was also less of a throwback, and more of an old soldier who was able to adapt to a changing environment.

In *The House of Strife* the two play off one another in the narrative, Kawiti does not understand the new world that they live in and Heke is too blind by ego and faith to see the reality of war in front of him. When they are not too busy squabbling with one another, the two of them face off against equally incompetent foes in the British army like Major Cyprian and Colonel Despard, who simultaneously underestimate their foes and overestimate their own competence.

For all of the criticism that can be thrown at the comic duo of Heke and Kawiti, they are still better developed than the anachronistic anthropophage chiefs of Verne and Satchell, and have more personality than Satchell's tohunga or Boldrewood's Ngarara. The bond between Shadbolt's protagonists and the Māori who resist colonial rule give them a depth not apparent in the New Zealand Wars historical romances. Each has a distinct motivation inspired by their history. Te Kooti and the injustice visited upon him and Titokowaru's desire to protect his people by any means necessary have their grounding in history but also make them more sympathetic compared to the historical romances. Even so, while Heke's egomaniac desire for glory has some justification, I feel Shadbolt has played up this aspect of his nature too much and he comes across as slightly pathetic.

Finally a Māori Perspective

Shadbolt, for all of his play with historical narrative, is still bound up in the colonial tradition of the historical romances. Ihimaera has no such restrictions on his writing, nor adherence to established tradition. As mentioned earlier, Witi Ihimaera represents a point of change in the representation of the New Zealand Wars, and more importantly, the Land Wars. The point of change comes roughly a decade after one of the most significant literary movements in Aotearoa New Zealand, the Māori Renaissance.

The flourishing of Māori artistic, cultural, and political expression that began in the 1970s has since become known as the Māori Renaissance. During this time a significant body of fiction written in English by Māori novelists such as Patricia Grace, Keri Hulme, and Witi Ihimaera began to emerge. The appearance of these works heralded a significant shift in New Zealand's literary tradition, from its Eurocentric foundations to a

postcolonial perspective that privileges the “insider” or indigenous point of view” (Romaine 32).

The change in perspective offers new and differing insights into the New Zealand Wars, the divergences from established tradition in these novels such as the historical romance and the typical stock characters are more marked than Shadbolt’s tentative forays.

Ihimaera is Aotearoa New Zealand’s first Māori novelist, as well as the first to directly write about the Land Wars in the form of a novel. The appearance of a Māori voice in novels engaging with the New Zealand Wars over one hundred and twenty years after *Taranaki: A Tale of War* is striking when in the nineteenth century literacy amongst Māori was “a skill associated with considerable mana” (Anderson, Binney and Harris 196). Ihimaera expands on a conversation about the New Zealand Wars that previously had been dominated by European and Pākehā voices (particularly Pākehā men). Ihimaera’s critique of colonisation has parallels with Satchell and Shadbolt. His “principle target is not so much the colonizer, symbol of imperial authority” (Wilson 175). Instead, like Satchell and Shadbolt he takes aim at the white settlers. As they are a “local representative of such authority and its ideology” (Wilson 175).

As introduced earlier, Ihimaera’s works cannot rightly be termed New Zealand Wars novels, as they do not focus on the conflicts as resolved issues set within the past. Instead his works concern themselves with the Land Wars, the persistent struggle by Māori over the possession of the land.

The Matriarch probes from a Māori perspective the causes of Māori alienation and dispossession from their land, in the belief that past historical injustices must be acknowledged before they can be resolved. Yet in

traditional Pākehā histories this past is nonexistent, forgotten, or written over. So the past, like the land, constitutes contested ground (Romaine 32). This contested ground is particularly apparent in *The Matriarch* given the historical context of Māori activism at the time. The Māori struggle over the land is encapsulated in the title for Ranginui Walker's history *Ka Whawhai Tonu Matou Struggle Without End*, particularly pertinent given the close time frame in which the two were coming to the public attention in Aotearoa New Zealand. Ihimaera's novels are both initially set within the present and look back to the past. They contextualise the past and how it affects both Māori and New Zealand society as a whole in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. In *The Matriarch*, Tama, while investigating and remembering the life of his grandmother Riripeti (Artemis) Mahana, is also a vehicle to relate the struggle and conflict over the land, a struggle which his family have a long history, from his ancestor Wi Pere, to his grandmother, to himself: "The time has come to tell you of your ancestor, Wi Pere and his mother, Riria Mauaranui the chieftainess. In many ways their relationship and ours are similar" (Ihimaera, *The Matriarch* 343). The Land Wars are a clearer image than the New Zealand Wars which only occupy a single chapter.

Sleeps Standing, while more detailed in its depiction of the New Zealand Wars, also concerns itself with issues of the Land Wars, though it does so in a different fashion. Simon, the Māori-Australian who has come to his extended family to learn about an ancestor, is indicative of many contemporary Māori. In the twenty-first century many Māori live far from their ancestral lands, in many cases Australia, leaving for economic reasons and becoming disconnected with their own history. "The 2011 Australian Census indicated there were over 100,000 people of Māori ancestry living in Australia" (Statistics New Zealand). At the same time,

Ihimaera uses this character as a device to relate the history of the New Zealand Wars to someone who is unaware.

This ignorance of history is another legacy of the Land Wars. As I mentioned in the Introduction, there is an underlying discrepancy of land and memory, one side taking most of the land and the other left with the memory. *Sleeps Standing* concerns itself with the sharing of memory, collective remembrance and commemoration. The narrative also focuses on a particular detail about Ōrākau that is often forgotten by Pākehā, that Ngati Maniapoto and Waikato-Tainui were not the only Māori fighting at the pā. *Sleeps Standing* concentrates on remembering the past and the connection to ancestral identity, issues that are still present in contemporary Aotearoa New Zealand.

Ihimaera's works are constructed in a style akin to the recounting of oral history, but are not transcriptions of oral histories themselves. Rather, they are a kind of oralised historical fiction. This orality is not just in the form of a first person narrator. *The Matriarch* opens with Tama's grandmother "telling him of his ancestry, his whakapapa" (Ihimaera, *The Matriarch* 8). There are other narratives as well: "E mokopuna, listen to the Song of Te Kooti. You will learn in the listening why you have to hate and, then, why you have to learn to forgive" (Ihimaera, *The Matriarch* 147). This orality in a novel is relatively common among Pacific writers. As noted by Michelle Keown, the writers base their narratives on the "rhythms and patterns of their respective oral traditions" (172). Ihimaera utilises "use of multiple narrators...approximating the Māori tradition of whaikōrero or speech making, in which different orators take turns to offer individual perspectives on a topic of discussion (172). This particular orality is present in both *The Matriarch* and *Sleeps Standing*, the history is being recounted back to either a character or the reader by a narrator.

In *The Matriarch* the story is narrated by Tama back to the reader, while simultaneously Tama has events recounted to him such as by his historian friend Laurence, by his family members, as well as by the eponymous Matriarch, Riripeti. In *Sleeps Standing*, the young Māori-Australian Simon has the story of his ancestor recounted to him by Rua and Hūhana. This postmodern approach is completely different to prior novels. Fox notes that

the coexistence of multiple perspectives, multiple plots, multiple voices, and multiple tonal and generic modes allows the two cultures to be mutually interrogated in terms of their respective value systems and aspirations (cultural, economic, and political) (Fox, “Hybridity and Indigeneity” 100).

While some writers such as Wiśniowski used a narrator speaking from the past, this narrator is recounting their own story. Ihimaera instead has a descendant recount the stories of their tūpuna to another descendant. The speaker is a character temporally distant from the events being recounted. Yet, at the same time, they are still feeling the effects of the event. The orality of Ihimaera’s work projects the issues and aftermath of the New Zealand Wars and confronts the issues of the Land Wars, particularly in *The Matriarch*, which also recounts historical struggles for Māori rights and disenfranchisement from the land.

Ihimaera does not limit himself to just presenting the novels in the style of oral fiction, however, as he draws upon the tradition itself. As Simon Perris notes regarding *The Matriarch*:

It goes without saying that Maori oral literature is pre-eminent among the grab-bag of sources which Ihimaera ransacks. Moreover, oral hypotexts offer a new window on Ihimaera's revisions by foregrounding differences between alternative conceptions of narrative and of literature (88).

Ihimaera's writing further contextualises the Land Wars and the constant struggle of Māori following colonisation to retain their own land. He makes use of Māori oral histories telling events which occurred prior to contact with Europeans. Romain writes that "It was a commonplace of early New Zealand history and literature that the country had no past before Europeans arrived" (36). This inclusion of Māori history prior to European arrival and British occupation as well as Māori accounts that were not included in earlier written histories sets *The Matriarch's* main purpose of questioning the established historical narratives and presenting alternatives. Ihimaera challenges the status quo, this challenge particularly evident in Nelson Wattie's comment that "*The Matriarch* has no neutral figure as in the Scott tradition" ("The New Zealand Wars" 436). There is equally no neutral figure in *Sleeps Standing*; in Ihimaera's work the historical romance has clearly been rejected for a different approach.

Ihimaera also makes the addition of Greek mythology and Italian Opera in *The Matriarch*, in this regard he constructs an internationalising of identity, that Māori can be compared to European culture as

many Pacific writers (such as [Patricia] Grace and [Albert] Wendt) have experimented with synthesizing aspects of Pacific and Western mythologies and ontologies, exploring the syncretic nature of postcolonial subjectivities (Keown 183).

Riripeti, in particular, has an affection for European cultural imports. Tama speaks of her knowledge of Italian swordplay, European music, and encouraging these arts with him: "Riripeti had given me a piano when I was a boy" (Ihimaera, *The Matriarch* 256). The syncretising of ideas and intertexts also speaks to a contemporary audience. What Ihimaera writes is not Māori culture as it was, but a

more contemporary understanding of Māori and other Pacific peoples who were born and live in Aotearoa New Zealand.

Many colonised peoples in the present day do not learn in an environment of just their own culture but also with influences of the dominant colonial culture and possibly the influences of other minorities.

Ihimaera is also writing for a generation of young Māori who, along with increasing numbers of indigenous Pacific peoples, learn their traditions from books written in European languages rather than by oral instruction from their elders in their native tongues. The matriarch laments that she cannot teach her grandson according to the old ways because their houses of learning have been destroyed by the Pākehā and their religion (Romaine 42).

In this regard, Ihimaera's novels are as much concerned with the contemporary reality of Māori as they are with the past. The novel opens "act one" by grounding itself in the mid-twentieth century: "It was July, 1974" (Ihimaera, *The Matriarch* 15). The novel is situated at the time when Ranginui Walker is writing in *The Listener*, Ngā Tamatoa have presented their petition to parliament for te reo Māori to be taught in schools, and a year later Dame Whina Cooper's Land Hikoi begins. This concern with the contemporary reality of Māori and how they have been affected by the consequences of the New Zealand Wars is what makes his novel a Land Wars novel.

Ihimaera's blending of cultures and ideas does not end with the literary and educational associations, however. Ihimaera is just as concerned with language. Many sections of *The Matriarch* feature untranslated dialogue in te reo Māori. As Joanne Tompkins writes:

Generally, the Maori words and phrases, although not directly translated, are contextualized enough to provide a sense of the meaning. There are no glossaries or literal translations in any of Ihimaera's texts, yet the perceptive reader can easily decipher them (493).

In this regard the novel challenges the reader to accept te reo Māori as a matter of course. *The Matriarch* normalises te reo Māori as something a reader should be aware of as it is the first recorded language spoken in Aotearoa. In comparison, *Sleeps Standing* is a fully bilingual novel. Each page is written in Māori on the left with an English translation on the right, while the English translation still makes use of a number of Māori terms and phrases in the same manner as *The Matriarch*.

The equal status given to the languages is significant, particularly as the 1987 Maori Language Act which granted te reo Māori official language status in Aotearoa was only put into law a year after *The Matriarch*'s first publication. Unlike its predecessor, *Sleeps Standing* does not endeavour to challenge the reader, but rather gives equal status to two of New Zealand's three official languages.⁸ The novels are signifiers of the second aspect of the Land Wars championed by various activist groups in the 1970s and 80s, in particular Nga Tama Toa, the revival of te reo Māori.

The Māori language had suffered under colonisation, with children punished for speaking it in schools, and had no official status until comparatively recently. It was only with the 1981 establishment of the kohanga reo, schools which taught in te reo Māori, that a revival of the language began (Walker, *Ka Whawhai Tonu Matou* 238). The reclaiming of the language and the open display of it on the page marks the transition. *The Matriarch* was published at a time when te reo Māori was still fighting for acknowledgement, whereas *Sleeps Standing* was published at

⁸ The third language being New Zealand Sign Language (NZSL)

a time when Māori is an official language and has found a more open incorporation into every day New Zealand English. The struggle over language is not central to either of Ihimaera's novels, but is addressed later chapter in Chapter Five.

Ihimaera's status as a Māori writer does not mean that his perspective is a pan-Māori perspective, nor even a wholly East Coast perspective (as that is where he is from). Māori history is filled with nuance and a persistent engagement with different perspectives.

The Māori world is not monolithic any more than the Pākehā world is. The Māori world, at least as it is portrayed in *The Matriarch*, encompasses several worlds, and the tension between them is part of the novel's problematic (Romaine 46).

Ihimaera is presenting a fictionalised perspective, which is an important qualifier. While his interpretation of the New Zealand Wars is the only one from a Māori novelist thus far, it does not mean that he speaks for all Māori when he writes, just as no Pākehā novelist speaks for all Pākehā with their representation of the New Zealand Wars.

Historical figures have an ambiguous position for Ihimaera. In *The Matriarch*, while there is much said about Te Kooti and Wi Pere, it is in the form of their stories told. They are described by either Tama or Riripeti, and their actions are presented, though they are barely featured as characters with dialogue. This is an effect of the oralised narrative being present throughout, and not solely as a framing device. Tama at one point says to Wi Pere: "I apologise for keeping you waiting, my ancestor" (Ihimaera, *The Matriarch* 333). The voice of historical figures appears instead in their writings, which are liberally quoted such as Te Kooti's letter to the Governor Grey from page 192 to page 195, and Wi Pere's letter to *The Gisborne Times* from page 334 to 341 of the novel. Since Tama and Riripeti

are telling the stories of these men, as much time is spent discussing and justifying the actions of people like Wi Pere and Te Kooti as in depicting them.

In *Sleeps Standing*, however, a significant historical figure does emerge as a character and is arguably one of the most famous historic Māori leaders, Rewi Manga Maniapoto. As the novel's te reo Māori translator Hēmi Kelly states:

It's one thing to be a leader of a tribe...but it's another to be able to call on other tribes—or have tribes turn up asked or not — because of who you are or what you represent (11).

Rewi appears in detail as a leader in *Sleeps Standing*. He gives clear and direct orders on the battlements of the pā, but is also a kind and supportive leader, openly acknowledging the efforts of Moetū, telling his men “the boy is showing you all up” (Ihimaera, *Sleeps Standing* 71). He even listens to Moetū's and Paerata's suggestion of letting the children assist with carrying water and ammunition.

Rewi's actions are not confined to the battlefield either. He shows further kindness in helping to reunite Moetū with his lover Kararaina after they lost one another in the retreat from Ōrākau.

This girl is a gift from my people to your people...for him, *Sleeps Standing*, for his service to my people. She comes of her own volition, as well as the tribe's (Ihimaera, *Sleeps Standing* 155).

The paternal nature that he shows to Moetū is not unlike Cedric Tregarthen's relationship with Governor George Grey in *The Greenstone Door*. Both men try to help and support the young protagonist, act as a figure of admiration, and have a hand in the protagonist's courtship of a young woman to whom the mentor has a tie. While Rewi has appeared in fiction previously, most of his appearances were cameos at best. Even the film *Rewi's Last Stand* (1940), which will be discussed more in the next chapter, does not provide him with much of a role, in fact Governor

George Grey has more dialogue. In this novella however, while Moetū is the protagonist, an Rewi arguably is the real hero, much like Riwaha Titokowaru in *Monday's Warriors*. Unlike his prior depiction of Te Kooti, Ihimaera does not need to rationalise or justify Rewi Maniapoto's actions in this story, he can appear as he was, a veteran war leader fighting to protect those under his command as best he could.

Sleeps Standing also features an in depth historiography of appendices. These appendices are not the simple historical notes that are included in historical fiction by writers such as Phillipa Gregory, Bernard Cornwell and even Maurice Shadbolt, Ihimaera includes a wide variety of accounts that form his source material. Transcriptions of historic accounts by Hītiri Te Paerata, Te Huia Raureti, Paitini Wī Tāpeka, Poupatate Te Huihi and Rewi Manga Maniapoto himself all appear in Ihimaera and Kelly's appendix.

Ihimaera comments that research is “a crucial methodology in my work and, in particular, locating the Māori voice within the historical text” (Ihimaera *Sleeps Standing* 167). These first-hand recorded oral accounts allow Ihimaera to include a greater level of detail on the battle than would normally be present.

Even though three come in English translation, they offer Māori perspectives, views from inside a Māori world on a particular encounter in which the Māori point of view has not always been taken (Ihimaera, *Sleeps Standing* 167).

In addition to these oral history accounts (some of which are solely in te reo), there are a number of photos of survivors of Ōrākau taken some years later. Furthermore there are photos and other famous images of key figures present at Ōrākau, Lieutenant General Duncan Cameron, Brigadier General Carey, Captain (later Major) Gustavus von Tempsky, and Lieutenant (later Major) William Gilbert Mair.

The inclusion of this material presents the novella not only as a story but, as Kelly noted, a commemoration of Ōrākau. This inclusion of sources redeems some of the controversy Ihimaera faced with the publication of the *Matriarch* where he neglected to acknowledge text written by Keith Sorrenson which was included in the novel (*Somerset*). While Shadbolt has a strong engagement with historical notes in his earlier novels, *Sleeps Standing* has more detail than any of other representation in this thesis. It is a novella that proudly declares what it is showing and where the influences are drawn.

In contrast to Shadbolt and earlier New Zealand Wars novelists (except Stringfellow), Ihimaera is also more progressive with his depiction of Māori women. This is more apparent in his revised version of *The Matriarch* than in its earlier edition as discussed by Simon Perris (85). Not only is Riripeti a character given a role outside of her relationship with her immediate family, but she is a strong campaigner for Māori rights, has travelled abroad, is fluent in foreign languages, is a spiritual leader within the Ringatū faith, and a leader to her people. Tama's mother, Tiana is developed as an independent woman and is courageous enough to also stand up to Riripeti as well as to the men in her own family: "Like her ancient ancestors my mother was never afraid to engage anybody in batte—even my grandmother Riripeti, the matriarch" (Ihimaera, *The Matriarch* 223). These are not the passive and hyper sexualised Māori women evident in the New Zealand Wars romances or in the descendent works by Shadbolt. The female characters have mana and are not disposable or interchangeable.

Ihimaera continues his array of powerful Māori women in *Sleeps Standing*. The novel hosts an array of strong independent Māori women, Whetū, the crack markswoman, her sister Kararaina who would help her with reloading and guards the children, as well as the historical Ahumai Te Paerata who "became as well

known as Rewi for her sterling leadership during the siege” (Ihimaera, *Sleeps Standing* 75). These women stand out from many earlier portrayals of Māori women in representations of the New Zealand Wars, especially Whetū as in the past many historians (particularly Pākehā historians) have paid little attention to fighting women. Typically Māori women are only described as a supporting presence loading guns, tending to wounded, and passing around water, never as direct combatants. This clearly visible toa wahine is a far cry from Shadbolt only making a passing mention of them in *Monday’s Warriors*. Whetū is not just a woman with a musket, she is a crack-shot, a fighter with some skill. This level of visibility and acknowledgement of Māori women who fought beside the men is an important paradigm shift.

The tone of Ihimaera’s two novels are very distinct. *The Matriarch* is written from a place of anger, contextualised by the activism of the 1970s and 1980s. As Ihimaera states, “*The Matriarch* reflects my own personal involvement in the tumultuous years of Maori protest during the 1970s” (*The Matriarch* 497). The novel looks to be defiant. This tone is understandable as Ihimaera also says of his time in the period: “I marched, gave speeches and was banned from Parliament Grounds for interrupting the business of Parliament” (*The Matriarch* 497). This is a novel written to provoke and to confront. In particular this marks Ihimaera’s treatment of Te Kooti.

For a century and a half, Te Kooti was the bogeyman of the New Zealand Wars. He has been depicted several times in literature and (as I discuss in Chapter Four) had his name tied to a feature film in the 1920s. Ihimaera acknowledges and rationalises the acts of Te Kooti as understandable and necessary.

Just as God had done unto the Egyptians when they would not let his people go, by sending death to the first born of the Egyptians during the time of

Moses, so did the prophet do to the Pakeha because they would not let the Maori nation go (Ihimaera, *The Matriarch* 168).

Ihimaera is clear and up front with his depiction of Te Kooti's actions. Ihimaera takes the radical position of siding with the prophet. As Wattie states:

The narrator sympathises with him and even blends his thoughts with his own; the Matriarch sings in praise of his actions; and the thoughts and feelings of Biggs are presented with ironic distance (Wattie, "The New Zealand Wars" 443).

Ihimaera's tone clearly expresses that for change and justice to be served radical action must be taken. He openly aligns his views with Te Kooti's and through Riripeti praises his retaliation. The biblical comparison to the plight of the Israelites and the confrontation with the Pharaoh of Egypt with Te Kooti and his followers offers legitimacy to the prophet's actions. This is an open challenge to the Pākehā hegemony which had spent the past century demonising Te Kooti.

Sleeps Standing is quite different in tone. Rather than a confrontational challenge, it is instead a celebration and commemoration of the heroism of the Ngāti Maniapoto and their allies at Ōrākau. As Hēmi Kelly notes:

It has also been written and published to acknowledge the extraordinary decision, supported by the Crown in 2016 and enacted in 2017, to honour the New Zealand Wars with future commemorative events (11).

The novella shows the change in perspective over the course of three decades. The New Zealand Wars are not something that Ihimaera (and Kelly) feel needs to be fought over for acknowledgement, but something to commemorate. While the issues of the Land Wars are still ongoing, the tone of this work implies progress is being made.

The Points of Difference

The points of difference between the two authors and their approaches merits further comparative analysis. As I mentioned earlier, Shadbolt and Ihimaera have been compared in the past by Nelson Wattie in his article “The New Zealand Wars in Literature.” Wattie’s analysis focuses primarily on the protagonists’ lack of neutrality and does not engage too heavily with the historicity of Te Kooti’s attack on Matawhero. With the publication of *Sleeps Standing*, there is also further comparison that can be drawn between Shadbolt and Ihimaera at Ōrākau.

Several major historical events are depicted in *Season of the Jew*, the Waikato Invasion, Te Kooti’s attack on Matawhero, and the Siege of Ngātapa. Among the different events, the Waikato chapters are the most out of place, as they occur in the opening chapters of the novel and are chronologically separated from the other chapters by five years. The chapters with their time difference and establishment of characters early on act as a kind of prologue.

Fairweather’s initial service in the imperial army is presented, along with his disillusionment and resignation, as is his initial acquaintance with Te Kooti and Meriana Smith. Ken Arvidson states:

The Waikato scenes serve a number of purposes, composed as they are of minutely researched details concerning two of the heaviest of all the battles fought between Pakeha and Maori in the entire New Zealand Wars, the battle of Rangiriri and the battle of Orakau. These scenes establish rapidly the wartime milieu of the novel, and Fairweather’s character emerges as that of a man of action, and one of very independent judgement and liberal moral perspective in the nineteenth-century context (Arvidson 115-6).

The second of the two opening chapters details the Battle of Ōrākau. Though it is not openly named, enough details are given to recognise the event. It includes a three day siege and a response of continued resistance to calls for surrender and safe passage for women and children.

This chapter solely presents the views imperial soldiers of the 65th regiment besieging the pā (one of several groups). Shadbolt does not shy from the brutality inflicted on retreating Māori from Ōrākau by the British soldiers.

A limping Maori woman, too weak to evade the onrush, took a thrust to the neck. Fairweather grabbed for her killer and found a man of his own platoon. It didn't delay him in felling the man. 'You said they called us turd, sir,' the creature whined.

'And now we are,' Fairweather said bitterly (Shadbolt, *Season of the Jew* 29).

The actions of Fairweather's fellows as shown here gives Shadbolt the opportunity to present Fairweather's disillusionment with the British Army and to give justification for his initial resistance to later joining the militia.

It is a significant omission that while Shadbolt makes mention of the 18th, the 40th, and the 65th and their presence at Ōrākau as well as pursuit and killing of Māori that retreated, he neglects to mention the Forest Rangers. This group were also present at the battle and also contributed to the killing of fleeing men, women and children. Belich notes "the fast-moving Forest Rangers—did considerable execution" (*The New Zealand Wars* 172). It is interesting that while Shadbolt depicts the brutality of the imperial soldiers and references the bloodthirsty nature of the settlers, he did not pass similar judgement on one of the worst groups, the

unit of Gustavus von Tempsky, even neglecting to mention the presence of the Rangers.

The purpose of these chapters enables Shadbolt to justify the different perspective that Fairweather has compared to his fellow settlers. The first two chapters establish the imperial point of view, from which General Cameron's men regard the Maori forces with professional sympathy and view the colonists with contempt as unscrupulous land grabbers (Arvidson 118). In this regard Cameron is shown as believing he has a messy, awful job but prefers it to the alternative of letting the settlers act as they wish.

With enough hell-raisers dead, other Maoris will lead healthier lives. Leave it to the colonists and God knows what might ensue. You have heard of the Tasmanian aborigines? Their fate? (Shadbolt, *Season of the Jew* 31-32).

The reference to the genocide of Aboriginal Tasmanians sets up the disillusionment that Imperial soldiers such as Fairweather and Cameron hold towards the more ruthless settlers. Their actions, while devastating towards Māori are considered better than the alternative of letting the settlers take charge. The chapters also allow Shadbolt to foreshadow the later command of Colonel G. S. Whitmore, as he too was present in the Waikato and appears at the end of the chapter. This chapter also makes reference to the Tūhoe present at Ōrākau, fighting as allies of the Ngāti Maniapoto. This allows Shadbolt to foreshadow their alliance with Te Kooti later in the novel. Apart from the off-handed reference to the Tūhoe presence at Ōrākau, however, little else is noted.

Ihimaera is far more detailed with his representation of Ōrākau, which is understandable as it forms the core of his novella, as opposed to serving as a prologue. He is also very clear about the ethics of historical narratives. From the outset, Rua, the narrator, states:

Ngāti Maniapoto have the primary right to tell the story of Ōrākau. Others think they can tell it; historians trample all over their right, and some accounts are despicable to the memory of the dead. Our family story intersects with Ngāti Maniapoto's history, but is only enhanced by it (Ihimaera, *Sleeps Standing* 87).

Ihimaera acknowledges that his narrative is subject to the Ngāti Maniapoto account as Ōrākau is principally their story, though other tribes were involved in the defence of the pā. Ihimaera's account of Ōrākau differs from previous representations of the battle. Many accounts the action take place outside of the pā rather than inside. Most accounts are from the perspectives of adults and generally men. This is the case with *The Greenstone Door*, *Season of the Jew*, and *War to the Knife*. For the story to be told from the perspective of a rangatahi (a young person) is a marked difference. Another difference is the willingness to depict women as skilled and active combatants (as noted earlier with Whetū).

Ihimaera, as noted regarding his historical sources, looks at ensuring his details for events at Ōrākau are accurate. He notes the presence of the 40th regiment, the Forest Rangers, the 65th and Waikato militia under their respective commanding officers. He also states the positioning of the different iwi operating under their tribal leadership. "Ngāti Maniapoto defended the southeast; the Urewera the southwest and part of the west flank; Ngāti Raukawa, Ngāti Te Kohera and Ngāti Tūwharetoa the northwest" (Ihimaera, *Sleeps Standing* 67). This is a crucial point as the presence of other tribes at Ōrākau with Ngāti Maniapoto and Waikato-Tainui is often omitted, particularly in *The Greenstone Door* and *War to the Knife*. Also while Shadbolt makes mention of Tūhoe at the battle, he omits the other tribes.

Details of the siege such as the three days, the waters and ammunition shortage, and the cry of "Ka whawhai tonu matou, ake ake ake!" are commonly

included in the many representations of Ōrākau. However Ihimaera's inclusions mark his representation of Ōrākau as distinct from the previous Pākehā-centric versions of the battle. Like Shadbolt, Ihimaera also clearly depicts the attack on people fleeing the pā. Though, unlike Shadbolt, Ihimaera clearly states among the soldiers engaging in the pursuit are the Forest Rangers. This is particularly apparent with their pursuit of the women and children led by Moetū. "The Rangers were riding full gallop, sabres drawn, their pistols thundering" (Ihimaera, *Sleeps Standing* 135).

Ihimaera does not focus quite as heavily on the actions of the warriors battling the soldiers in the novella, however, instead the focus is on Moetū at Ōrākau and his role in protecting the children and later returning them to their respective whanau. Ōrākau is where the story takes place, but the novel is not about a rangatahi fighting and killing Pākehā, it is instead about children and the importance of safeguarding the future. The importance of children and the next generation is particularly apparent in the narrative frame where Rua relates the story to Simon. The narrative presses the point further as Simon's partner is pregnant and they wish to pass Moetū's name on to their child. This novella is about continuation and maintaining the histories of the New Zealand Wars, ensuring that the next generation is able to pass the knowledge on. This is a significant difference between Ihimaera and Shadbolt, where Shadbolt treats Ōrākau as a past event (even within *Season of the Jew*), Ihimaera presents a contemporary link to the battle and why it is so important to remember (especially for the iwi present).

As Arvidson states, Ōrākau was one of the heaviest battles in the entirety of the New Zealand Wars. The nature of the warfare in the Waikato was on a different scale with different levels of resources (on either side) compared to the later conflicts. While the war within the Waikato had one set of rules and form, the

pursuit of Te Kooti was to be a very different conflict entirely. Furthermore, it occurs at a time when the nature of the New Zealand Wars had changed drastically.

A key historical point on this matter is that imperial soldiers were only active in Aotearoa New Zealand until 1867 (and by this stage in a much reduced capacity). The efforts of Governor Grey to bring the soldiers to the colony had ceased, by 1868 all Government military action was performed by armed constabulary and militia. The next point is geographical, during the Waikato campaign, the soldiers had access to secure supply lines and easy transportation due to gunboats controlling the Waikato River. The later conflicts would often take place in arenas lacking such resource, as well as much reduced manpower relying instead on part-time soldiers rather than professionals. The massive technological and personnel advantages of the earlier years had been much reduced.

Te Kooti's attack on Matawhero has been given several names, the Matawhero Massacre, the Poverty Bay Massacre, the Matawhero Raid, and Te Kooti's Retaliation. Today it has a memorial on the edges of present-day Gisborne, showing local acknowledgement of the event. This event has had different perspectives applied to it and the motives of the perpetrators.

Shadbolt presents the attack as one of simple revenge for Te Kooti's wrongful imprisonment and exile to the Chatham Islands. Judith Binney presents a different argument:

Te Kooti had owned land in Poverty Bay. Its importance to him can be seen from the way he became involved in two separate disputes about adjoining pieces of land there. They were both at Matawhero, where it has been assumed in the historical dialogue that he had no particular claims. But it was there that the violation of his and his family's rights was most manifest. It is no accident that the only people to be killed in the November attack

were those living on land at Matawhero which Te Kooti could properly consider his own (Binney 106).

Shadbolt admits Te Kooti had ties to the area, but does not use such information in his novel, likely as he has admitted to altering history to better suit narrative convenience. The attack is treated as a devastating massacre and shown as indiscriminate. Shadbolt mentions the homesteads that were attacked, and the details of the people who were killed. Yet he treats them as more attacks of convenience.

Kooti is much more concerned with making himself felt on the land hereabouts. So that no colonist can feel safe. The port would be a shabby prize and irrelevant. Land is the thing (Shadbolt, *Season of the Jew* 216).

This reductive statement implies Shadbolt depicts Te Kooti as attacking for the sake of panic, that there was no other meaning to why he attacked where he did.

In contrast, Binney notes that “Te Rakiroa, who was with the kokiri, also said that Te Kooti had himself stated precisely ‘who were to be killed’” (Binney 120). Monty Soutar provides further comment that the killing of Biggs, the officer in charge at Matawhero was restitution for his own summary execution of the chief Pīta Tamaturi when the rangatira was taken prisoner in 1865 (Soutar 309). The attack was therefore far more precise than what Shadbolt claims with the novel. It is of further note that *Season of the Jew* only shows the aftermath of the attack, Fairweather is away from Matawhero when it takes place, so he can only experience the aftershock of the event . This presents a more historicised “after the fact” depiction of the attack. Shadbolt does not try to reconstruct what took place, but instead lean on the historical record and shows what happened instead of how or why it happened.

An important consideration in Shadbolt's favour, however, is that he does make sure to show Te Kooti's attack was not limited to Pākehā settlers.

It has usually been forgotten that the attack was not solely directed at the European families at Matawhero. Te Kooti himself said that 18 Maori chiefs were killed at Turanga, and this seems to be the most accurate statement. All in all, probably 22 Maori were deliberately killed. This figure is lower than some recent revisionist accounts have suggested. The Maori deaths were specifically selected and were no more random than those of the Europeans (Binney 121).

While Shadbolt does not outright depict these deaths (outside of the fictional Smith family), the fact that he acknowledges Māori targets of the attack does speak to his credit. It is not uncommon for the focus of Te Kooti's attack to solely dwell on the fate of the Pākehā settlers and to wholly neglect the Māori who were also affected. William Pember Reeves for instance only mentions a Māori chief being killed for protecting fleeing Pākehā (Reeves 221). In this regard, at least, Shadbolt is reassessing the historical record, though he still deliberately limits the Māori targets of the attack to his fictional characters.

While Binney's *Redemption Songs: A Life of Tekooti Arikirangi Te Turuki* was not published until nine years after the publication of *Season of the Jew*, her work with the Tūhoe people and their perspective of history had been in development since the 1979 publication of *Mihaia: The Prophet Rua Kenana and His Community at Maungapōhatu*. It is clear that Shadbolt is being selective with what histories and perspectives he presenting, and is still much more attuned to earlier accounts than the scholarship of his contemporaries.

In Ihimaera's representation of the event he is more in tune with Binney's assessment. "If there was to be an act of war, let it be a small act, and let it be

directed against those who had in fact fired upon the prophet and thereby on Jehovah” (Ihimaera, *The Matriarch* 158). Ihimaera does not shy away from the events as they occur, and does not look at them as a past event like Shadbolt. Instead, in *The Matriarch*, the actions of Te Kooti are shown with entries of time counting down to the retaliation over the course of six pages (160-166), beginning three days prior all the way to the evening of Monday November 9. Ihimaera treats the attack as a doom that has come upon Matawhero, it is shown as an inevitability based on the actions of Major Biggs.

The novel breaks down moments of the retaliation into similar time headed entries which includes the preparation and the planning of the attack. The first entry is the evening of Monday November 9. “For the rest of the evening, the raiders planned their attack on Matawhero and the strategy of the attack” (Ihimaera, *The Matriarch* 177). This acknowledgement of the premeditation is absent from Shadbolt’s representation of the attack. By writing from a different perspective, Ihimaera presents another side to Te Kooti’s attack. The following entries detail various killings, each one preceded by a time stamp. While the accounts are not graphic, as Nelson Wattie comments:

It is unfair to accuse the writer of the evasiveness and repression which he points to in others, but the act of violence is not described nakedly – and the views of Te Kooti and his followers are in the foreground (443).

Ihimaera presents the various deaths as matter of fact. Riripeti’s account does not shy away from them and they are not glorified. Ihimaera is confronting his audience with the facts of the conflict. “All religious wars have been marked with similar killings, whether they be during the Crusades, the Spanish Inquisition, Iraq–Iran wars, and the Arab–Israeli struggle, so don’t protest to me about the Te Kooti Retaliation” (Ihimaera, *The Matriarch* 188). Ihimaera’s account pushes the difficult

subject matter of the Land Wars onto his readers. Earlier in the novel he mentions how the attack on Matawhero is not discussed by Māori or Pākehā in the area, the tone of this confrontation is very different from his later work in *Sleeps Standing*.

The Matriarch pushes the difficult material on the reader rather than show them the aftermath as with *Season of the Jew*. Ihimaera's focus on the instigators of the attack provides a better understanding of the attack and Te Kooti's motives, whereas Shadbolt's representation better reflects how the attack left such a mark on the settlers.

Conclusion

Maurice Shadbolt and Witi Ihimaera both reveal a change emerging in representations of the New Zealand Wars. They are also indicative of the changing attitudes from the 1980s onwards. While Shadbolt does adhere to a number of the historical romance traditions endemic in the early works, he provides a far clearer representation of historical figures. His cynical tone is also a significant shift from preceding narratives of the New Zealand Wars. Meanwhile, Ihimaera's work persists as highly influential. His legacy is not just evident in the publication of *Sleeps Standing*, over thirty years after the publication of *The Matriarch*, but also in the style and approach he presents in telling Land Wars stories as much as New Zealand Wars stories. This influence can be seen in theatrical works that emerged such as Ihimaera's own play *Woman Far Walking* (2000), as well as plays such as *Manawa Taua/Savage Hearts* (1994), Riwia Brown's play *Irirangi Bay* (1995), and the staging of the plays *Othello* (2001, 2007) and *Troilus and Cressida* (2003). These narratives also depart heavily from the historical romance convention, and tell Land Wars stories rather than New Zealand Wars.

Shadbolt's novels, however, accomplished something few other writers managed. They brought the New Zealand Wars onto the twentieth-century literary

world stage as it had been absent abroad following the nineteenth-century romances.

Jones comments:

With all of his fiction published in England and most of it in America, Shadbolt has received more overseas reviews than most New Zealand authors, and is represented in all of the standard international reference works on contemporary authors (“Out of the Rut and Into the Swamp 1).

Shadbolt brought the specifics of the conflict back to international readers and Ihimaera succeeded in bringing a much neglected Maori voice to the fore, not only at home but also abroad.

Chapter Four: The New Zealand Wars Go to the Movies

In the depths of the bush, muskets echo, trumpets blare and a voice yells “cut!” For almost as long as Aotearoa New Zealand has been producing films, there have been films about the New Zealand Wars (in particular the later war years of 1863 to 1870). I contend that these films fall into two key genres: historical fiction and what Linda Hutcheon terms historiographic metafiction. This chapter examines two distinct waves of films. First are the early twentieth-century historical fiction films of Rudall Hayward—*The Te Kooti Trail* (1927) and *The Last Stand* (1940). The second wave are the later historiographic metafictions of Geoff Murphy’s *Utu* (1983) and Vincent Ward’s *River Queen* (2005). While all these films employ conventions of the New Zealand Wars romance, they can be further split by those that follow the tropes of the western and those which focus on the tropes of the national epic. International film trends, particularly from the United States of America, influenced these works despite grappling with material specific to Aotearoa. These filmic influences affected the historical fiction of Hayward, the postmodern western *Utu* and the period drama/romance *River Queen*.

The first section examines the films of Rudall Hayward, looking at how the particular genres intersect with these representations of history, as well as the character types that emerge from the New Zealand Wars romance and enter the filmscape. Next I discuss how Hayward addresses the historical period of his films, including his adherence to James Cowan’s histories. Following from Hayward I apply the same process to *Utu* and the *River Queen*. While Michael Black’s *Pictures* (1981) is arguably a New Zealand Wars film, it is solely concerned with the aftermath and the New Zealand Wars scenes depicted are very few. Furthermore, it

shares very few of the common characteristics that tie the four films examined in this chapter. Meanwhile, the 1925 *Rewi's Last Stand's* fragmented state makes it difficult to conduct a thorough textual analysis. In any case, *The Te Kooti Trail*, *The Last Stand*, *Utū*, and *River Queen* are arguably the most recognisable and influential of the New Zealand Wars films.

The romance aspects found on screen are much like their novelistic predecessors as they draw on the traditions of Sir Walter Scott and James Fenimore Cooper. *The Last Stand* and *River Queen* both fall into this category. In addition to their whakapapa back to the historical romance novels, they also possess features of the historical epic. Vivian Sobchak states:

Historical adventures of epic quality, quantification of the scope and magnitude of hardships and obstacles that had to be endured and overcome, heroic perseverance, appeal to national pride (340).

The focus on the formation of New Zealand as a nation is a preoccupation with the New Zealand Wars romance films. These stories tell a grand narrative of New Zealand as a changing place with a pair of lovers caught in the conflict.

Yet there is also a more personal quest that defines the story: the search for a person, as in Cooper's *The Last of the Mohicans*. The films are akin to *The Greenstone Door* and *War to the Knife* in this regard. The story will then undergo a resolution, both to the quest as well as the larger conflict that takes place in the story with the object of the quest achieved and the land around them changed. Such films also feature a framing narrative device retelling the history to the viewer either in the form of a book or voice-over:

both invoking "the past" in visual onomatopoeic reference to antecedent forms of writing, to "original documents," and claiming the anonymous authority that the written word has secured in our particular culture. At times,

the repetition is oral. While voice-over narration also performs the function of doubly exposing time, its authorizing power is different. The narrators entailed by the genre to establish, repeat, and elaborate upon the dramatic representation call particular and reflexive attention to their own personal (if cinematically derived) authority as a means of further authorizing and “authenticating” the dramatic material (Sobchak 344).

These films seek to justify their presence in depicting the New Zealand Wars, so they give the impression of authenticity through what Sobchak terms invocations of “the past”.

The historical romance also develops into a different genre that emerged initially in the United States of America, but eventually spread in popularity to other parts of the world, the western. The western is not solely fixed in the geography of the USA, it has enjoyed popularity in Central America, South America, and Australasia, developing beyond the colonial romance.

The western is a genre with clearly established features spanning settlers, journeys, and ranching, gunfights and the Indian wars. Like the New Zealand Wars romances many westerns draw on the legacy of James Fenimore Cooper and his stories set in the frontier of the United States of America. Douglas Pye argues that, in Fenimore Cooper a

current of romantic narrative, capable of inflection in more than one direction, meets other currents of thought associated particularly with the idea of the West and its significance for America, and this conjunction of romantic mode and complex thematic gave a shape to the western (191-2).

The American Old West has many parallels with the European (and predominantly Anglo-Protestant) settling of Aotearoa, complete with its own indigenous peoples and the conflicts emerging from contact.

As a frontier of the British Empire, Aotearoa was akin to the “wild west.” There was the all-pervasive struggle over land with settlers pushing into and interacting with the indigenous populace, there were industrialists looking to exploit natural resources, there was even a gold rush and a cosmopolitan surge of people coming to the country looking to make a new start or their fortune.

Due to these parallels, it is unsurprising that there is a continuation of the western’s ideas into the films of *The Te Kooti Trail* and *Utū*. That said, the West could have varying meaning:

From the earliest times, these concepts could mean several things, some of them apparently contradictory. If the West was seen as a potential Eden, the garden of the world, it was also seen as the wilderness, the great American desert. The life of the frontier was both ennobling, because it was close to nature, and primitive, at the farthest remove from civilization. The Indian could be both a child of nature, primitive but innocent, and the naked savage (Pye 192).

Such ideas of New Zealand were also being disseminated, particularly in the form of novels featuring imperial adventure narratives. As Lawrence Jones comments:

The land was seen as the raw material for the creation of a Pastoral Paradise that would be a paying proposition. Right from the first in *Taranaki*, the landscape was something that ‘nature had adorned...with lavish hand’, but which ‘art, taste, skill and capital’ could make into something much better. There was no doubt that the land was made for this purpose, with its ‘fertility, salubrity and general adaptation to the needs of an Anglo-Saxon race’, as Boldrewood put it in *War to the Knife* (“The Novel” 117).

The western is associated with the land as much as the New Zealand Wars and the Land Wars. The western examines the effect of European expansion into territory

that they feel can be better utilised by western means and possession. The conflict over how the land can be held and utilised, and how people act in an environment with little legal oversight is as pertinent to nineteenth-century Aotearoa as it is the Arizona, Kentucky, California, or any of the other states that were part of the push west.

The western can present itself in a variety of styles, many of them entirely fictionalised: fabricated stories, biographical tales, and factual tales stretched beyond plausibility. Of these varieties it is in the sensationalist dime novel westerns that the greatest influence on the New Zealand Wars film is felt.

In dime novels, the western became increasingly extravagant and fantastic, although it was fed by actual events—the Indian wars, the adventures of outlaws and lawmen, the cattle drivers. Actual people became the basis of heroes of dime-novel sagas in a constant process of romanticizing actuality in the service of sentimental fiction and the adventure story (Pye 192-3).

This is apparent in the use of actual historical characters being specifically depicted or acting as inspiration for characters in these New Zealand War westerns. Larger than life figures such as Te Kooti Arikirangi Te Turuki, Gustavus von Tempsky, Gilbert Mair, and Kereopa Te Rau all possess qualities akin to famous western figures such as Wild Bill Hickok and Billy the Kid. It is the same with specific events, these stories are embellished or altered, but all have some basis in reality. There are no New Zealand Wars films with a wholly original plot, as they all feature characters and events grounded in reality.

Much like the New Zealand Wars romance novels and the novels by Olga Stringfellow and Maurice Shadbolt, a major feature in these films is a Māori-Pākehā romance. Typically this romance takes place between an indigenous maiden and a Pākehā man, though unlike the romances the Pākehā is not exclusively a traveller

from abroad. This particular feature is common to both the national epics and the westerns. Russell Campbell also details common Pākehā character archetypes in the New Zealand Wars Film. The most significant of which is the Pākehā hero:

The hero travels about a lot and knows the country well...Lower middle class by background or occupation (trader, freelance writer, junior army officer, small farmer), he is generally familiar with aspects of Maori language and culture and gets on well with Maoris (Campbell 11).

This Pākehā hero is the type of character found in *The Te Kooti Trail*, *The Last Stand*, and *Utū*. He is much like the Walter Scott neutral protagonist and settler protagonist characters discussed in preceding chapters. He has a familiarity with and ties to both sides of the conflict. Imperial officials also still feature, particularly those inspired by historical characters, such as Governor George Grey. In addition to these Pākehā, there is also the appearance of the Māori militiaman. The Māori maiden character and her typical role is maintained within the story. However, by 1940 the Māori maiden's rival, the typical European lady, has left the screen.

Hayward and the Nation-making Agenda

Rudall Hayward's films are the first on screen representations of the New Zealand Wars. Despite the influences of overseas films, his were distinctively New Zealand. The two films discussed here drew principally from the writing of the New Zealand historian James Cowan. Hayward also never resorted to using black face or browning Pākehā actors, as was common in American film: "Māori always played Māori" (Cooper 37). For Hayward, the aim of the films was to depict a shared history of Māori and Pākehā alike. Annabel Cooper argues that Hayward

avoids making the conflict explicitly racial. Enmity is mitigated by his depiction of interracial intimacies – friendships, alliance and love affairs – and by the historical events he chooses to portray (39).

Hayward's engagement with the New Zealand Wars focused on the development of the country and attempt to acknowledge a significant period of the country's history. His films contrast with nation-making films from the United States like *Birth of a Nation* as he does not present an openly racist perspective mired in fears of miscegenation. Cooper states that "interracial marriage is idealised in Hayward's films, and Māori and Pākehā socialise amicably" (39). The two films I discuss here are concerned with the formation of New Zealand and idealising a possible future of race relations based on mutual respect.

The Te Kooti Trail is the first New Zealand Wars film to feature as a western. It is both inspired by larger than life characters and conforms to the genre conventions. While there are seven basic western genre plots, two are of particular relevance for *The Te Kooti Trail*: "The Cavalry (cavalry vs. indians)" and "The Marshal (lawman vs. outlaws)" (Lusted 25). Like many westerns, while the film does show fictionalised situations, it is focused around historical figures who were in the area at the time, and an historical event they took part in. Guerrin, Te Kooti, Peka Makarini, Gilbert Mair, and even the tragic young woman Monika are based upon genuine historical figures.

Even so, the historical figures who people *The Te Kooti Trail* also conform to character types of the genre. The Marshal/Cavalry are Gilbert Mair and his Ngāti Awa and later Te Arawa allies, the Ngāti Pukeko are treated as friendly natives, and the indigenous maiden character role is filled by Monika. The "outlaws" and "Indians" are Māori followers of Te Kooti, more specifically Te Kooti and Peka Makarini, who take the film role of Native Americans. "Villainy became as central as heroism...the worst villainy of all is overwhelmingly represented by savage Indians" (Lusted 49). Due to the negative reputation held by Pākehā towards him,

the unprovoked attack on Guerrin's Mill makes Te Kooti and his followers convenient choices to represent indigenous savagery.

The Te Kooti Trail features many wide frame scenes of riding on horse back, a common feature of the western, particularly Te Kooti's followers attacking the mill, as well as Mair and Taranahi's heroic racing to save the mill on horseback. Also, while the role of cavalry racing to save a settlement filled by indigenous allies would seem radical, it too has a precedent in the western. Ten years prior to *The Te Kooti Trail*, William S. Hart's American western *The Silent Man* (1917) featured a similar scene.

Although the Cheyenne are the villains...the Pawnee scouts are cited as friendly Indians...they even replace the more conventional cavalry as the last-minute rescuers of the railroad folk from the final mass attack of the Cheyenne (Lusted 139).

There is a very similar scene shown in *The Te Kooti Trail* with the Ngāti Awa men rallied by Gilbert Mair to battle against Te Kooti and his Tūhoe followers. It is likely, given Hayward's love for westerns, that he was inspired by this scene.

However, as impressive and heroic as this cavalry charge appears, there is no mention of it in Cowan's account of the conflict at the Mill. He instead states: "A few days after the fight, Captain Mair found the bodies of Wirihana Koikoi and Paora Taituha in the mill-dam" (Cowan, *The New Zealand Wars Vol. II* 317). There was no race against time to get to the mill, only to arrive too late; Mair instead arrived some time after the action. Before examining the historicity of Hayward's films it is important to clarify that while he was intending to create historical fictions, his films make the same allowances that Shadbolt would later use in writing his trilogy of novels. The story has historical ties and historical figures, but there are deliberate divergences from the record in order to further the narrative.

Seventeen years after the *The Te Kooti Trail*, Hayward constructed another depiction of New Zealand history for the centenary of the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi, *The Last Stand*. This film goes out of its way to align itself more thoroughly with Cowan, to such an extent that the opening of the film and key scene changes feature the turning of pages in a copy of Cowan's history. This film (unlike many following) depicts the mid-1860s, the height of the conflict rather than what historian Danny Keenan refers to as "Last Stands" (*Wars Without End* 233). More particularly, it examines the Battle of Ōrākau, the major military engagement between the Kīngitanga and the Crown, led by the Ngāti Maniapoto Chief Rewi Maniapoto against the British army.

Unlike Ihimaera's novella *Sleeps Standing*, the film is only partly focused on the battle. The depiction of history is quite sparse until the Battle of Ōrākau; any historical events on display are merely to set up the climactic battle. Events such as Rangiriri, the Pāterangi Line, and the massacre at Rangiaowhia are black points on a red line moving across a map to Ōrākau. The implication is of an unimpeded advance by the British army moving southwards from Auckland. Hayward is technically being accurate with his depiction of the march south, but the rapidity of its depiction is much quicker than the many months in which the advance actually happened. Furthermore, Hayward does not even address the reason for the conflict (the land), instead placing the blame on aggrieved young Māori without discussing why they are fighting.

The film does not dwell too greatly on Ōrākau; the battle only takes place over the final twenty minutes of the film. Much of the film focuses instead on the fictional romance between Ariana and Robert Beaumont. Much of the narrative is occupied by the removal of Ariana to her mother's tribe, Beaumont's taiaha duel to save her, his journey to enlist the aid of Governor George Grey to get her back, and

his failed rescue mission. All of these events occupy far more of the film than the invasion of the Waikato. Much of the action which does occur at Ōrākau (the site of the “Last Stand”), however, is based on historical fact, such as the three day seige and the water running out, though it focuses only on the action at the pā and is sparse in depicting the pursuit following the battle where most of the casualties were inflicted upon the defenders.

The Last Stand as a film also bears the imprint of the “dying race” narratives presented in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, such as William Satchell’s own representation of Ōrākau as discussed in Chapter Two. This manner of recounting history is a way to write Māori out of society; since they are dying out, there is no need to be concerned about their present as a result of past actions, such as dispossession:

In most local histories Māori people, the tangata whenua, are made to retreat (or disappear) from the text by salutary infusions of what is usually called civilisation. This writing-out of one people and the writing-in of another is a textual reenactment as well as recapitulation of colonisation (Gibbons, “Non-Fiction” 73-4).

The Last Stand treats the defeat of the Māori at Ōrākau as a lamentable, but inevitable event. The build-up and the film’s justification for Ōrākau is centred around Ariana. When referring to Ariana’s capture and relocation to her mother’s people Grey comments: “Until we invade the Maori kingdom and restore law and order, this sort of thing will go on” (Hayward, *The Last Stand*). Like her fictional predecessors Erena and Puhī-Huia, as indigenous maiden Ariana is doomed to die as a representation of the land to free it for complete settlement and European control.

The film treats the deaths of the Māori as sad but necessary for the country of New Zealand to emerge. In essence it is an attempt at forming a foundational national narrative, giving the film characteristics of what Sobchak defines as historical epics and their appeals to “national pride”. In the film Hayward is engaging in some national myth making, and regardless of the truth, this narrative of the founding of Aotearoa New Zealand persisted until the 1980s.

In contrast to the New Zealand Wars novels where the fictional characters tend to take centre stage, in *The Te Kooti Trail* they are the supporting cast. The predominantly fictional figures included by Hayward in *The Te Kooti Trail* are his “lost legion” of an Englishman (Eric Mantell), an Irishman (Barney O’Halloran), and a Frenchman (Joules Vidow). It almost sounds like the start to a joke, an Englishman, an Irishman, and a Frenchman all walk into a colonial campaign. Even so, these three echo Sygurd Wiśniowski’s depiction of a very international settlement of Aotearoa. *The Te Kooti Trail* makes its own contribution in challenging a homogenous Pākehā settler identity.

Another character type from the New Zealand Wars romance is the European Lady Alice Winslow, though Alice has only a very minor role in seeing Eric off in England and then coming to New Zealand herself at the very end of the story. In a small way she is like Hypathia from *War to the Knife*, but lacks any of her depth. All that is shown is that Alice loves Eric and later comes to New Zealand to be with her beloved, this ensures the two establish and preserve a white settler line of descent. There is nothing else to her character. Eric Mantell is arguably a traveller character who comes to Aotearoa. His story of being cheated out of his inheritance by his older brother Geoffrey gives his reason for travelling to New Zealand. Yet, once in New Zealand his role becomes heavily diminished, relegated to the supporting militia alongside Barney and Joules. While Eric is the framing

device for *The Te Kooti Trail*, he is not the protagonist. As discussed later that honour is taken by Gilbert Mair.

The film's principle couple, Monika and Taranahi have some historical basis. Monika, in particular, is clearly stated as having been at the Mill by Cowan. These two characters stand in contrast to previous couples in New Zealand Wars narratives as they are both Māori. Previous significant couples tended towards Pākehā or mixed couples. Furthermore, the two draw associations away from the Pākehā world. "Monika and Taranahi, through Taranahi's flute playing are associated with Hinemoa and Tutanekai and thus evoke the world of Māori before contact with Europeans" (Fox, "Rudall Hayward and the Cinema of Maoriland" 55). This is not solely limited to intertextual allusions to pre-contact stories among Māori. The film also shows their cultural difference in terms of practice as well.

Taranahi seeks *utu* (revenge) after Monika's death, in accordance with traditional Māori practices; and in his dying moments he has a vision of Monika waiting for him on the high-point at Cape Reinga from which the spirits of the dead depart in Māori mythology (Fox, "Rudall Hayward and the Cinema of Maoriland" 55-6).

The characters' difference in outlook and culture serve as a representation of the "Old New Zealand," the Aotearoa that had existed for centuries before the arrival of Abel Tasman and later, James Cook. This Aotearoa predates the Christianity which had by 1870 permeated the country, particularly in areas near Pākehā settlements. Alistair Fox argues that "their tragic deaths may also figure the death of the old world they represent" (56). This change is indicative of the western, with new people and ideas moving in, displacing the old, sometimes violently (though not always from the incomers). The western sets itself in a time of change and Monika and Taranahi are victims of colonial growing pains.

The Last Stand places far more weight on the principle fictional characters. The plot is more about Beaumont, a Pākehā man, and Ariana, a beautiful woman of both Māori and Pākehā heritage, and the obstacles they face as lovers, than it is about the Battle at Ōrākau. *The Last Stand* tries to present Beaumont as an idealised New Zealand-born man. He speaks Māori, and learned to use the taiaha (with a debatable level of skill) among the Ngāpuhi. He is in love with a young woman of mixed ancestry and moves between the different worlds of Auckland and Waikato fairly easily. In this regard he echoes aspects of Satchell's protagonist Cedric from *The Greenstone Door*. He even interacts with major figures such as George Grey. In contrast, however, Beaumont looks at the conflict as an unfortunate circumstance, as opposed to a natural progress of civilisation, and loves a woman of both Māori and Pākehā ancestry, unlike Cedric who falls for a quintessential European lady.

Even so, Beaumont also has many unanswered questions surrounding him. He travels to see Governor George Grey about Ariana's disappearance and the two act as if they are friends. Yet there is no reason given for how Beaumont knows Grey. Prior to Ariana being taken to live among the Maniapoto, he declares: "I spent my boyhood in the far north, amongst your ancient *friends* the Ngāpuhi" (Hayward, *The Last Stand*). Yet the viewer is not informed of how he came to live among them nor for how long. He looks too young to have fought in the Northern War, which occurred eighteen years prior to Ōrākau. Therefore he must have spent time among them after the conflict. Which begs a further question, which group of Ngāpuhi? Ngāpuhi are the most populous iwi in New Zealand and had members who both supported and resisted the Crown.

While Beaumont is an attempt at a Walter Scott-style neutral protagonist, he raises more questions than answers and some of his backstory seems a bit too convenient. He comes across as an amalgamation of William Satchell's Cedric

Tregarthen with Rolf Boldrewood's Massinger. Yet he has none of Tregarthen's depth, and much of Massinger's inept arrogance. Like Massinger, his only concern for Māori is wedding and bedding a native woman, the cultural erasure and theft of land is not his concern. Even so, despite the plot holes in the narrative, Beaumont fulfils his function as a textual bridge, he stands on the line between Māori and European.

In relation to Ariana the film takes a curious stance. She has a Ngāti Maniapoto mother and a Pākehā sailor father, but as shown in the film opening at John Morgan's mission station, she was raised by Pākehā missionaries. By her speech and manner of dress, she can be considered to have been assimilated into Pākehā society. Yet after initially being forcibly returned to her mother's people, she rediscovers her heritage. When Beaumont comes to rescue her, she eventually turns back, returning to her iwi declaring to Beaumont: "I can't change what is in me" (Hayward, *The Last Stand*). So strong is her new-found loyalty to her mother's people that she is willing to stand with them at Ōrākau. She conforms to a stereotype of the indigenous maiden, similar to Monika in *The Te Kooti Trail*.

Like the Māori maidens of the romances, Ariana is a character of absolute devotion. This depiction leads to Ariana's downfall as evident in *The Last Stand*, where her absolute devotion to her people results in her death at Ōrākau. Fox also comments:

By showing Ariana's refusal to desert her people to join her Pākehā lover, Hayward's film implicitly acknowledges the impediment to assimilationist progress posed by the commitment of Māori to their own identity (61).

Ariana represents the difficulty for Māori in adhering to the colonial policy of assimilation. Like Monika she has clung to the old Aotearoa, and in terms of settlement, that means she has no place in the New Zealand that is emerging in

Hayward's narrative, so by the forms of many New Zealand Wars narratives, she must die to let New Zealand be born.

In another parallel to the New Zealand Wars romances, Hayward makes heavy use of historical figures in both *Te Kooti Trail* and *The Last Stand*. As his name is in the title, Te Kooti is the overall antagonist within *Te Kooti Trail*, though it is his lieutenant Peka Makarini who is the more direct adversary. In either instance, only a passing reference is given to these characters' motivations. The representation of Te Kooti was also subject to censorship where Ringatū elders disapproved of certain interpretations of his character. "As a result two intertitles and one scene were deleted. They have one element in common: Te Kooti's reputation as a prophet" (Cooper 63). The concern with Te Kooti's reputation is not unwarranted as he was a religious figure. Apart from the scepticism of his prophet status, Hayward's depiction of Te Kooti is more positive than earlier depictions such as in Mona Tracey's *Rifle and Tomahawk*. Hayward describes Te Kooti as a "great military genius" in the intertitles. He is fearsome, but not malicious. He does not wish to kill Monika. "You are brave and so young to die—speak and save yourself!" (*Te Kooti Trail*). This Te Kooti is not the man compared to the brutal Pol Pot conceived by Shadbolt, but nor is the nuance of this influential man given its due.

The representation of Peka Makarini, Te Kooti's lieutenant, is far more negative. In contrast to his leader, Makarini laughs at the misfortunes of the mill folk. He is described as Te Kooti's "notorious lieutenant" (Hayward, *The Te Kooti Trail*) and, as noted prior, in the film he suggests the forced marriage between Erupeti and Rangihiroa. The historical Peka Te Makarini was married to Te Kooti's sister (Binney 86). Judith Binney also describes him as completely bilingual, serving as a translator for his fellow warriors (96). The film is correct with regards

to Makarini as a bugler, though he is only shown to use his bugle as a means to deceive the pursuers, rather than the official role he held (165). Makarini is made to embody all of the indigenous savagery embedded in the early western films. Despite the greater complexity of his person in historical record, for the purpose of the film he exists as the principle outlaw who must be battled and brought to justice by his on screen nemesis and arguably the film's true hero Gilbert Mair.

Mair was a larger than life character in reality, fighting alongside and leading the Māori militia of the Arawa Flying Column. He was fluent in te reo Māori and had many close ties among Te Arawa. "He learned to speak Maori fluently and developed an enduring interest in Maori history and culture" (Savage). Notable among many militia leaders during the New Zealand wars, Mair was born in Aotearoa, in Whangarei.

In his short military career Mair displayed a degree of initiative, skill and reckless courage that singled him out from other officers. He excelled in the use of guerilla techniques of bush warfare, which allowed scope for initiative. A bold and unorthodox commander, he did not always wait for official approval before acting. He identified closely with Te Arawa who served under him and led them into battle in traditional Maori fashion, which may explain the unusual degree of influence he had over them.

Although Mair was a willing participant in the New Zealand wars, and a ruthless enemy in battle, he was aware of the complexities and moral implications of the campaigns, and sensitive to the views of his Maori opponents (Savage).

In many ways Mair is comparable to Gustavus von Tempsky as a commanding officer of an irregular fighting unit in the Bush. There are some key differences, however. Where von Tempsky was a foreign adventurer, Mair was born in Aotearoa.

Mair also showed a greater command of te reo and a greater understanding and acceptance of tikanga.

In both Mair's actions and his characterisation he is the true hero of *The Te Kooti Trail*. He is shown to have close ties with many local Māori, as indicated by his friendship towards Taranahi and Monika, much like his real life counterpart. He is affable with his men, particularly the "lost legion," even competing with them in a foot race. Mair is the one to make the heroic ride to Tauranga to seek aid, he leads the militia in the pursuit of Te Kooti, he is also the one to finally confront and kill Peka Makarini. As mentioned above he is depicted as the true hero of the story, despite Taranahi and Eric's comparable screen time and role in the film.

The Te Kooti Trail is also the first on screen representation of Māori militiamen. Despite the presence of allied Māori during the Waikato Invasion however, they are not also present in *The Last Stand*. In *The Te Kooti Trail* they are the soldiers rallied by Gilbert Mair to aid Taranahi in the desperate attempt to save Guerrin's mill, and particularly for Taranahi, his beloved Monika. The role the allied Māori play here is quite clear cut. As Alistair Fox describes:

Te Kooti's attack on Geurrin's mill is modelled closely on the Indian attacks in Griffith's westerns, as is the pursuit of Taranahi when he rides off to seek help, and the suspense as to whether the colonial forces (the equivalent of the cavalry) will arrive in time to rescue the besieged defenders of the mill (55).

Their allocated role places a heroic mantle upon the allied Māori in this context. They are the cavalry riding (or in this case running) to the rescue. But that does not provide any characterisation for the soldiers. They are just a crowd of Māori jumping when Gilbert Mair says how high.

Given the nature of the film, it is unsurprising that they are reduced to background figures, as they fulfil the sole role of the cavalry, who in westerns typically have very little characterisation towards the rank and file. Yet even in a camp scene, the Māori militiamen have no dialogue. Bruce Babington notes this in his own discussion of the film:

Hayward staged intimate Pākehā/Māori relations in all three of his films—most obviously the love plot in *Rewi 2*, the cosy interracial marriage in *The Te Kooti Trail*, and the homosocial bond between Mair and Taranahi in the latter—but in *The Te Kooti Trail* Mair's kūpapa are, except for Taranahi, faceless (157).

These men are ignored in terms of characterisation, but are clearly based upon the Ngāti Awa and the Arawa Flying Column. The first group rallied as Mair races to the mill are of Ngāti Awa who live in the area where Guerrin's Mill was located. The second group of soldiers are of the iwi Te Arawa, who occupy areas of Rotorua and Bay of Plenty and have a history of supporting the Crown during the New Zealand Wars. Some Te Arawa had supported the Crown ever since the Waikato campaign, but it was later from 1870 that they truly became distinctive from other allied Māori. In the late stages of the New Zealand Wars (from 1870 to 1872) they were commanded by Pākehā officers.

Following the battle of Ohinemutu in 1870, Donald McLean, the Native Affairs Minister, was convinced of their capability but proposed a differing approach to previous allied Māori divisions. In his monograph *Kūpapa: The Bitter Legacy of Māori Alliances with Crown* (2015), Ron Crosby explains:

McLean had also seen repeated reports of the difficulty Pākehā officers had had with more senior Te Arawa rangatira in particular. However, the performance of the young Te Arawa men in the field had been exemplary

under two young Pākehā officers who were fluent in te reo, and who were able to inspire their men into amazing acts of courage and resilience (*Kūpapa* 402).

These officers were George Preece and Gilbert Mair. These two men became famous enough for their actions that not only was Mair featured in *The Te Kooti Trail*, both were inspirations for fictional characters in other representations such as *Season of the Jew* and *Utu*. For McLean, the solution to his issues with the Arawa leadership was to separate the younger fighting men of Te Arawa from their rangatira, and to have them led by the two young Pākehā officers. At Ohinemutu McLean saw “experienced young Te Arawa men were prepared to disregard their elders and follow energetic, courageous European officers” (Crosby “The Arawa Fly Column” 368).

Mair was later promoted to Captain and replaced General Thomas McDonnell in the pursuit of Te Kooti. This led to the development of the Arawa Flying Columns, a highly mobile fighting unit which consisted of 80-90 men equipped in a manner beyond regular allied Māori; they were geared with modern weapons, waterproofs, tentage, and ground sheets. While their numbers were smaller, they were better equipped than the taua under Te Keepa and Ropata Wahawaha (Crosby *Kūpapa* 404). In *Tutu Te Puehu* (2018), Crosby even refers to them as “special forces” (“The Arawa Flying Columns” 358).

Hayward took pains to depict the Arawa fighters in correct period dress. Alongside the three men of the “lost legion” they are dressed in their recognisable attire of militia coats, caps, and kilts. This is understandable given Hayward’s endeavour to show events of Aotearoa New Zealand’s past on screen as closely to available history as he could. Yet despite the effort at historical accuracy, little time is spent on the characters. Most of their action in *The Te Kooti Trail* consists of

silent soldiers happy to follow Gilbert Mair into battle. Little time is spent examining their own ideas or motivations. This lack of character development is not unexpected considering Hayward's nation-making agenda. He did not need the allied Māori to do anything but blindly follow the path of progress. For allied Māori to have more nuanced motives in regards to their involvement would complicate and potentially disrupt the historical narrative that Hayward was presenting.

The historical figures that appear in *The Last Stand*, Governor Grey, Rewi Maniapoto, and General Duncan Cameron, much like the antagonists in *The Te Kooti Trail*, are not heavily developed. The Pākehā characters feature as cameos at best. Of the three Grey is the one who speaks the most dialogue, despite only appearing in a single scene. Grey appears as a paternal figure, who wants to ensure peace in the colony for all of its inhabitants and blames Māori dissidents rather than his own settlement policy. While reassuring Beaumont, he provides him with a comforting pat on the back, while the two sit closely side by side. This Grey clearly wants to put Beaumont at his ease and present an affable face to his visitor. It is entirely possible that Grey is simply manipulating Beaumont, but there is no further evidence to show that this is the case. The man presented here is one who is trying his best to keep the peace in the colony.

This interpretation of Grey is in line with the time period. As William Pember Reeves describes: "Grey had knightly virtues—courage, courtesy, and self-command" (175-6). Though Reeves still refers to him as an "autocrat" (172), it was not until later histories that heavy criticism of Grey became as widespread. Walker asserts that in 1861 when Grey took over as Governor General, he had been preparing for this very conflict.

Grey pursued both a 'peace policy' and a 'war policy' simultaneously, knowing full well that assertion of sovereignty would ultimately have to to

be accomplished by force of arms. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that Grey planned the Waikato war well in advance (Walker, *Ka Whawhai Tonu Matou* 120).

Walker's assertions are not the only comments on Grey's devious character either. Belich comments that the Governor General could have "taught Machiavelli a trick or two in methodology" (Belich, *The New Zealand Wars* 120). This aspect of Grey is not apparent at all in Hayward's representation of the man, even Pember Reeves' opinion of Grey as "an autocrat" (172). Instead, he is presented as a reasonable authority figure. The Grey on screen is even more positively portrayed than Satchell's own depiction of the man. Hayward does nothing to imply as Satchell did that Grey is a "stormy petrel" of the Empire. This Grey is arguably the softest and kindest treatment of the man.

Lieutenant General Duncan Cameron is only seen as a general on the battlefield and truthfully has no scenes of characterisation that depicts him as anything else. His only identifying feature (apart from the appearance with his trademark sideburns) is his comment that "this country is a grave of glory" (Hayward, *The Last Stand*), showing the weariness of the British army fighting in Aotearoa. This comment foreshadows the eventual military withdrawal in 1867 and the change to colonial militia, but otherwise Cameron (as a historical figure) has little impact on the film's action, quite different to his battlefield opposite. Cameron's appearance in the film is little more than a cameo, much like his appearance in *Season of the Jew* and *The Greenstone Door*. The presence of Cameron at the battle is just a signifier of historicity. He is there because in the interests of historical accuracy he needs to be, though his personal contribution to the plot is negligible.

Rewi Maniapoto, despite having little onscreen appearance compared to Beaumont and Ariana, still features in the film more heavily than Grey or Cameron. However, his presence is mostly visual, he speaks only a few lines of dialogue in his scenes. If left unnamed his only identifying feature (apart from his appearance) are the declaration that the fighting will continue forever. In all other respects the character lacks the mana of a man for whom warriors from the far side of the island would aid, simply because he asked. The film is a stark contrast to the Rewi Maniapoto depicted by Witi Ihimaera seventy-eight years later. As noted in the previous chapter, Ihimaera's representation of Rewi was shown in greater detail as a leader with his encouragement to his warriors and the respect others held for him, as well as his kindness to the character Moetū.

Rewi is shown as he was historically, a Māori war leader, though the film barely mentions his fellow leader Wiremu Tamihana. The film also treats Tamihana solely as a statesman rather than a fellow battle leader and his role as the “king maker” for the Kīngitanga movement. While Rewi's uncertainty at the fight at Ōrākau is present in the film, and that he was outvoted by other chiefs, the film treats Ōrākau as if that was the end of Rewi's career. This is despite the historical evidence to the contrary.

Rewi and at least half his men had escaped. Although the lower Waikato was occupied the rest of the country was not about to submit. Ngati Maniapoto and their allies Ngati Haua and Ngati Raukawa simply regrouped behind another defence line known as aukati, the closed boundary which indicated their readiness to resist further invasion (Walker, *Ka Whawhai Tonu Matou* 126).

This region behind the aukati, known as the King Country, was closed off to any trespassers until the 1880s. Rewi was not truly defeated, he was pushed back to his

own lands and his true last stand was arguably maintaining the aukati from incursion, which was a success. The end of the film treats the New Zealand Wars as something that has ended with Ōrākau, ignoring any later issues and resistance, from both Maniapoto (and the Kīngitanga) as well as the rest of the North Island.

As mentioned with regards to genre and characters, Hayward has a mixed relationship with history in his films. *The Te Kooti Trail* is a historical film that in the end makes allowances for genre. The history is subject to the terms of genre so while the film does present history in its chronological order, some embellishments are added to fully make it a western. In *The Te Kooti Trail*, the attack on Guerrin's Mill follows Cowan's account fairly closely (excepting the cavalry racing to rescue the mill). These events are discussed in chapter 30 of Cowan's second volume of *The New Zealand Wars*, dubbed *The Hauhau Wars (1864-1872)*. The attack took place in 1869 during the pursuit of Te Kooti. The loss of the Mill, the forced marriage between Guerrin's widow and Te Kooti's follower Rangihiroa and the killing of Monika are all events recorded by Cowan. The film is a representation of Pākehā historical account, though it has been reframed into the form of a western. While this particular scene appears added for drama, much of the conflict is based upon Cowan's record.

The two-day siege of Guerrin's Mill, his defence with others dwelling at the mill, his sister-in-law Monika and wife Erupeti supplying ammunition, and even the presence of a defensive redoubt at the Mill, are all drawn from Cowan's account. A point of difference in relation to the killing of Monika, however, is that Cowan describes Te Kooti as making the decision, as opposed to being prompted to it by Peka Makarini. This action serves to place most of the villain role on Makarini rather than Te Kooti himself.

The later pursuit of Te Kooti and killing of Peka Makarini is also based upon Cowan's later account, drawn from his interview with Gilbert Mair regarding Te Kooti's 1870 attack on Rotorua. As Mair himself related to Cowan:

A long chase followed across the undulating country (Kapenga and the rear of Pakaraka) and it must have been close on 7 p.m. when I and three men—Rewi Rangiamio, Te Warihi, and Ngahere te Wiremu—ran right into Peka te Makarini and his rear-guard among some rocks at the foot of Tumunui. I was ahead, Te Warihi some 50 yards behind, then Rewi and Ngahere together. There were five or six others out of sight, not within 100 yards. I think Peka had nearly thirty men, but as they were among the rocks I only saw eight or ten...It was there that I shot Peka Makarini, and the rear-guard took to flight (Cowan, *The New Zealand Wars Vol II* 544).

Hayward replicates the scene, to a certain extent, stating clearly that Makarini had thirty men in the expository intertitles, though only a small number appear on screen. What does occur though is Mair is shown advancing alone, with no support. As the intertitles state: "the athletic Mair raced far ahead of his men and attacked the enemy single-handed!" (Hayward, *Te Kooti Trail*).

This representation is contradicted by Mair's own words; he asserts that he had support only fifty yards behind, yet even the wide shots which show the surrounding scenery feature Mair alone. When Taranahi comes to lend support, he is killed but not before slaying Peka Makarini, leaving Mair as the heroic survivor. The depiction is likely an attempt to present Mair in a more heroic light, a lone hero facing off against thirty armed men. Hayward's representation makes it clear that Mair survives against massive odds and is a person worthy of historical recognition. Unfortunately, this depiction comes at the expense of allied Māori who continue to be marginalised at the expense of their Pākehā counterparts.

The Last Stand marries itself to Cowan to an even greater extent than *The Te Kooti Trail*. Firstly, it counts him as the official historian (Babington 57). The film goes further as well, by featuring a copy of Cowan's *The New Zealand Wars*:

At the beginning of the film, and later at irregular intervals, there are close-up shots of James Cowan's book *The New Zealand Wars* (the quasi-official history) being skimmed through, followed by a title in the style of a printed page. The texts are short factual statements, lent an additional air of exactitude by details of place and dates ("10 p.m. April 1st 1864"). From the opening title it is clear from whose point of view this history is written (Campbell 12).

The closely wed nature of the film to Cowan's work makes clear there is an agenda of nation-making and civilising narratives on display. While these themes are implicit in *The Te Kooti Trail*, in *The Last Stand* they are explicit. The use of Cowan's history as a framing object exhibits Sobchak's discussion of temporal objects being used to lend authority to the narrative. The history book not only shows that the film's events are past, consigned to history, but that they have depicted the events accurately, regardless of what the truth may be.

Ranginui Walker describes the set up to the Battle of Ōrākau in a different fashion to Hayward's on screen representation. On Rewi Maniapoto's way north to a strategy meeting with Wiremu Tamihana,

he met up with Tuhoe and Ngati Raukawa warriors withdrawing from Paterangi. These men persuaded Rewi to fight the British at Orakau, otherwise they would have carried their weapons and ammunition a long way for nothing (Walker, *Ka Whawhai Tonu Matou* 125-126).

Not once in Hayward's depiction of the battle is the presence of Māori acknowledged as being multiple tribes. The Tūhoe and Ngāti Raukawa are lumped

in with the Maniapoto. This cinematic choice may be for simplicity's sake, but it also falls into the trap of mistakenly homogenizing Māori for a cinematic audience, a trend that continued in later films such as *River Queen*. Furthermore, Walker discusses the evacuation of the pā.

This remarkable military feat was accomplished by the warriors forming a solid body with their women, children and chiefs in the centre. The warriors fought their way through the weakest point of the cordon of soldiers and then split up to escape through the swamps. It was at this stage that they suffered their heaviest casualties at the hands of the Forest Rangers who hunted them down (*Ka Whawhai Tonu Matou* 126).

While the film does depict a formation around the organised evacuation of the pā with the fighting men formed around the women and children, it is far more sanitised in depicting the escape.

The Forest Rangers are shown in only a small capacity, and there are very few deaths depicted on screen following the escape from the pā. Those shown do not account for the majority of deaths that actually occurred in the withdrawal. Furthermore, the only woman shown killed on screen in the escape from Ōrākau is Ariana, which was known to definitely not be true. Given the crediting of Cowan as “official historian” for the film, and Cowan’s work interviewing eye witnesses to Ōrākau, the changes from historical record must be deliberate to suit Hayward’s vision of a nation-making epic. This on screen depiction of Ōrākau is highly sanitised, the representations of the battle by Satchell, Shadbolt and especially Ihimaera do it far greater justice than Hayward. The film implies that, from this conflict at Ōrākau, Māori authority was broken and led to a more peaceful existence between Māori and Pākehā, with the film as the monument, much like the statue

proposed by the Capulets and Montagues at the end of *Romeo and Juliet*. It looks nice but does not achieve anything.

The film does nothing to acknowledge the continued issues over sovereignty and does not explain that the drive for land is why the War in the first place is taking place. In fact, it tries to angle the blame for the conflict on the Maniapoto (as they are the instigators for bringing all of their people back to their lands from wherever they were previously located). Campbell notes:

It is true that the written prologue to **REWI** refers to the “struggle for possession of this land of promise”, but nothing in the film that follows suggests that hunger of pakeha settlers for the rich Waikato land could have been the precipitating cause of the war. Instead the reasons for the invasion of the Waikato, given in Grey’s conversation with Beaumont and in the governor’s proclamation delivered by Beaumont to the *Ngati Haua* and the *Ngati Maniapoto*, are that half-caste children are being kidnapped and that rebellious tribes “are assembled in armed bands threatening to ravage the settlement of Auckland.” Even at the time, it was recognized that such “reasons” for military attack were no more than a pretext (13).

It is also clear that despite mentioning the *Ngāti Haua* and *Ngāti Maniapoto*, there is no mention of the *Kīngitanga* either. The film deliberately avoids mentioning the struggle for the land, and contents itself with focusing on the plight of the two lovers. Shifting the narrative from land makes a more palatable representation of New Zealand history than reminding Māori of the damage wrought by the Native Land Courts a generation prior.

The ties to direct historical events in Hayward’s films, and to a noted historian of the period clearly places them into the category of historical fiction. Even so, the narrative presented is still highly slanted. In addition to the

subservience of the historical fiction to the genres of the New Zealand Wars romance and the western, the history presented was weighted towards the Pākehā narrative of the time. While there was some small input from the Māori who participated in the *Te Kooti Trail* and a preliminary screening to Tūhoe elders to avoid offence, their voices were still subject to Hayward and by extension, Cowan. These films slant the depiction of Ngāti Maniapoto, Ngāti Pūkeko, Ngāi Tūhoe, and Te Arawa in both *The Last Stand* and *The Te Kooti Trail*, and fall into dangerous territory by presenting a narrow, Eurocentric view of history.

Utu: Postmodernising the New Zealand Western

Following Hayward there were no cinematic depictions of the New Zealand Wars until the 1980s. A potential factor in this hiatus was funding. Hayward's productions were all locally produced and had an amateur quality to them. It was not until the 1970s that the New Zealand film making industry had decent finance available. "With the advent of the Film Commission and tax-shelter funding, the film industry had been looking good. We could finance our films" (Murphy, *A Life on Film* 216). This initial increase in funding and the later film success in New Zealand brought by *Lord of the Rings* and other blockbusters meant getting a film made in New Zealand was far easier and more professional than in Hayward's day. Due to a number of historical, social, and aesthetic factors the two key films that emerged also shift from being predominantly historical fiction to historiographic metafiction. These social events can be seen in the Māori Land March, the Māori Renaissance, the emergence of postmodern discourse, as well as international film trends such as the post-Vietnam western and the period costume drama.

The films constructed during this era are therefore more likely to challenge previously dominant ideas around the New Zealand Wars, especially colonial constructs of European dominance and their "civilising" influence on Māori. This

is evident in the greater nuance in Māori representation on screen, a more prevalent use of te reo, and the incorporation of Māori culture and practice. These films also offer a greater visibility to European women on screen and, on occasion, depict European officers in a less heroic light to how they were previously portrayed.

It would be incorrect to argue that historiographic metafiction is an outright rejection of previous works. Rather it is a reassessment of existing conventions. As Hutcheon describes:

Historiographic metafiction appears, then, willing to draw upon any signifying practices it can find operative in a society. It wants to challenge those discourses and yet to use them, even to milk them for all they are worth (133).

Therefore, even when aspects of the New Zealand Wars and Hayward's depictions are being challenged, many aspects are maintained showing a clear whakapapa to these representations. Each is not just created in response to but as a progression from their predecessors, though in a more aggressive fashion than Shadbolt's *New Zealand Wars Trilogy* towards the nineteenth-century romances.

A key feature of these New Zealand Wars metafiction is the composite nature of events and characters. This is a departure from Hayward's reliance on the historical record. They are a contrast between realist historiography and the more postmodern historiographic metafiction. To quote Amy J. Elias:

Realist historiography desires a historical truth that is not Truth but that is still binding, a pragmatist, robust history of reasonable belief. Radical postmodernist historiography desires a Dionysian playground of language and a historical ground from which to declare the end of historical grounds (163).

There is not the desire to show the events as they happened, but to gauge a feel for the period by commingling and blending key historical figures and events together. The films depict a feel of historical authenticity, but are not exact recreations of history.

A film that presents such ideas in terms of language and historical ground is the 1983 film *Utū*, an anarchic, borderline parodic, nuanced western. The film presents a greater degree of characterisation for Māori (likely as a result of many Māori having key positions in the production) and an increased use of te reo (by both Māori and Pākehā) translated in subtitles. The film quite clearly drew some inspiration from more recent westerns as well as the local, as noted by Bruce Babington:

While the Vietnam westerns' influence is immediately visible in the cavalry attack on Te Wheke's village, *Utū*'s narrative can, from a local perspective, most fundamentally be seen as rewriting its native predecessors – Hayward's New Zealand epics *The Te Kooti Trail* and the two versions of *Rewi's Last Stand* – in a kind of respectfully disrespectful deconstruction (Babington 154).

Building on Babington's comparisons, in contrast to Hayward, Murphy does not base *Utū* around a single historical event, but is instead inspired by several. Most significantly are Rangiaowhia (1864), the killing of missionary Carl Volkner by Kereopa Te Rau (1865), the pursuit of Te Kooti (1868-1872), and the Bush Trial of Wi Heretaunga (1870). Murphy's depiction of the Land Wars adds an additional western plot: "The Revenge (the wronged man vs. the truly guilty)" (Lusted 25) and an additional villain type, characteristic of post-Vietnam westerns, the bigoted officer.

Despite its post-colonial deconstructions, the film does not disregard and jettison the features of Hayward, it simply reassesses and reworks them. For instance, *Utu* by means of scenery does take place in a similar region of Aotearoa as *Te Kooti Trail*. In fact they are both set around the same time period and inspired by at least one of the same figures. Furthermore, *Utu* also draws from James Cowan's works. The entire end scene of *Utu* is a reworking of Cowan's story "The Bush Trial", which inspired the film. So there is what Hutcheon terms an "attraction/repulsion" with convention in the film.

Perhaps this contradictory attraction/repulsion to structure and pattern explains the predominance of the parodic use of certain familiar and overtly conventionally plotted forms in American fiction, for instance that of the Western: *Little Big Man* (Hutcheon 133).

Utu makes liberal use of parody. In one scene, while raiding a supply wagon, one of Te Wheke's followers sticks his head into a sack of flour commenting "I'm a Pākehā" and "I've only been a Pākehā one minute and already I hate you Māori" (Murphy, *Utu*).

The film strikes a balance between humour and drama and draws further comparison to *Little Big Man* (1970). There is the idealistic young man who is serving in the colonial forces, contrasted by his paranoid and moronic commanding officer. Campbell also details this commanding officer as the racist Pākehā villain character. This character's role is typically to "displace guilt from the ordinary Kiwi joker onto the outsider, the older man marked by class or national origin (British) as different" (11). This particular character has most in common with Shadbolt's imperial officials, though on screen they show greater competence and are more of a direct narrative threat.

The portrayal of indigenous peoples is far more complex and sympathetic than early westerns that feature a violent faceless band racing to attack a settlement with little cause.

Historiographic metafiction...use parody not only to restore history and memory in the face of distortions of the “history of forgetting”, but also, at the same time, to put into question the authority of any act of writing by locating the discourses of both history and fiction within an ever-expanding intertextual network that mocks any notion of either single origin or simple causality (Hutcheon 129).

Hutcheon hones in on the key features of historiographic metafiction and a key feature within *Utū*. While any film is a product of its time and the stylistic and narrative choices of Hayward do reflect the 1920s, *Utū* is also actively aware of its time of construction. The comments regarding land (absent in *The Te Kooti Trail*) echo the historical events of Dame Whina Cooper’s Land Hikoi and the occupation of Bastion Point. Comments such as “Could we put ten thousand warriors on the streets of Auckland for just one hour?” (Murphy, *Utū*) are reminiscent of the protests endemic during the period. The film’s discourse is not just located in the past, like the *Te Kooti Trail*, but also in its present. It acknowledges the Land Wars as an ongoing issue to be addressed and confronted, rather than something to be consigned to the past.

In keeping with the metafictional nature of the narrative, gone is the direct depiction of historical figures. There is no Te Kooti or Peka Makarini, instead there is the amalgam character of Te Wheke, inspired by Te Kooti, Kereopa Te Rau and Wi Heretaunga. Te Wheke’s parallels to Te Kooti are perhaps the easiest to describe. Te Kooti was formerly on the side of the government serving with kūpapa units in the mid-1860s, much like Te Wheke. Te Wheke is also a fugitive figure who travels

with a group of his followers and is pursued by the colonial militia. Arguably though, Te Wheke is not particularly a religious figure like Te Kooti, apart from his speech at the deceased vicar's pulpit, Te Wheke is grounded in the mortal world and does not show much connection to wairuatanga. Therefore his links to Te Kooti are solely temporal.

The aspects of Kereopa Te Rau are more event specific, such as the swearing of vengeance as members Te Rau's own family were killed at Rangiaowhia which set him to seek utu. The next parallel is Te Wheke's execution of the firebrand vicar in his church. This correlates to Te Rau's killing of the Missionary Carl Volkner who he (wrongly) believed was acting as a spy for the government. This belief was not unwarranted, however, as many missionaries, such as John Morgan did act as government informants throughout the nineteenth century. In the final scene of the film however, Te Wheke is a direct reflection of Wi Heretaunga in Cowan's account of Heretaunga's trial in *Tales of the Maori Bush*. He is held to trial before a fire and is executed by his own kin.

Te Wheke takes on a number of aspects of these men, but he is not a direct copy of them. Te Wheke has his own characterisation and identity, he shows an enjoyment of Shakespeare, specifically the play *Macbeth*, which will be discussed in Chapter Four, and has an ironic sense of humour, saluting a chicken as "colonel." The reassessment of his character is also given clearly defined motivations. In *The Te Kooti Trail* neither Te Kooti's nor Peka's motivations are clear, other than Te Kooti's visions of reasserting Māori dominance, which are not touched on in any detail. Te Wheke has a clear motivation for his actions, he is not a flat character who attacks Pākehā because they are Pākehā, he outright states his desire for revenge. "Tell the Colonel I'll catch up with him. Sooner or later" (Murphy, *Utū*). He also expresses that he opposes the Pākehā taking of Māori land. "He says it's

his land!?” (Murphy, *Utu*). Compared to Māori antagonists in Hayward’s films, Te Wheke is very clearly defined and far more sympathetic than how Te Kooti is depicted and better understood than Rewi Maniapoto in *The Last Stand*. As a postmodern-style antagonist he is shown greater respect on film than earlier Māori leaders on screen.

Utu does not just place all of this historical inspiration onto the “revenger” of the piece. Equally his object of vengeance, Colonel Elliot, is heavily derived from historical figures, despite the scepticism shown by past scholarship. These historical figures are the less believable but no less accurate historical inspirations of G. S. Whitmore and Thomas McDonnell who construct Colonel Elliot. As much as Elliot appears a caricature, some of the commanding officers of the colonial militia were exactly as classist, neurotic, paranoid, egotistical and apoplectic. In terms of these figures, Elliot is more heavily inspired by Whitmore, partly due to the area of the country in which the action takes place, but also in terms of his character. He is British, not New Zealand-born or raised. Additionally:

He was also cursed with the personal charm of a rattlesnake. Like his New Zealand-bred rival, Thomas McDonnell, he was touchy and egotistical.

Unlike the popular McDonnell he was also tactless and elitist (Belich, *The New Zealand Wars* 220).

Such comments are quite appropriate for a character who speaks in an upper-class accent and refers to Lieutenant Scott derisively as “a colonial” (Murphy, *Utu*). Whitmore’s inability to pronounce Te Wheke’s name correctly shows his blatant disrespect for Māori people and the language. While Whitmore was never killed, or even shot at by his own side, I am sure many of his men were sorely tempted to do so, such was his unpopularity.

On screen, Colonel Elliot is also reminiscent of Richard Mulligan's Custer in *Little Big Man*. This is supported by the on screen brutal cavalry attacks upon a Māori village, not unlike the cavalry raids in *Little Big Man*. The willingness to present Elliot in such a negative light is a departure from prior films which avoided depicting upper-class officers poorly. It also shows a disillusionment with the myth of the valiant New Zealand settlers compared to the incompetent British officers that had previously persisted. There is a willingness now to depict the agents of the colonial government in a negative light. Elliot shows that the historiographic metafiction reassessing of history applies as much to Pākehā as it does to Māori.

In terms of the young Pākehā hero, Lieutenant Scott is inspired by the officer Gilbert Mair. However, instead of the more experienced and ultra-bearded Gilbert Mair, there is the naive, idealistic and clean shaven Scott (comparable to the treatment Disney gave John Smith in the 1995 film *Pocahontas*). Scott, like Mair (historically), enjoys a relationship with a Māori woman and speaks fluent te reo. He leads a column of Māori, with no other Pākehā (a similar set up to Mair, though he commanded the Arawa Flying Column with George Preece). Men who fought with the Arawa (Mair and Preece) inspire both protagonists and both have a relationship with a Māori woman who is attacked by the man they are pursuing. While the film is a western, Lieutenant Scott's character owes much to the 'neutral protagonist' of the historical romance. Even the surname Scott gives such a hint.

As a "colonial" who speaks te reo, Lieutenant Scott has ties to both Māori and Pākehā worlds; he even has a doomed romance with an indigenous woman like many "neutral protagonists". Lieutenant Scott has some parallels with Braithwaite's protagonist Williams. The man knows the terrain, he respects Māori as capable foes, has a cordial relationship with the allied Māori Wiremu in a similar vein to Williams' relationship with Te Keepa, and also is invested in building a

Pākehā New Zealand. In this regard, Lieutenant Scott is a precursor towards *Season of the Jew's* Fairweather and so Wattie's criticism of Fairweather also applies to Lieutenant Scott, since he is a soldier in the militia Scott cannot truly be considered "neutral." Whatever differences Lieutenant Scott has with Whitmore, he is under no illusions what side he is on. Lieutenant Scott is less defiant of convention than Te Wheke, but is still evidence of the shift in representations that emerges in the 1980s, particularly the gradual movement away from Sir Walter Scott as a model.

The Māori maiden character is also still present within *Utu*, though Kura presents a greater degree of character and agency than Erena or Puhi Huia. Kura has a romance with Lieutenant Scott, yet is still aligned with her people (who sided with Te Wheke). She is also not afraid to pick up a musket to defend herself. She uses her wits to evade capture (such as using a dripping barrel to give the impression of urination to cover her escape). Nor is she above seducing Lieutenant Scott to distract him from an upcoming attack, keeping him away from the fighting. Kura shows herself to be clever and daring. Unfortunately, while Kura displays greater agency than her literary predecessors, she too does not survive the narrative, becoming a victim of Te Wheke's rage when the attack on Te Puna hotel is thwarted. The character was clever, well-conceived, yet fell victim to the typical conventions of the New Zealand Wars romance. While there is another indigenous woman present in the narrative, Matu, she is not a Māori maiden character, her age and *tā moko* indicate she is a mature woman. Unfortunately, while she appears in the background, Matu has very little role in the narrative until Kura's death and later Te Wheke's trial where she too decides to testify and seek revenge. Her main function in the narrative is to show the destructive desire for vengeance is not solely a masculine trait but something to which anyone can succumb.

Where *Utū* makes the greatest level of reassessment compared to previous representations of the New Zealand Wars is in its depiction of the Māori militiamen. Though the allied Māori in *Utū* are not identified as a specific historical group, their uniforms and location of action and their placement as serving under Pākehā officers shows a clear evocation of the Arawa Flying Column. Three characters in the film exhibit a greater discourse of what it meant to be seen as kūpapa: Te Wheke, Henare and Wiremu. Te Wheke is the ultimate disillusioned allied Māori. In the opening of the film he serves as a scout for the militia, acting as a guide. However the killing of his tribe at their cultivation turns him against the Crown who he formerly happily aided. Henare is a character who openly interrogates his role in fighting alongside Pākehā and is disillusioned with what he is doing, questioning the nature of the fight that pits tribe against tribe.

Of all the allied Māori in the film *Wi Kuki Kaa's* Wiremu is the most detailed in portraying the motivation and understanding of why Māori fought with the militia. "Kaa's own Ngāti Porou descent equipped him to understand the complexity of kūpapa, and gave this history a powerful resonance with him" (Cooper 137). Wiremu is perhaps the most compelling figure in the film. When he is openly confronted about what side he is on by Lieutenant Scott and responds "The same side as you sir, I was born here too" (Murphy, *Utū*). Additionally, when asked about making a better world in Aotearoa he holds up a musket asking if that will make a better world, and if not, "Does it matter which side we're on?" (Murphy, *Utū*). Bruce Babington states:

Wiremu, played with *Wi Kuki Kā's* mixture of opaqueness and thoughtful gravitas, is impressively bicultural, in a way only hinted at in *Hayward*, with his command of French and his prowess at chess, leaving nonetheless, his command of Māori ritual and knowledge undiminished (157).

In many respects Wiremu is the idealised multicultural Māori, one who has learned to appreciate the advantages of both cultures. Yet he has become disillusioned to war and only fights to honour his oath to serve the Crown. This oath does not prevent him from serving his own *utu* at the end of the film. In all representations of Māori fighting either on behalf of or alongside the colonial government, *Utu* is perhaps the one to give the most nuanced portrayal of these figures.

Utu's ties to history comes at the very start, with the burning of the Māori village of the fictional Ngai Marama. This scene is based on the massacre at Rangiaowhia thematically, rather than graphically. The reason I say this is the rapidity of the attack and no features that reflect Rangiaowhia's tragedy, such as women, the elderly, and children burned in their houses or places worship. The cavalry raid and burning of a *kāinga* also reflects the actions of the mounted rifles from 1865-1870 more than the Waikato Invasion. Instead, the scene's ties to Rangiaowhia are evident in one of Te Wheke's inspirations, Kereopa Te Rau, whose family were killed at Rangiaowhia and whereupon he swore to seek *utu* from the government.

The massacre at Rangiaowhia was not the only historical event tied to Te Rau that Murphy includes in *Utu*. On March 2 1865, Kereopa Te Rau executed the missionary Carl Volkner at Opotiki on the belief that he was a government spy (Binney 38). In Murphy's version, Te Wheke enters a church where an angry vicar denounces Māori resistance from the pulpit. The vicar is hacked to death and decapitated by Te Wheke in front of an indifferent congregation. Following the killing Te Wheke proceeds to give his own sermon using the vicar's words "all those who live by the sword, will die by the sword" (Murphy, *Utu*). This scene is inspired by Te Rau's killing of Carl Volkner. Rather than hacking Volkner death with a hatchet, however, he was hung by rope (Belich, *The New Zealand Wars* 205).

Te Wheke's sermon is also an allusion to Te Rau's position as a preacher of the Pai Marire faith, particularly Te Rau's variation that spoke of violent action rather than passive resistance.

The scene was going to be more closely based on Te Rau's actions, but this aspect of the story was left out, not out of sensitivities to gruesome action, but due to cultural accuracy. Following the killing of Volkner, Te Rau ate the missionary's eyes. The film intended to recreate this action but as Murphy himself explains, the reaction of their casting director Merata Mita and cultural advisor Joe Malcom dissuaded him:

When Merata saw the footage she was horrified, not by the act itself, but by the fact that Zac had chewed them, and this was not the way it was done. She consulted with Joe, and when he saw the film he was even more upset... You were meant to swallow them whole, not chew on them as Zac had done (Murphy 225).

This faux pas meant that the eye eating was cut from the scene, as Murphy refused to produce the event inaccurately. This direct engagement with his cultural advisors meant the film shows not only a willingness to incorporate Māori cultural elements, but also a desire to make sure they were correct. So, while the metafiction has quite an array of freedom in how it shows history, in this instance at least, there are boundaries. The decision made also reinforces the desire to still create a feel or mood of the New Zealand Wars, despite the play with history and to not deviate into a fully fictional space.

The final scene of the film is a direct representation of the Trial of Wi Heretaunga. The scenery is a deliberate evocation of the event as recounted by Cowan.

The snow lay deep on the mountains and the clearing, and as the evening breeze increased in strength masses came swishing down from the tree branches like small avalanches. In the bush camp great fires were burning, and the blaze lit up as clear as daylight a wild savage scene (Cowan, *Tales of the Maori Bush* 62).

While Murphy does not create scenes of snow, the trial is still held in winter and with a cold breeze. Murphy positions Scott in the place of Mair and Preece, the militia in the place of the Arawa Flying Column and Te Wheke in the position of Wi Heretaunga.

Much like the film's characters Williamson and Matu, there were claimants wishing for utu and the right to execute Heretaunga. But it is the next point that is most poignant:

There was a quite celebrated young Maori warrior in the Contingent, a New Zealand Cross man named Kepa te Ahuru. He earnestly requested the right of putting the prisoner to death, and he gave these reasons: Wi Heretaunga was a man of high rank in the Urewera and Wairoa tribes, and his death at the hands of the Arawa natives might engender bad feeling, prejudicing the efforts to obtain peace and preventing Te Kooti's capture. He said, moreover, that his right could not be questioned: he was the condemned man's nephew, the son of his sister: therefore, according to Maori etiquette, it would be absolutely tika—that is—correct for his uncle to die by his hand (Cowan, *Tales of the Maori Bush* 65).

This particular instance is echoed through Wiremu's own action during this scene, taking the responsibility for the execution of Te Wheke. Wiremu states "Ko rangatira, like Te Wheke... this is my brother" (Murphy, *Utū*). He makes it apparent that he is of a standing and is not seeking utu in a similar fashion to Kepa te Ahuru.

Where the angle of the scene changes however, is the nature of the familial relationship. Wiremu is not a young nephew, but an older brother. His ties are even closer which makes the scene more poignant, particularly with Wiremu's comments to Te Wheke that they shall meet in heaven. The relationship further highlights the argument presented by Belich of The New Zealand Wars as a civil war and not a colonial war. The theme of brother fighting brother is often brought up in regards to conflicts like the American Civil War and the Irish Civil War, and *Utu* goes out of its way to make the same argument. Further in the scene, there is the loan of the rifle. As Cowan states:

Kepa te Ahuru stripped to his waist-shawl, and begging the loan of Mair's carbine, strode up and down before the condemned man. The carbine was a Westley-Richards Snider, sent to Mair by Sir Cosmo Gordon, of Scotland, for some kindness he had shown to his nephew, Cosmo Gordon, First Lieutenant of H.M.S. *Rosario* (Cowan, *Tales of the Maori Bush* 65).

This is the same story given for Lieutenant Scott's carbine that he gives to Wiremu, a gift from a British nobleman for service helping the man's nephew. The striding leads to the haka performed to Te Wheke, before his execution and Wiremu's speech lauding the mana of the carbine itself as a worthy weapon to execute Te Wheke.

This entire scene, in addition to its close adaptation of Cowan's account, also provides further ambiguity over the morality of the entire film. Te Wheke is found guilty by the court, but he is afforded an honourable death in not only a culturally appropriate manner, but also one befitting a man of his mana. This scene is a powerful presentation of Māori culture that previously had not seen as large an audience or depiction in a wider national (and later international context). The scene alone pushes for the greater visibility of Māori cultural practice in film, highlighting

the post-coloniality of *Utu* compared to its Hayward predecessors. The post-colonial western reassesses earlier practices, including the visibility of indigenous people and more significantly culture. Māori do not needlessly attack or defend Pākehā settlements, nor are they outnumbered victims of European onslaught. Any action carried out is for narrative (such as Te Wheke's pursuit of revenge) and symbolic (destruction of the piano and china) reasons. They are developed and three-dimensional characters.

River Queen's Return to the Historical Romance?

Utu's role as part of the push back against the past representations of the New Zealand Wars and a greater engagement with the Land Wars contrasts with the most recent of the films which appears at first glance to be a Sir Walter Scott throw back. Of all the filmic representations of the Land Wars, the most visible in terms of popular culture and scholarship is the 2005 film *River Queen* directed by Vincent Ward.

The film continues the change from Hayward's historical fiction to historiographic metafiction as *River Queen* principally depicts events inspired by Titokowaru's War (1869-1870) and adds elements of several other histories. This is particularly evident in the characters who are, as in *Utu*, inspired by or are amalgamations of historical figures. *River Queen* differs from *Utu* in the same way that *The Te Kooti Trail* differs from *The Last Stand* with it being a romance rather than a western. In fact, Amy J. Elias would define it as more of a metahistorical romance:

what I call 'metahistorical romance' to some extent repeats the contemporary debate about history in historiography. I claim that metahistorical romance is historical fiction which morphs the historical romance genre into a literary form that is able to encompass the

historiographical debates of his own time. Just as Scott's historical romance reflected the historiography of his own time, the metahistorical romance reflects the postmodern turn on history. Scott's novels illustrated a stadialist view of history perfectly in keeping with the Enlightenment historiography of the Scottish philosophies, and today's metahistorical romance illustrates our own historiography's lack of faith in, but continuing desire for, 'historical' knowledge (163-4).

Elias' ideas are evident with *River Queen*'s highly post-colonial examination of New Zealand history, continuing *Utu*'s rejection or reassessment of the New Zealand Wars.

The film not only examines the interactions between Māori and Pākehā, but also attempts to acknowledge the shades of cultural difference among Pākehā. In particular, *River Queen* features Irish characters who are treated as distinct from the English and not just comical figures with funny accents (as shown in *The Te Kooti Trail* with Barney). *River Queen* is also, like *The Last Stand*, steeped in the tradition of the New Zealand Wars romance. It therefore is concerned with many of the similar aspects as *The Last Stand*, for instance the Māori-Pākehā romantic relationship (between Sarah and Boy's father, as well as Sarah and Wiremu) and the grand scenery and time of great national change.

The film is less concerned with how history transpired, and more with a representation of marginalised stories (albeit highly fictionalised) through a fixed narrative form:

Indeed the generic complexity of *River Queen* properly suggests not a commodified history-making, but a sustained effort to call a privileged historical account into question—the grand narrative of colonialism and its

well-disciplined practices—in line with the textual activity that Linda Hutcheon calls historiographic metafiction (Nicholson paragraph 8).

Furthermore, while *River Queen* does share features with Hayward's *The Last Stand*, it is less preoccupied with concerns of national identity. Rather, it has been constructed as a period film in line with the trend of the time. As Olivia Macassey states:

its relatively low budget, international stars and its status as a UK/NZ co-productions (produced by Don Reynolds and Chris Autry) are all hallmarks of the trend, as are its debut at the Toronto Film Festival and Ward's auteur stamp (123).

Therefore it follows a different plan to the historical epic style that Hayward was presenting in his historical romance. It features an array of alterations as a result of the change.

A factor in this change is in the target markets for the films. Hayward was aiming at a domestic market, Ward, however, was as focused on the international market as on New Zealand:

Claire Monk argues that since contemporary period films primarily address international audiences and niche markets, it is productive to read them in these terms rather than as articulations of a specific national identity and heritage (Macassey 123).

Arguably, the development of a new film set during the New Zealand Wars, thirty-two years after *Utu*, had just as much to do with the trend in New Zealand film-making as it had with the international film trends:

one could argue that the Aotearoa New Zealand Government's recently established Film Production Fund, and the availability of personnel who had previously worked on films such as the *Lord of the Rings* trilogy (Peter

Jackson 2001-2003), *Without a Paddle* (Steven Brill, 2004) and *The Last Samurai* (Edward Zwick, 2003) have provided the material preconditions for *River Queen*'s emergence as a New Zealand film (Macassey 123).

This reliance on an international market does alter the nature of *River Queen* compared to Hayward's films and *Utu*. While those films were influenced by international trends, they were not beholden to them or their particular style in order to break into the market (the international cut of *Utu* notwithstanding).

The change in markets does lead to some genericising in the film in order to fit within the period film genre of which *River Queen* is a part, and fitting into the film festival circuit style. As Macassey argues:

In these films, a universalised western discourse pits the individual agency and romantic interests of central characters against a repressive society. Since the repressive society in such films is necessarily colonial, the result is that this conflict is by its very structure analogous to colonial power relations between colonised and coloniser (Macassey 124).

Despite the confines of the plot, *River Queen* does not wholly conform to the requirements of the colonial heritage romance genre, as Macassey continues:

River Queen differs from colonial heritage romance *per se* in that the romance plot in the personal sphere is juxtaposed with a prominent action plot in the public sphere – the literal replaces the allegorical as the protagonists are increasingly swept up into bloody warfare (Macassey 124).

River Queen does present closer parallels to the New Zealand Wars romance, especially compared to *Utu*. In this regard *River Queen* shares similarities with *The New Zealand Wars* novels of Maurice Shadbolt. The film, therefore is tugged between two poles: the New Zealand Wars romance, creating a representation of history, which the characters have been swept up in, and a colonial heritage

romance popular in contemporary international film circuits. It pulls equally towards the Sir Walter Scott tradition as it does contemporary cinema.

In this fashion *River Queen* continues the parallels and love affair with *Last of the Mohicans*, particularly as an acclaimed film adaptation of the novel was released in 1992 directed by Michael Mann. Both feature journeys along a river, a quest in search of a missing person, and conflict between native peoples and settlers (with their own native allies). The principle change here is that Ward's film aligns itself more with the indigenous populace than the militia and settlers. As Nicholson notes:

River Queen employs the venerable traditions of the romance, and specifically a quest romance that revolves around the recovery of a lost child: a motif that goes back through Shakespeare to ancient Greek Romances and which is also a politically-charged antipodean tale, in fantasy and fact (paragraph 7).

Where *Utú* is a metahistorical western, *River Queen* is equally a metahistorical romance. Like *Utú*, *River Queen* also features characters based upon people from New Zealand's history.

The lead of *River Queen*, like *Utú*, is based upon multiple figures, with some adjustments and characterisation to fit the film's narrative. Sarah O'Brien (played by Samantha Morton) is based upon two women: Anne Evans and Caroline "Hera" Ngoungou. Ngoungou (née Perrot) was a young girl who was kidnapped by local Māori in 1874 in Taranaki and taken to live among the tribe. She was also the inspiration for the name Queenie. Evans, meanwhile, was a former subordinate of Florence Nightingale and worked in Camp Waihi as a storekeeper, midwife, and surgeon (Belich, *I Shall Not Die* 290). Anne Evans' story inspired the aspect of Sarah as a medic:

North of the Waingongoro she was blindfolded to conceal the route from her, but ended up at a few huts in a small clearing near Te Ngutu o te Manu. Here she found an old man with pneumonia—Titokowaru. She treated him, and others...for six weeks (Belich, *I Shall Not Die* 290).

Anne's story was much less dramatic than Sarah's, however, as following his recovery, Titokowaru arranged for her passage home and gave her a £100 note, a substantial sum for the time. It is interesting that neither inspiration for Sarah O'Brien was near the Whanganui region during Titokowaru's War. Instead their stories contributed to a heroine that is in the thick of the fighting.

Like Te Wheke, Sarah is not just based upon these characters but has traits unique to her character. For instance, neither of the women she was based upon were Irish, and the earlier point in time of the film changes the dynamic with her story to their own. Sarah's characterisation also features a playing with the historical romance, as she

seldom wears the kind of costume we usually associate with the genre.

Rather, this heroine wears an odd mixture of feminine attire and old army cast-offs, most notably a military style jacket (Macassey 125).

This blend of outfit conveys a greater attention to her character, and not just presenting a stereotype at the expense of genre. Sarah, despite her historical inspirations, is not beholden to their appearance, actions or story. Cooper argues that this narrative choice stretches believability beyond the boundaries of Sarah's roots. "It is unlikely that a woman could have travelled safely alone on the river for her son" (Cooper 238). In this regard the film reaches back into the historical romance genre, to a greater extent than *Utu*.

In a different mode to convention, Sarah is a female Pākehā historical romance protagonist rather than a love interest. As mentioned in Chapter Two, she

has strong parallels with Olga Stringfellow's protagonist of the novel *Mary Bravender*. Like Mary Bravender, Sarah's romance with Wiremu is unusual for the time period, as a Pākehā woman's romance with a Māori man was considered scandalous. Yet the censure Sarah receives is about political allegiances than fears of miscegenation: "I hear you have some friends up the river. In wartime that's treason" (Ward).

Much like Stringfellow's protagonist, Sarah is not a character in the model of the European lady. She has far more in common with the Walter Scott neutral protagonist. This is particularly apparent with the love triangle involving someone from the same background as herself and an indigenous love interest, much like *Waverley*. In this vein, *River Queen* is arguably even closer to the model of Sir Walter Scott than Shadbolt (albeit with a gender flipped set up). Like Bravender, Sarah is a traveller from abroad who comes to settle in Aotearoa (more specifically the Whanganui), and becomes involved with an indigenous love interest while a European suitor is also in the picture. Sarah becomes swept up in a conflict, yet stays firmly neutral not getting directly involved on either side. Like Bravender, Sarah is also a mother and chooses the indigenous suitor.

The parallels are not absolute, however, as Bravender chooses to live in between the Māori and Pākehā world, while ultimately Sarah utterly rejects European society and is tattooed with a tā moko signifying a total integration into Māori society. Her full immersion in the river following the tattooing is symbolic of her new identity as Queenie, a woman with strong connections in a vibrant Māori world. Sarah can be read as a female alternative to the Scott protagonist; she is not just the male counterpart with a different gender, but comes from a different perspective and finds a different destiny. This destiny is the most radical aspect of the film and jettisons many of the nineteenth-century tropes and enduring attitudes

in favour of a twenty-first century vision of feminine strength and autonomy, and a celebration of cultural diversity. Of particular note is the film's reworking of the traveller figure. Sarah is a migrant to New Zealand, with a sense of identity as an Irish woman, but the film traces her transition from this self to a new self. By remaining in New Zealand, affirming her motherhood of Boy, and committing herself to Wiremu she embodies the opposite trajectory to the Scott-like traveller who returns to "civilisation". For Sarah, Aotearoa becomes home.

The film utilises Campbell's character types and features a bigoted Pākehā antagonist. The commanding officer of the colonial militia, Major Baine is based upon two colonial officers. His dominant characterization is the temperamental Thomas McDonnell and, to a lesser extent, Gustavus von Tempsky. Both of these men were important officers in 1868-9, and were even known to be rivals. Von Tempsky had the fame while McDonnell had the rank. Though while von Tempsky met his end at the Battle of Te Ngutu o te Manu, McDonnell survived the remainder of the New Zealand Wars, much like Baine surviving the entirety of the film. Baine's long hair and beard are clearly based upon von Tempsky's, but his paranoia and melodramatics are more McDonnell-esque.

Yet, much like Murphy's treatment with Elliot compared to Whitmore, Ward has actually toned Baine down from his inspiration. Following a loss at Turuturumokai it was "reported that McDonnell had melodramatically drawn his sword, kissed it, and sworn vengeance on it in the moonlight" (Crosby, *Kūpapa* 326). This flair for the dramatic was not the only aspect of McDonnell that makes him a borderline caricature of the wicked commander, as Belich states:

McDonnell was not quite 'all there'. His mastery of Maori metaphor was a self-delusion, and he believed that force was the only argument that natives respected. There was a touch of paranoia about his jealousy of rivals such

as Robert Parris, his desire for acclaim and his readiness to detect treachery everywhere (Belich, *I Shall Not Die* 20).

It would be too convenient to claim that Major Baine simply fills the role of stereotype in creating a negative image of a Pākehā officer. Again, much like Colonel Elliot of *Utu*, the reality is that many of these Pākehā military leaders were far more eccentric than the sober leadership of Duncan Cameron during the Waikato Invasion would imply. Ward, like Murphy, has been accused of exaggeration with his negative portrayal of militia officers, but as I stated earlier, many of them were exactly as unrealistic and unconventional in reality as they have been portrayed since the 1980s.

The Māori leader Te Kai Po, in contrast to the *Utu*'s composite character Te Wheke, appears based solely on one historical figure, the skilled tactician Rīwha Titokowaru. In her discussion of *River Queen* Olivia Macassey argues "Te Kai Pō seems to be created by the amalgamation of Rīwha Titokowaru, who fought at Te Ngutu o te Manu, and the prophet Te Kooti Arikirangi Te Turuki" (130). I disagree with Macassey's comments. Te Kai Po shows no characteristics that could be solely attributed to Te Kooti, unless Te Kai Po's dreams are inspired by Te Kooti's own visions. Yet Titokowaru's own status as a prophet (of Pai Marire) contests visions as the sole purview of Te Kooti. In contrast, Te Kai Po's characteristics in common with the historical Titokowaru are many. First is his bowler hat, a trademark of his attire with European clothing (Belich, *I Shall Not Die* 8). In addition is the interaction with Anne Evans (that has been moved to early in Te Kai Po's campaign for the film). The most significant parallel though is Titokowaru's warning that is presented almost verbatim by Te Kai Po.

A word to you. Cease travelling on the roads; stop forever the going on the roads which lead to Mangamanga [Waihi], lest you be left on the roads as

food for the birds of the air and for the beasts of the field, or for me, because I have tasted the European, as beef, he was cooked in a pot; the women and children partook of the food. I have begun to eat human flesh, and my throat is constantly open for the flesh of man. I shall not die. When death itself is dead I shall be alive (Belich, *I Shall Not Die* 61).

Played by Temuera Morrison, Te Kai Po shows his historical counterpart's penchant for theatricality. Morrison's portrayal of the historical figure is the most recognisable depiction of a man who has now such a reputation some call for him to be acknowledged as a national hero. "Tītokowaru was merciless on the battlefield - but he changed. To me, that transition sets him apart. In my view - he is a New Zealand hero - and should be treated as such" (Gower).

Yet, while Morrison's portrayal of Tītokowaru does do him some justice, it is not without complications. He is also consistently shown to be a figure of sexual dominance. As Cooper argues:

A disturbing series of cuts during the battle, between a sexual act and the scene of the fighting, suggests a link between sex and killing – connecting his prophetic and military power to his sexual power (244).

Ward takes the story of Tītokowaru's abandonment at Tauranga Ika pā and makes it a core part of Tītokowaru's identity. He is powerful due to his sexual prowess, and his sexual prowess makes him prophetic and a fearsome warrior. This aspect of Riwā Tītokowaru's character draws heavily from the stereotypes of the indigene that Terry Goldie criticises. While visually and in terms of Morrison's performance this Tītokowaru is a powerful presence on screen, unfortunately the narrative draws on tropes that makes his representation problematic.

Te Kai Po is not the only Māori character with an historical counterpart, however. Sarah's lover Wiremu is based upon Katene Tuwhakaruru, a Māori

warrior who fought for the militia but later sided with Titokowaru. Much like Wiremu's former service under Baine, Katene fought under McDonnell (Belich, *I Shall Not Die* 103). Katene's son was also killed by Māori militia at Te Ngutu o te Manu, an event that shaped much of Ward's representation of Māori who sided with the colonial government.

After the nuanced portrayal of Māori militiamen in *Utu*, the far more negative depiction in *River Queen* is jarring. The film features two key examples of allied Māori during Titokowaru's War. In the case of Wiremu, his defection is similar to Te Wheke's. On witnessing the attack and burning of a village by armed constabulary, Wiremu makes up his mind to leave the militia (described on screen as the army). Yet Wiremu's motives for serving the militia are never explored in great detail. It is his service as a warrior for Te Kai Po that is treated as important to the plot. In the film his casting aside of his allegiance to the Pākehā is treated as a return to his true Māori self. A polar opposite is found in his cousin, Hone, who is shown to be sadistic and mercenary in his outlook. Hone sees no issue in killing children in cold blood and betraying his tribe for profit. In fact, he is less of a character and more of a caricature, the obvious sort of man who would betray his people.

I have several issues with this kind of character, the first being he is not shown to have any real motives for allying with the Crown other than profit. Motives for serving in or alongside militia were not always so clear cut. These could be related to historic enmity, they could be political, the reason could even be due to following the chief's orders. Furthermore, it is unusual and unlikely for an allied Māori to be fighting in Whanganui/Taranaki and be serving directly under a Pākehā officer. As mentioned earlier, the Arawa Flying Column was an exception to most groups. While the higher command may have been Pākehā, direct command of the

units were generally under traditional leadership. As mentioned in Chapter Three, eminent among these leaders was the chief Te Keepa, sometimes called Major Kemp of the South Whanganui. Instead, the allied Māori in the film are shown as directly serving Major Bain, rare in a massed deployment.

It is clear that the audience are cued to be negative towards the allied Māori as represented on screen. While many of the actions (such as the killing of Wiremu's son) were based on historical events, actions on the side of Te Kai Po do not feature anything the audience may find unsavoury, such as acts of ritual cannibalism which were recorded as occurring amongst Titokowaru's followers. The only allusion to this practice is Te Kai Po's letter, which is treated as a deliberate antagonism played for humour.

River Queen exhibits an idea that has grown in contemporary representations of the New Zealand Wars, particularly with regard to allied Māori. It is a necessary construction of binaries that limits the perspective of the wars in order to seek justice and restitution. Ron Crosby states in regard to Māori rights and activism: "To show prejudice and a victim required a perpetrator of the breach—the Crown. Anyone aligned with the perpetrator therefore became tainted by the Crown's breach of the Treaty" (*Kūpapa* 11). Therefore, all depictions of Māori allying with the Crown become affected by the idea that they were traitors, regardless of the context of the time and the motives in forming an alliance with the Crown. Furthermore, regarding the process of compensation in Treaty claims Crosby argues: "It has been of no benefit to Māori in this new process to trumpet an iwi's past alliance with the Crown" (*Kūpapa* 10). This practice includes later Treaty breaches by the Crown toward allied Māori. Due to the claims process and narratives that examine only in terms of persecutor and persecuted, the greater complexity of loyalties is overlooked. Therefore, in representing the New Zealand

Wars in this narrative, the only way to reconcile the actions of allied Māori is to depict them as traitors. The very nature of the differing narratives forces the viewers into engaging with binaries. Either viewers are expected to be (as with Hayward and still arguably Murphy) for or (as with Ward) against. There is little room for complexity.

Arguably the representation of Māori who sided with the Crown is always going to be mixed. There is no one narrative to apply to such figures. Their reputation is always going to depend on the audience. What is necessary, however, is to not allow them to be misremembered as something they were not, whether depicted as blindly loyal subjects of the Crown, profiteering mercenaries, or absolutely loyal patriots to the Queen. Each is a slanted narrative that misremembers. There also is a danger of misremembering the past to seek justice in the present. The complexities of Aotearoa/New Zealand's history need to be acknowledged.

Both the Māori who fought with the government, and their even more neglected opposites, the Pākehā such as Kimble Bent, who fought alongside the Māori deserve proper recognition on screen as well as in the history books. As Vine Deloria Jr argues:

If the weak points of each minority group's history are to be covered over by a sweetness-and-light interpretation based on what we would like to think happened rather than what did happen, we doom ourselves to further decades of racial strife (39).

Where *River Queen* does endeavour to create nuance with a colonised person fighting for the imperialist side is not with a Māori character, who is reduced to a stereotype of savagery, but an Irishman. Private Doyle, the third corner of Sarah's love triangle, fights alongside the colonial militia and had previously served with

the British army in New Zealand. He makes a direct comparison between fighting for the colonial militia and fighting for Oliver Cromwell during his invasion of Ireland in 1649.

This depiction of an Irishman seeing parallels to indigenous cultures is not surprising. Some Irish

were more likely to view Indigenous peoples as fellow victims of British imperialism, even though such nationalists often had difficulty shedding their own conscious or unconscious racism (Morton and Wilson 7).

The fact that Doyle creates an association with the local Māori, despite fighting against them implies that he is at heart a nationalist, even while fighting for the colonial government and formerly the British Army.

While there was some racial bias that could be found among the Irish people there was also sympathy for other colonised cultures. Nationalists drew parallels to indigenous groups as a tactic in their own push for self-determination:

Rather than undermine their domestic project, associating themselves with nonwhite victims of colonialism gave Irish nationalists both a moral high ground and a supranational edge that transcended the day-to-day politics of home (McMahon 94).

Yet the issue of military service in the British Army did mean that tensions arose. Cian McMahon states: “Irish service in the British Army only heightened the drama” (102). Arguably this status gives Private Doyle, greater similarity to Māori who fought alongside the militia. His own complex feelings of loyalty and service yet distaste for fighting against those with whom he feels kinship is the closest that *River Queen* comes to examining what it means to be considered kūpapa:

As the film progresses, the message is made even more overt. Doyle views the Māori warriors he fights against as his brothers, and the British army as

an unjust imperialist instrument with a long history of oppression against his own people (Moffat “The River and the Ocean: Indigeneity and Dispossession in Vincent Ward’s *River Queen*” 96).

Doyle’s complicated feelings towards the conflict would not be out of place in a Māori character like Henare from *Utu*. In *River Queen* however, the internal conflict of an allied Māori has been whitewashed and made into an Irishman.

Ward’s endeavour to depict Titokowaru’s War is limited. There are few events from the conflict depicted on screen. In this regard, the film further parallels *Last of the Mohicans* where the background of the Seven Years War is subservient to the escort and rescue of Colonel Munro’s daughters. In *River Queen*, Titokowaru’s War is a stylistic backdrop to the main plot of Sarah’s romance and quest for her son.

The film’s representation of the New Zealand Wars may centre loosely around one exemplary, historical engagement, but as the film progresses, continued military action devolves into a set of skirmishes, minimally explained, lacking the definition of a campaign. Ward makes narrative, intelligible sense of this otherwise shapeless history by threading it on the remorseless linearity of romance, since the film begins with the heroine, Sarah O’Brien, and lasts long enough for her to discover love, suffer in its cause, and finally settle into a happy future, the demands of passion finding a complex but conventional resolution (Nicholson paragraph 6).

While the events of *River Queen* are broadly based upon Titokowaru’s War, there are only two key events that are depicted. The initial raids and burning of cultivations which convince Wiremu to leave the colonial militia could be inspired by any of the numerous attacks launched by McDonnell in and around Mount

Taranaki. The first major event is the third attack by McDonnell at Te Ngutu o te Manu which I described in some detail in Chapter Three.

The main difference depicted in this film, compared to the historical record, is how it shows the aforementioned murder of a Katene's son by Māori militiamen. This murder of Wiremu's son is based on an actual event of the same battle and provides further characterization for the von Tempsky aspects of Baine that show his own later cruelty towards Sarah's son Boy. According to James Belich's historical account of the battle, kūpapa moving with Tempsky came upon a hospital clearing where "Katene's son 'would not keep quiet' and a kupapa seized the crippled boy and 'dashed out his brains'" (*I Shall Not Die* 121). This event is more callous on screen, as in reality the other two children discovered were silent and left alive, implying the event to have been more brutal pragmatism than the abject barbarism shown on screen. The scene stands in contrast to previous on screen depictions of allied Māori, but to its credit shows the callousness of the war, compared to the "honourable deaths" in *The Last Stand*.

The battle of Te Ngutu o te Manu, as with the battle in real-life, ended with a call to withdraw by McDonnell, followed by a pursuit. With the pursuit

Titokowaru restrained his men, instructing that the pursuit be tightly controlled—harassment from cover without unnecessary risk. Katene led the pursuit and he accepted and implemented these orders. But he still intended to take full revenge for his son (Belich, *I Shall Not Die* 131).

During the course of the battle Titokowaru's Ngā Ruahine followers lost only three men, two of whom are shown on screen, compared to the many suffered by the militia. The film's version of the battle is what exposes Sarah to the violence of the conflict. It exists on a greater scale than what she saw at an earlier raid on a cultivation. As she spends intervening time away from the action of Titkowaru's

War and instead nursing Private Doyle before his death, it is understandable that the audience do not see any more of Titokowaru's War until Tauranga Ika pā, glossing over weeks of time.

Despite the visual medium of film, the incredible structure of Tauranga Ika is not given its full due by Ward. The film shows a wooden palisade and the natural barrier of a river and gully to act as its protection. As discussed in Chapter Three, the pā as described by Belich was a more formidable obstacle and a testament to Titokowaru's engineering. Ward's pā falls into the stereotype of placing indigenous people into a reliance on the land for their protection rather than heralding the feat of ingenuity that Tauranga Ika truly was. Terry Goldie remarks "such avoidance of technological issues is certainly understandable if considered in the context of another aspect of the indigene as natural, the indigene as natural freedom" (23). The film is constrained by its own depiction of Māori as a freer and more natural society that dwells beside the river or among the trees; where even cultivations of crops are presented in only a very small capacity. It is apparent that grand feats of human artifice would not fit the prescribed narrative.

Not only is the pā itself altered to fit the narrative, but so too are events which transpire in the pā. For instance: "As they besiege Te Kai Pō's fortified pā, the soldiers join with the opposing Māori warriors to sing a song about the devil as an Englishman" (Moffat, "The River and the Ocean: Indigeneity and Dispossession in Vincent Ward's *River Queen*" 96). This scene, with the trading of songs, did take place, though not in the way presented by Ward. Instead the "position was close enough to converse with the Māori garrison" (Belich, *I Shall Not Die* 249). While they did sing to each other, they were more US Civil War songs such as "Marching Through Georgia" than the devil as an Englishman. The film makes the change to

instead draw a closer connection between the soldiers (many likely Scottish and Irish) and the Māori in mocking their English colonial rulers.

Ward's representation of Tauranga Ika's historic abandonment conforms more with Belich's analysis of the event. While the warriors are awaiting battle, Te Kai Po has sex with a woman (in the film the wife of a major ally), causing a loss of mana and support. Ward also provides a reason for Te Kai Po's actions beyond mere lust, as he angles the narrative instead to state that Te Kai Po engaged in the affair fully aware that it would cause his followers to desert him, thus avoiding the river of blood from his visions. The scene has parallels with Shadbolt's own representation of Tauranga Ika, but where he implied, here it is more explicit. "We could have won this day" "The battle – yes. But winning the war? Never!" (Ward). *River Queen* presents its version of Tauranga Ika as Te Kai Po's final stand. The film implies that following the affair and abandonment of the pā, the warriors dispersed and peace came to the land. Te Kai Po's forfeit is quite different from the actions of Titokowaru, as for him the conflict continued for some time later, despite his much-reduced numbers of soldiers.

River Queen attempts to show a new paradigm in perceiving the New Zealand Wars. It reassesses the narrative to include a Māori perspective of the conflict and, as is underscored with Sarah's journey, the film affirms the Māori world as a place of safety, home, belonging, and the future. This is highlighted, in particular, by Boy's commercialisation of his tattooing art. Rather than holding the status of a tohunga tā moko like his grandfather, Boy is a tattooist. On the one hand, this could be interpreted as a jettisoning of heritage and tradition that appears to consign the Māori way of life to the past. As Goldie argues:

Regardless of the author's obvious intent to provide a positive image of the indigene, and in many cases even to lament the process of the white invasions, the semiosis presents the indigene as a sign of the past (150).

On the other hand, however, Boy's adaptability can be read as a rejection of outmoded ideas about Māori as a "dying race". Far from belonging to a lost world, Boy is part of a new world of commerce, exchange, and innovation.

In *River Queen* the Māori way of life is something to be admired and, indeed, emulated and this aspect of the film is an important corrective to the earlier sentiment expressed by Hayward's *The Last Stand*. *River Queen*, as a story of nation making, however, does treat the issues of the past as having ended, despite the myriad problems of land confiscation and continued resistance (especially by Titokowaru) that came later.

Conclusion

The films all adhere to many attributes of the nineteenth-century New Zealand Wars romances. While Hayward sets the ground that spawned the later productions, his films are clearly reliant on nation-making ideas, as well as keeping to genre conventions (even when it would omit or alter the histories he claimed to rely upon). Of all the film makers, he transfers the ideas New Zealand Wars romance novelists such as Satchell and Boldrewood onto screen (particularly in *The Last Stand*) the most. This close adherence to the romance convention is likely due to the historic proximity to the writers (*The Te Kooti Trail* was filmed thirteen years after the publication of *The Greenstone Door*).

In terms of genre, *River Queen* is one of the most subversive of convention. The narrative centres on a female European protagonist (the character who had fared worst for representation in the past). It toys with the romance tropes without

quite breaking free, but it does include the radical decision to integrate into the Māori world rather than returning to the Europeanised society.

Utu endeavours to create the most radical changes, and while it does not feature a European lady to the same extent as *River Queen*, overall it has the broadest spectrum of representation of perspectives in Aotearoa. The film showcases a greater degree of spoken te reo by both Māori and Pākehā, and allows key roles to be occupied by a wider array of characters than prior or subsequent films. It was also the most experimental, taking chances such as including significant amounts of Māori culture and its use of *Macbeth* as a metatext, which will be explored further in Chapter Five. Film saw a greater degree of Māori influence on the representations of the New Zealand Wars, but in all of the fictional versions shown here, none were in the driving seat. It is another medium that truly brings Māori to the conversation for representing the Land Wars and builds from Ihimaera's efforts in the 1980s, that is through Shakespeare and drama.

Chapter Five: Shakespeare and the Land Wars

The relationship between Shakespeare and New Zealand, traces as far back as the eighteenth century with a copy of the Complete Works upon the *Endeavour* during Captain James Cook's initial voyage around Aotearoa in 1769 (Houlahan, *Oxford Companion to New Zealand Literature* 489). Houlahan also notes that the first recorded Shakespeare performance in New Zealand (*Macbeth*) had an audience of soldiers deployed to Aotearoa to fight in the New Zealand Wars in 1848 ("Unsettling the Bard: Shakespeare in Australasia and the South Pacific" 797). This is the first link between Shakespeare and the New Zealand Wars. These Shakespearean ties to the New Zealand Wars are also found in New Zealand's first novel, Henry Butler Stoney's *Taranaki: A Tale of War*, where an officer comments on a Māori defeat and the arrival of General Duncan Cameron "Othello's occupation was gone" (Stoney 118). Admittedly, however, these examples are not direct engagements between the works of Shakespeare and the events of the New Zealand Wars; those begin with Geoff Murphy's 1983 film *Utu*. The moment that the Māori revenger Te Wheke acquires a copy of *Macbeth* establishes a link between the works of Shakespeare and the New Zealand Wars that other creative artists followed.

What is important to note, however, is that within New Zealand there is a distinct duality in Shakespeare's cultural role. His works are a vehicle of colonisation, bringing Pākehā (particularly English) performance traditions to Aotearoa and presenting set views on what is considered art on stage. Yet, in recent years, Shakespeare has become increasingly adapted to a New Zealand context, his works co-opted and modified. The plays are re-imagined and reconstructed to tell stories, and present ideas in a way that represents the perspectives of colonised peoples.

Shakespeare has occupied the attentions of New Zealand writers such as Katherine Mansfield, Janet Frame, and R. T. Hammond. In terms of performance, author Ngaio Marsh was a significant populariser, particularly in mid-twentieth century Christchurch. In general productions of Shakespeare within New Zealand have a complex history. They have varied from being highly orthodox renditions of Early Modern drama bent on preserving bastions of English culture, to more diverse and innovative adaptations that reflect a distinctly New Zealand flavour. Lisa Warrington asserts: “In recent years, New Zealand stages have seen Shakespeare reclaimed in the form of post-colonial pastiche or parody” (305). These have ranged from a *Romeo and Juliet* variation centring around Samoan and Māori families in South Auckland, to a bilingual meta-narrative one-man performance of *Othello* named *Solothello*. In 2018 there was a pan-Polynesian performance of *A Midsummer Night’s Dream* which featured segments of the play translated into Cook Island Māori and Samoan alongside English (Tantau).

There are also performances that position the plays in nineteenth-century Aotearoa. These stories break with the prescribed settings of Shakespeare, changing geographical and chronological locations. In turn, the productions can create new meanings within the performances by engaging with the new environment. Michael Neill states: “Local Shakespeare...is powerful because it is disruptive: it relocates in order to dislocate” (“Shakespeare Upside Down” 149). The disruptive nature of these productions raises the profile of local ideas and issues. Contemporary revisioning relocates Shakespeare from Early Modern England to the more familiar ground for audiences of Aotearoa New Zealand. Often there will be an overt effect of the production revealing insights about New Zealand history and culture in terms of race relations.

As stated, there has been a connection between Shakespeare and the New Zealand Wars ever since the first performance in Aotearoa New Zealand. In 1848, a production of *Macbeth* was attended by “soldiers on leave in Wellington from action in the land wars against Maori tribes” (Houlahan “The Tragedies in Australasia and the Pacific” 797). From Shakespeare’s first staging on the country’s shores, it was linked with the struggle over the land. In the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, this connection has expanded. Several productions take Shakespeare’s works and blend the performance with the New Zealand Wars, incorporating many of the historical figures and complexities of that period as well as the ramifications of the conflict, which still directly affect New Zealanders into the twenty-first century.

The stage performances arguably follow on from the period of works by Witi Ihimaera, and to an extent Maurice Shadbolt, interrogating the New Zealand Wars and finding room to depict the ramifications of the Land Wars. Philip Steer argues:

1982 through 1993, which saw nine novels published, was a time of crisis in Pakeha identity. Internally, the cultural renaissance and increasing political presence of Maori challenged Pakeha assumptions about their own identity, while historical grievances against the Crown were given a new prominence when the Waitangi Tribunal was permitted to hear claims from as far back as 1840 (129).

These stage productions’ and *Utu*’s interaction with Shakespeare can be seen as part of a wider movement. This chapter examines the Shakespearean ties to the Land Wars first through the allusions to Shakespeare in the film *Utu*. Next I discuss the allusions on stage with the production *Manawa Taua/Savage Hearts*. Lastly I

discuss three performances that have staged Shakespeare plays with a New Zealand Wars setting.

Utu, “I Like Revenging”

The first of these major Shakespearean interactions with the New Zealand Wars, took place on screen rather than on stage. Geoff Murphy’s 1983 western *Utu* takes elements of the New Zealand Wars, issues of the Land Wars, mixed with quotations, homages, and comments from *Macbeth* to present a decolonising cocktail on screen. It is important to note that the Shakespearean elements within *Utu* function intertextually, the film is not itself an adaptation of *Macbeth* like Akira Kurosawa’s *Throne of Blood*; rather Shakespeare exists to inform the narrative.

Ranginui Walker defines the word *utu* as “equivalence or payment.” In a more serious context it is “compensation for some injury.” The “most serious level of *utu* was revenge” (*Ka Whawhai Tonu Matou* 69). The word is also in the *Reed Dictionary of New Zealand English* but has been reduced in meaning to be defined as “revenge or satisfaction” (Orsman 1276). *Utu* situates itself in a place familiar to the Renaissance. While not an intentional evocation of a revenge play, the darkly comic moments in the film and the title also echo Thomas Middleton’s play *The Revenger’s Tragedy*.

At its most basic level, early modern revenge drama tells the story of someone from outside the ruling elite challenging the *status quo*, having been failed by the institutions designed to protect citizens (Dunne 4).

The revenger of *Utu* is the Māori leader Te Wheke and his motivation comes from the butchering of his village by colonial soldiers. Even though his people are described as friends of the government, they are killed just the same as Māori who resisted government control. In the opening act of the film they are ridden down by mounted soldiers or burned while in their homes. This action pushes Te Wheke

down his path of vengeance. He challenges the status quo of believing Colonel Elliot acts in the country's best interests, so Te Wheke aims to dispose of Elliot with violence. This sentiment amplifies when Te Wheke decides that the entire Pākehā establishment should be overthrown for the benefit of Māori. The followers that Te Wheke amasses also demonstrate Dunne's assertion that revenge functions "not as a personal duty, but as a political, participatory act carried out by a group of citizens in opposition to the powers that be" (5). The reciprocity sought by Te Wheke, the justice he desires, is redress for his peoples' deaths. This massacre exposes what he sees as the illegitimacy of the Government and so they must be overthrown. His goal echoes Vindice's in *The Revenger's Tragedy*, who seeks the wholesale overthrow and execution of the Duke's entire family for the poisoning of his beloved Gloriana.

The character of Te Wheke, played by Anzac Wallace, is partly inspired by the Māori leader Te Kooti Arikirangi Te Turuki, who is discussed in Chapters Three and Four. A warrior-prophet from humble beginnings, Te Kooti served alongside the British army in combating other Māori groups resisting government control and interference. Te Kooti, however, was falsely accused of allying with anti-government Māori groups by both British forces and enemies he had made among local Māori. He was then imprisoned on the Chatham Islands. After escaping in a supply boat with a core of devoted followers whom he had met while imprisoned, Te Kooti began to wage his own war resisting Government control. He was pursued for four years (1868-72), and eventually found refuge with King Tawhiao until he was pardoned in 1883. In a similar frame Te Wheke is a Māori soldier in the service of the colonial militia, specifically a Lance Corporal serving as a scout. Though his betrayal is when Elliot's men attack his home and place him on his path to seek *utu*.

The trigger for the directly Shakespearean intrusions in the film occurs when Te Wheke comes across a book titled *The Tragedie of Macbeth and Other Plays* while attacking a settler homestead. It is from this point onwards that Shakespeare comes to the fore in the film. Te Wheke uses the play to externalise his turmoil, to make witty commentary upon those passing him by, and even as a tactical manual. As Houlahan comments on Te Wheke's attraction to Shakespeare and the production team's uses of *Macbeth* within the film:

Through him they signal a desire not to dispense with Shakespeare's cultural authority, but to appropriate it for their own purposes, transforming an imported artefact into some kind of 'New Zealand' thing ("Shakespeare in the Settler's House" 115).

The scene where Te Wheke acquires his copy of *Macbeth* is particularly significant. Here is a man who, in previous scenes, had demonstrated anger towards and rejection of many European introduced items. Yet he picks up a copy of *Macbeth* from a bookshelf and chuckles whilst reading it as, all around him, his men proceed to destroy a rural homestead. This scene shows Te Wheke's literacy, which is not terribly unusual as Māori had been reading books since the 1820s when the Bible was translated into te reo Māori (Walker 85). It also, however, shows his literacy in English, as to be literate in two languages proves a level of education unusual in New Zealand at that time. "Maoris were literate, but most only in their own language" (Belich 219). Te Wheke easily overturns the cultural stereotype of the savage anti-government Māori rejecting all trappings of his oppressor and presents a more complex character. This is a further parallel to his partial inspiration, Te Kooti Arikirangi Te Turuki, who was known to be very clever, highly literate and well-educated. "There is even an indication that he could read English" (Belich 219). This reading of *Macbeth* is also an instance of understanding his enemy. It leads to

an imbalance of knowledge, as while Te Wheke may know key parts of the Pākehā literary canon and the lessons to be found within, none of his Pākehā adversaries, apart from possibly the settler Williamson, could boast the same education with regards to Māori cultural narratives.

This awareness leads to Te Wheke's Shakespearean commentary in the film where he quotes *Macbeth*. At one point, while observing his enemies he states: “‘What are these so withered and so wild of their attire, that look not like the inhabitants of the earth,’ and yet aren't they?’” (Murphy, *Utu*). In applying these words from Act 1, scene 3 of *Macbeth* to the Pākehā within New Zealand, Te Wheke is emphasising how alien and foreign they are to their land and Māori. This sentiment is similar to the concept presented by Walker regarding the origins of the word Pākehā. He argues that it derives from phrases meaning humanoid beings from folklore with pale skin. In this case, Te Wheke uses the words of the Pākehā's own literature to criticise their presence, particularly the presence of settlers within New Zealand. He does so with the implication that their presence within Aotearoa is as unnatural as the presence of witches whom Macbeth describes.

The film's references to *Macbeth* are not limited to Te Wheke, however, for Lieutenant Scott's arrival at a windmill is heralded ironically by a militiaman: “Well, well, something wicked this way comes” (Murphy, *Utu*). This exclamation referencing the fourth act of *Macbeth* is dissimilar to the ominous tone of the witches, as it is instead a mocking, derisive exclamation, followed by another militiaman spitting onto the ground. Both Colonel Elliot and his men see Scott's arrival as a nuisance, as they do not share his approach to apprehending Te Wheke. For the militia, these remarks are spontaneous, and not done with book in hand. Nor does the play appear to hold significant relevance. The quote instead shows Shakespeare as a natural part of their cultural software.

This indicates that while the militia use Shakespeare as an everyday part of their lives and vocabulary, Te Wheke sees the play as personally applicable to himself and his situation. With the exception of these disdainful soldiers, the *Macbeth* fascination is limited solely to Te Wheke. This is evident where, in response to Te Wheke's comment of "Birnam wood," his follower says "You burn 'em your own wood" (Murphy, *Utu*). The exchange highlights the fact that while Te Wheke is fascinated by Shakespeare and ready to quote it, the appeal is not shared by his men. This reaction is possibly because they either do not share his literacy in English, or are more preoccupied with their conflict than with English literature. This fascination with the play makes Te Wheke's appropriation of *Macbeth* all the more noticeable, showing Te Wheke as an outlier or possibly a visionary compared to his followers. This visionary status creates a further potential link to one of the inspirations for his character, Te Kooti Airikirangi Te Turuki, who became the prophet and founder of the religion Ringatū.

Nowhere can Te Wheke's appropriation of *Macbeth* and his visionary approach to the text be argued better than his success in weaponising the works of Shakespeare. Te Wheke takes his copy of *Macbeth* and uses its contents to provide unorthodox tactics for his followers in their attack upon the Te Puna Hotel:

His men crouch and move behind cut manuka bushes, a tactic designed as an homage to Malcolm's approach to Dunsinane. 'Birnam Wood' Te Wheke calls it, while his Pakeha opponents stage an ironic discussion as to whether the moving bushes are manuka or matagauri (Houlahan, "Shakespeare in the Settler's House" 114).

Te Wheke takes one of the great totems of the New Zealand settler culture, authority and high art (an item held in esteem comparable to the Bible) and turns it against his enemies. While his attack ultimately fails, he takes the theatrical elements of

Shakespeare and makes them an active force in shaping the narrative within this depiction of the New Zealand Wars.

The use of *Macbeth* does not end with Birnam Wood. There is the instance of Te Wheke's flight from the militia following his attack on the Te Puna Hotel, also mentioned by Houlahan. "Tis a tale told by an idiot/Full of sound and fury, but signifying nothing" ("Shakespeare in the Settler's House" 114). For Te Wheke and Macbeth this line signifies an emotional hardening in anticipation of the conflict that they know is to come. When Macbeth gives this line in the fifth act, he has just learned of Lady Macbeth's death and he has nothing left to lose. Te Wheke's use of the quote is also spoken following the death of a woman. In contrast, however, Te Wheke's speaks in response to his follower Matu's question: "Is this your plan for us all?" (Murphy, *Utu*). Te Wheke's response is in a derisive tone, dismissive of his recent murder of the young Māori woman Kura. Much like Macbeth, Te Wheke is awaiting his final confrontation with his enemies, following the recent death of a woman and expresses his opinion of the lives of himself and his followers. For Te Wheke though, it is not rage born of grief but a cold, unfeeling anger at Kura's perceived betrayal for which she was murdered. So, while for Macbeth this is a tragic moment, an instance of pain and loss, for Te Wheke it is a moment immediately following a fit of rage and murder. Like Macbeth, though, Te Wheke is ultimately drawn down a path of self-destruction ending in true Shakespearean fashion with his own death once his revenge against the Colonel who massacred his village is achieved. This ultimate revenge is a deconstruction however, since, as mentioned in Chapter Four, it is not achieved by Te Wheke's own hand but his brother's.

Watch Your (Shakespearean) Language

Where *Utū* uses the works of Shakespeare as a form of rebellion, over a decade later, a stage production interpreted the Bard's works as an encompassing force of cultural colonisation. In 1994 the Auckland theatre company Theatre at Large performed *Manawa Taua/Savage Hearts*. Written by David Geary, Christian Penny and Anna Marbrook, and directed by Penny, Marbrook and Heather Lee, the play detailed the dramas of a fictional first Shakespeare Company performing in Aotearoa in 1860, around the time of the First Taranaki War.

As noted earlier, their status as the first company is twelve years too late, so the play already enters a fictional space. During the course of the play, the rangatira Tupou is instructed by Queen Victoria to join a Shakespeare company to assist in their production of *Othello*.

Rehearsals begin at sea and, as life begins to imitate art, Tupou plays Othello, Lottie (Alison Bruce) plays Desdemona and her husband Roy plays Iago...though it is against everything he holds dear, Tupou finds himself falling in love with the (married) leading lady (Wakefield 13).

Much like *Macbeth* in *Utū*, Shakespeare's *Othello* acts as an intertext, highlighting the emotions surrounding the issues of the Victorian preoccupation with race, particularly with regards to Tupou, as well as his betrayal towards his people back in Aotearoa.

Omni-present is Tahutu (Rachel House), who narrates this story as legend. Betrothed to Tupou (a stately Cliff Curtis) and betrayed by him, she still holds the power, inspiring currents of awe and impressively conducting the response of the audience (Hewitson 44).

The story is set during a period of the New Zealand Wars where conflict was building, particularly in the Taranaki region. Tensions over loyalty and land were

running high, particularly with resistance to land sales: “There are British soldiers coming to force us off our land as we speak” (Geary, Penny and Marbrook 128).

As well as the context of the setting, the play was also affected by the events of the 1980s and 1990s. Curtis even comments that “*Manawa Taua* is more about now than then, if you think about it” (Hewitson 44). The play was noted as grappling with ‘tricky issues’, in particular the “the very issues that in New Zealand in the 1860s led to the land wars and which are still real forces in society” (Rae 2). The play was performed the year preceding the Waikato Tainui Raupatu Settlement, when there was a significant level of attention on the negotiations; the level of attention is understandable as that settlement dealt with the forcible confiscation of Māori following a war of aggression by the New Zealand Government and was the first in the current wave of Treaty settlements.

However, the awareness and influence of issues in the 1990s goes further than politics, it enters the realm of New Zealand popular culture. Earlier that year Lee Tamahori’s film adaptation of Alan Duff’s novel *Once Were Warriors*, in which Curtis had also starred, had hit national screens and parts of *Manawa Taua* can be seen as a response to that film. As Curtis commented:

Duff’s story is not the only story — although it is the popular story at the moment. But there are plenty of Maoris who succeeded, despite the difficulties. I have my own Maori heroes both from that time and now (Rae 2).

Manawa Taua endeavoured to tell a different story about Māori than the ingrained and toxic nature of indigenous poverty and violence shown in *Once Were Warriors*. Anna Marbrook mentions in an interview with Bernadette Rae: “Perhaps the biggest challenge in that process has been the ‘honouring of everybody’s story,’ so the piece

is not simplistic” (Rae 2). For many years, the Māori story of the Land Wars was neglected, not solely in terms of land but also culture.

As noted in Chapter Three, during the 1980s, Witi Ihimaera was the first Māori novelist to write about the New Zealand Wars. The Māori language had also suffered under colonisation, with children punished for speaking it in schools, and te reo Māori held no official language status until 1987. It was not until 1981, with the establishment of Kohanga Reo, schools which taught in the Māori language, that a revival of the language began in earnest (Walker, *Ka Whawhai Tonu Matou* 238). The necessity of ensuring that both Māori and Pākehā perspectives are presented in the production is further maintained by the director’s consultation with the kaumatua, Ngamaru Raerino, and trips to the marae of both Raerino and lead actor Cliff Curtis.

The issue of language is a significant part of the play. *Manawa Taua* approached the subject of language by associating an embracing of Shakespeare with a consequent loss of Māori identity. It is exemplified by Tupou’s growing inability to speak te reo as he further masters his role in the company’s play as *Othello*: “You speak like a Pakeha. You think like a Pakeha” (Geary, Penny and Marbrook 133). This loss is compounded by his betrothed’s reaction to his return to Aotearoa after joining the company, claiming that he has become a Pākehā. The loss of language is similar to the concept addressed by Gayatri Spivak when discussing the Australian Aborigines of East Kimberley and the phrase they use: “lost our language.” Spivak explains: “It means, in the words of a social worker, that ‘they have lost touch with their cultural base.’ They no longer compute with it. It is not their software” (404). This loss is conveyed within *Manawa Taua*. The play implies that the works of Shakespeare will overwrite the ‘software’ of Māori; his works are a force of colonisation and therefore a force that will erode indigenous

identities. Yet, as later New Zealand Shakespeare productions such as Toi Whakaari's *Troilus and Cressida* (2003) and Rachel House's *Troilus and Cressida* (2012) the opposite can be true. Te reo Māori can not only survive Shakespeare but enhance it. Catherine Silverstone says in regard to Don C. Selwyn's 2001 film *The Maori Merchant of Venice*: "Māori is credited with improving Shakespeare and releasing 'his' meaning" (Silverstone 65). As time goes on with these productions, the level of Māori incorporated in the productions heightens rather than leads to a decline, and arguably accentuates the language.

Staging the Land Wars

In terms of specific Shakespeare plays, three significant performances have relocated the plays into the New Zealand Wars. By using the cultural mana of the name Shakespeare, directors and actors can draw attention to the conflict in a more accessible fashion for a potentially uninformed audience. "The brand name 'Shakespeare' is a major drawcard, and many audience members are fans of Shakespeare" (Houlahan and Schafer 266). Hence his works make for an effective vehicle to examine this period of Aotearoa New Zealand history. This is particularly important with regards to cross-cultural narratives. "In the narratives of encounter they leave us, cultures betray their anxieties, antagonisms, and prejudice" (Bruster 14). Arguably, these productions about the Land Wars reveal the concerns of New Zealanders and the perception towards Māori and Pākehā historical relationships.

Due to the place Shakespeare holds within New Zealand society and the contentious nature of the history and ramifications of the New Zealand Wars, these productions are significant in the theatre - to process and engage with the conflict. As Mark Houlahan argues:

Productions foregrounding still unresolved issues of settlement, race and land...have provoked memorable versions of the main tragedies.

Shakespeare's tragedies may thus be thought of as exercising a contradictory cultural pressure ("Unsettling the Bard" 795)

The the first production of Shakespeare's plays set during the New Zealand Wars was Court Theatre's *Othello* (2001) in Christchurch. Another performance of *Othello* (2007) was by Downstage in Wellington, as well as Toi Whakaari's *Troilus and Cressida* in 2003, which toured but predominantly performed in Wellington. An important aspect of the three plays compared to representations of the New Zealand Wars in other medium is that the productions feature a greater involvement of Māori. These productions not only have consultants and staff who were Māori, but also directors such as Cathy Downes with Court Theatre's *Othello* and co-directors such as Rangimoana Taylor with *Troilus and Cressida*. This Māori spearheading of the productions shows a greater degree of acknowledging the different perspectives inherent within this history.

Among the productions, the attraction to *Othello* on the stage both in direct staging and its appearance in *Manawa Tāua* is unsurprising, given the popularity of the play as a means of interrogating the colonialism of the Victorian and Edwardian periods:

This created a context in which the racial bigotry of Iago, Roderigo, and Brabantio became readily explicable to a modern audience, whilst allowing them the comfort of a certain historical distance (Neill 66).

Such examinations of racial bigotry are applicable to various former colonies such as Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa. However, by inserting the play into the solely New Zealand context of the Land Wars two key points of difference emerge. One particular point of difference is that in these productions the Māori Othellos, while outsiders, are not the only Māori to appear on stage. They are instead Māori who have been anglicised. These productions add the concepts of

cultural betrayal and loss of connection to their heritage by providing non-anglicised Māori as figures of contrast. A second point of difference is that the Othellos are not fighting against a different foreigner on behalf of Pākehā, but other Māori, which magnifies their internal conflict and serves to show elements of post-colonial trauma.

As noted earlier, these productions followed on from the novels of Shadbolt and Ihimaera that came at a time of re-examining New Zealand identity. Even so, while the productions emerged from a general movement towards material challenging and engaging with the subject matter of the Land Wars, they do so in a differing fashion. By tying themselves to Shakespeare, they are engaging with Pākehā hegemony on its own ground, through a medium of the establishment. Another significant difference is the level of Māori input in the development of the production. Most Māori voices had only served in an advisory capacity in representations of the New Zealand Wars, and the only novel depicting the Land Wars from a Māori perspective was *The Matriarch*. The medium of theatre allows Māori directors to present the conflict as the Land Wars, in a fashion akin to Ihimaera, rather than simply the New Zealand Wars.

Othello (2001) was staged during a period of increased national awareness of the conflict. In 1995 the Raupatu claims settlement passed, compensating Tainui for the land confiscations following the Waikato invasion. While no significant novels engaging with the Land Wars had been written since Shadbolt's *The House of Strife* (1993), a wider reaching presentation of the conflict had dominated the national scene. Two years prior to *Othello*'s performance, James Belich appeared across New Zealand television screens with his documentary series *The New Zealand Wars* (1998). This series presented the conflict to areas that do not live with visible reminders of the history, such as Dunedin and Christchurch, and by

extension, the majority of the South Island. Apart from a single military engagement in Wairau in 1843, the New Zealand Wars were fought entirely in the North Island. Belich however, brought the New Zealand Wars into people's homes across the country.

The status of the Court Theatre *Othello* as the first Shakespeare production with a Land Wars setting gives it some importance, but what makes it truly significant is the manner in which it was framed. As Ayanna Thompson argues:

The way we frame the story of *Othello* will impact the way the play will be understood and performed, and students, scholars, performers and audience members have long debated the best way to crystallize the story of the play (2).

The production gave *Othello*, played by Jim Moriarty, a new back story; a Māori boy adopted by missionaries, and taken overseas where he received a European education, joined the military and became a successful general, returning to New Zealand to lead the Empire's armies against his native people. "Challenged by Bianca, the only other specifically Māori character in this interpretation, he questions his allegiances" (Warrington 306). Cassio's lover Bianca is presented as a fiery and feisty Māori woman; an example of a Māori with a healthy psyche, lacking the turmoil evident in *Othello* himself.

In this regard *Othello* is suffering from a trauma brought about by the "loss of language" that Spivak discusses. As he has lost touch with his "cultural base," *Othello* can be considered already colonised and arguably on encountering Bianca and other Māori the realisation is a trauma. The work of Eduardo and Bonnie Duran goes some way to explaining his trauma with their comments on Native Americans and the psychological trauma of colonisation that they term the "soul wound." "When self-hatred is externalized, we encounter a level of violence within the

community that is unparalleled in any other group in the country” (Duran and Duran 29). This framing of *Othello* firmly entrenches the production within a post-colonial context by addressing issues affecting indigenous peoples.

The play was set during the Waikato Invasion. In 1863, General Duncan Cameron on the orders of Governor George Grey crossed the Mangatāwhiri stream and invaded the Waikato. This was due to a perceived threat to the city of Auckland (Belich 124). In reality, however, Grey was under pressure from different pre-existing interest groups, particularly settlers, to provide land for incoming Europeans, so to get land he had to take it by force. As Ranginui Walker puts it:

An invasion of the Waikato had been mooted as early as April 1861 by the Attorney General, Frederick Whitaker, to Governor Browne. Whitaker and his partner Thomas Russell, who founded the Bank of New Zealand, had plans for agricultural investment in the Waikato (Walker 120).

These pressures are what led to Governor Grey’s two years of preparation and the Waikato invasion and subsequent land confiscations. This campaign involved the largest ever deployment of soldiers in New Zealand and was the biggest conflict to occur during the New Zealand Wars. As historian James Belich states: “The ensuing conflict lasted for fifteen months, and was the largest and most important of the New Zealand Wars” (*The New Zealand Wars* 119).

The Waikato River was a major feature during this conflict, with gunboats traversing the river shelling various locations and transporting imperial soldiers. A further point of unintentional Shakespearean connection is that one of the gunboats was called the *Avon*.⁹ This particular boat was armed with the typical weaponry of the river boats, twelve-pound Armstrong guns and Congreve rockets. The

⁹ Another gunboat with a Shakespearean name is the *Miranda* which saw action in the Firth of Thames, rather than the Waikato

armament, in particular the breach loading Armstrong guns, were described as “the most up-to-date technology of the day” (Middlemiss 24). The river boats used in the conflict were an example of superior Western weaponry being unleashed against an indigenous populace. Thus these gunboats were a powerful symbol of British imperialism within New Zealand. Alongside another boat *Pioneer*, *Avon* also played a key role in the battle of Rangiriri where “*Avon* and the gunboats opened fire with their 12lb Armstrong guns, mortar and rifles to create a diversion so *Pioneer* and the *Avon* could go alongside and land their troops” (Middlemiss 24). Considering the impact of the gunboat within the Waikato and its connotations as a potent force for colonialism, it is unsurprising that *Othello* at the Court Theatre in Christchurch is set on a fictional gunboat dubbed the *Cyprus*.

There was a need for the Court Theatre to demonstrate that their production had accurately depicted the setting, especially with the politically charged nature of the Land Wars and its legacy. As Downes stated:

Looking at *Othello* it’s a good idea to actually research the Land Wars, if you’re going to set it there. I do a certain amount of that, and I also set tasks for my cast (Byrnes).

The setting for this production was constructed to reference the use of gunboats and the expected outcome by the Government during the Campaign. It began with

large topographical maps of the Waikato, with surveyed blocks marked and numbered, which are transformed into an armour-plated river boat called *Cyprus* which is finally turned inside out to reveal the cabin where Desdemona meets her doom (Smythe 42).

By displaying the survey blocks marked out for settlement, the play leaves the audience under no illusions to the nature of the conflict that takes place during the play. The Waikato has been earmarked for confiscation and profit. While *Othello*

in isolation from the setting can be figured solely about race, this setting design also makes the play about divided loyalty and the all-pervasive object behind every idea and action within the New Zealand Wars: the land.

In terms of the river boat “Tony Geddes, the set designer, came up with the vision of the whole play being set on a long boat in the Waikato river” (Byrnes). This also added additional complexity to the marriage dynamic between Othello and Desdemona.

How claustrophobic is that – poor old Desdemona right from those first scenes in Venice – or England I suppose they were – down in the bowels of this boat suffering from...suffocating down there. So it was really potent, and all around, on the land, was Maori who didn’t want him to be there, Othello on this boat (Byrnes).

The confined space of the river boat therefore acts like a pressure cooker for Othello’s turmoil. He is surrounded by the stigma of fighting against Māori outside, and the confined space of the river boat within, while coupled with the aforementioned symbolism of the river boats as emblems of British imperialism within New Zealand. The backdrop of the play presents the historical scenery of the conflict and the two things most associated with the Waikato Invasion, the dominant use of gunboats and the expected prize of land that would enter European hands.

Along with the dramatic backdrop, was this production of *Othello* featuring the imagery regarding the isolation of the eponymous character from his indigenous culture. Much like Tupou in *Manawa Taua*, Othello contends with the othering racial politics of the Victorian period. This conflict with racial politics is compounded by an inner turmoil that Othello grapples with and ultimately leads to his catastrophic rage and murder of Desdemona.

Furthermore, Othello suffers from the stigma of being kūpapa. He is “dispossessed of his heritage – of his family, lands and history – his one realm of sovereignty is his marriage” (Smythe 42). The production was making a statement about New Zealand politics and also contemporary New Zealand social issues where many Māori are disenfranchised and alienated from their own culture. John Smythe makes a comment agreeing with this assessment:

As cultural memory brings quivering hands and warrior postures to the surface, the allegorical reverberations simultaneously ground his actions in our own soil and allow the wings of universality to spread (Smythe 42).

In contrast, Michael Neill states that in the nineteenth century Victorian productions of *Othello* favoured a

culturally inflected reading of the tragedy, in which the protagonist’s surrender to vindictive passion represents the disintegration of his Christian identity and a return to the barbaric mores of the desert culture that spawned him (117).

This was not the intention of Downes’ production. Rather it is Othello’s inner turmoil and a crisis of identity that leads to him lashing out. The presence of other Māori characters without the same angst seen in Othello, such as Bianca, supports this assertion. The Court Theatre Othello was an outsider to both his birth people and his adopted people.

This alienation is the cause of his ultimate doom, rather than any ideas of cultural atavism. Duran and Duran have a further analysis that is applicable toward Othello in their discussion of the concept of the “Warrior Regression”.

Native American men have a higher enlistment rate into the military and usually serve in a “beyond the call of duty” manner. By serving as a warrior the traditional warrior has some expression, except that the man is serving

as a warrior protecting the way of life of the people who have destroyed his traditional way of life. Serving in the colonial army can only contribute to the dissonance and splitting that the Native American male is already experiencing (Duran and Duran 41).

In this regard, Othello's service in the colonial army, while providing a way for him to act as a warrior, ultimately contributes to the shattering of his psyche by acting on behalf of the very colonial power that oppresses his people. Moriarty's performance in this Colonial New Zealand Othello was noted as being a high point of the production. "The great integrity Moriarty brings to his performance is equal and opposite to Othello's lack of coherent identity and the consequent disintegration of his rational mind" (Smythe 42).

The production managed to achieve some acclaim within Christchurch, albeit not without attracting some controversy. It in fact caused some quite heated debate in the Christchurch press. One letter before the opening of the play complained that

To associate Shakespeare's title for a tragedy and his name with a drama about a Māori warrior is to entice people with misleading information...What redress protects a community from the vandalising of a theatrical work? (Haydon 2001).

Arguably this letter says more about Christchurch in 2001 than the play itself.

Though as Houlahan and Schafer mention regarding audiences:

If they have made the decision to spend money on, and time with, Shakespeare, they may resist having foisted upon them the recalcitrant, challenging meanings sometimes mined by directors and their companies (266).

The reaction to the production from individuals does reveal the resistance towards productions confronting issues like the New Zealand Wars through a cultural touchstone like Shakespeare. On the whole, however, this was a successful production which pioneered the way not only for a 2007 *Othello* production in Wellington, but also the 2003 Toi Whakaari production of *Troilus and Cressida*.

The 2007 *Othello* at Downstage Theatre in Wellington and directed by Jonathon Hendry was heavily influenced by the 2001 production. Lisa Warrington argues the Court *Othello* “was reworked at Downstage in 2007” (306). A major divergence from the setting of the 2001 *Othello*, however was the time and location. While the Court Theatre set the performance in 1863 Waikato, Hendry’s production engaged with a different part of the New Zealand Wars, the Northern War of the 1840s. This was the conflict between the followers of the Ngāpuhi rangatira Hone Heke and Kawiti against the British Army and allied Māori. This particular conflict was begun by the disaffection Heke and Kawiti felt towards the Treaty of Waitangi and the government’s lack of respect towards their tino rangitiratanga that was enshrined in the Māori translation of the Treaty.

Several battles were fought across Northland and, as stated in earlier chapters, at Ōhaeawai the first modern pā was constructed, resisting a barrage of artillery fire that would not have been out of place in the Somme seventy years later. It can be argued that this particular conflict ended in neither a victory nor a loss for either Māori or Pākehā as it concluded with a peace agreement, facilitated by Tāmami Wāka Nene, the preeminent rangatira among the Government allied Ngāpuhi. As James Belich states:

Heke’s and Kawiti’s success was also limited locally...their resistance had anyway been undertaken for very limited ends. The British had at least demonstrated that their resources were great and their troops formidable,

and Waka Nene and his associates held to their alliance with the government (*The New Zealand Wars* 70).

This conflict was the first wide scale engagement by Māori in armed resistance to the Government and is an area of the conflict equally significant, though not as recognisable, as the Waikato Invasion.

Due to the damage of the Christchurch earthquake, photographs of the Court Theatre production were not accessible to the public at the time of writing this thesis. Stephen A'Court's photos of Hendry's 2007 *Othello* production, however, are available at the Turnbull Library. From these images it is clear that *Othello* was costumed in period appropriate red coats, setting the production between the 1840s and mid-1860s when the British Army were present in New Zealand. It heightens the contrast between his Pākehā upbringing and Bianca's more traditional Māori attire and actions. *Othello*'s costume becomes more dishevelled as the play goes on to reflect his deteriorating state of mind. "Moriarty warms up to his part, by the second half he is seething with passion, as his British reserve is stripped away and he becomes what those around him believe him to be, savage and wild" (Freeman). As with the 2001 production of *Othello* this reaction is not *Othello* revealing his true self, but lashing out as a result of his conflicted identity causing a mental break. This break in his psyche is apparent from his wild hair and unbuttoned shirt, a far cry from his previously immaculate appearance.

Hendry (and Moriarty) also incorporated a greater degree of Māori elements than were previously seen in the 2001 production, such as the use of kapa haka to suggest *Othello*'s internal conflict. As with the Downe's production, Bianca is again depicted as a Māori woman, fitting her role as an example of a Māori character who is not conflicted and repressed from the effects of cultural erasure. She wears attire

that is period appropriate using a blend of Māori and European clothes, which was not unusual for the period.

Hendry's 2007 *Othello* had a more mixed reception than Downes' 2001 effort. For the audience the setting was not made readily apparent, with John Smythe commenting: "Unlike the comprehensive Court Programme the Downstage programme says little about the historical context...So Venice, Cyprus and the Turks stand for Auckland, 'Russell' and the disaffected Māori respectively" (Smythe 2007). Another account also exhibits confusion about the setting:

The time of the piece was left (deliberately?) vague, and the details of geography – Sydney working as Venice, Cyprus becoming Kororareka/Russell – were also only supplied to those who choose to buy a programme and read not the director's, but the Set Designer's note (Kingston).

This production's lack of details on the particular setting change would likely have made it difficult for the audience to realise the precise period of the New Zealand Wars that was being evoked here. Even the reviewers' lack of agreement regarding the setting highlights the need for clarity in the play.

This issue would have been compounded by the fact that many New Zealanders are far less aware, and see less physical evidence, of the Northern War than the Waikato Invasion. With the Waikato there are signifiers along the major road State Highway 1. This main highway was built for the express purpose of transporting soldiers into the region. From Papakura, through to Pokeno, Mercer, Rangiriri, and Ngaruawahia, all the way to Te Kuiti, there is still visible evidence of the Waikato Invasion and the road built to facilitate it. The 2007 *Othello* made an effort to shed light on a particular part of the New Zealand Wars that is often overshadowed by later events, but was hampered by a lack of familiarity. This lack

is even visible with Belich's documentary series where a single episode covers Northland, and then the region passed over to examine the many conflicts in the central North Island. Unfortunately for the play, its vague linking with the era, coupled with the distance and unfamiliarity of Wellington with Northland, made this production less effective in drawing attention to the New Zealand Wars compared to its forebear in 2001.

The 2003 Toi Whakaari production of *Troilus and Cressida* in Wellington, in contrast to both productions of *Othello*, featured a much greater number of Māori characters. Instead of a minority, these characters played by actors of Māori, Pasifika, and Indian descent form half of the cast. The production deliberately evoked the New Zealand Wars; the Greeks were envisioned as the "British" and the Trojans were "Māori." This production featured a significant involvement of Māori in the devising process, as well as the performance, with Rangimoana Taylor as co-director with Annie Ruth.

The performance went out of its way to construct a bi-lingual production, with some of the scenes performed entirely in te reo Māori. This production foreshadowed the 2012 production of *Troilus* performed at the Globe where the "translation by Te Haumihata Mason was the first full-length translation of *Troilus and Cressida* into Maori" (Bevington 130). The use of te reo did provide an obstacle to the Toi Whakaari cast, however, as many did not speak it. The performance also took pains to keep things in house for their conversion of scenes into te reo Māori. Ruth says that included cast members playing multiple roles.

We had asked a second year acting student, Te Kohe Tuhaka, if he would be willing to translate for us. Te Kohe spoke only Te Reo until he was 12 years old and experience in translation exists in his iwi (34).

While learning te reo did provide an obstacle to many of the non-Māori Trojans, such as Andrew Ausage, the Samoan actor playing Hector, it was integral in ensuring the play balanced culturally (and philologically) between Māori and Pākehā.

In addition to language, there was a greater amount of attention towards a Māori perspective within this performance compared to Downes' *Othello*. As Ruth herself stated:

Perhaps it was inevitable that the story would hold a bias. Both directors have a personal political stance on these issues, as did the cast and this was evident in all these choices (35).

Ruth's comments regarding bias in *Troilus and Cressida* due to the staging is not a wholly New Zealand phenomenon. In recent years the play has had multiple post-colonial reimaginings presenting the Trojans as either indigenous peoples or ethnic minorities resisting colonial/imperialist oppression. Bevington argues:

Fitting Troilus to this pattern has required a marked reinterpretation of the play, one that sees the victimization of the Trojans at the hands of Greek warmongers, and the victimization of women by men (126).

Of all of the periods of the New Zealand Wars, *Troilus* appears to fit well with the mid to late 1860s. It is only during these campaigns that the larger and more elaborate pā were constructed. There are thus greater parallels to be drawn between the defensive structures and the mighty walls of Ilium.

The pā that resisted the Waikato Invasion were huge earthworks, and in some cases enforced a stalemate until the British could bring extra reinforcements up the river. In certain battles such as Gate Pā the structures enabled victories for the defenders, although the Māori numbers were never enough to decisively win campaigns. That said, there is also another point in the conflict which, given the

overall nature of the production would also apply as inspiration for the setting. Titokowaru's War, ranging across Whanganui and Taranaki from 1868-69, would be another effective period in which to locate this play. Particularly the siege of Tauranga Ika, Titokowaru's nigh impenetrable fortress, which, much like Troy in Shakespeare's production was brought down by a man's passions.

For Troy it was the lust of Paris for Helen, for Tauranga Ika, it was, according to folklore, Titokowaru's desire for the wife of one of his allies. In Paris' case the Greeks invaded to take her back, while for Titokowaru it caused a great many of his allies to abandon his cause due to his loss of mana. Furthermore, Parihaka, the place where those who chose to reject the fighting and instead seek to resist without violence was where Titokowaru also dwelt after returning to a path of non-violence. This fits in effectively with the anti-war narrative presented within *Troilus and Cressida*.

Taylor and Ruth also attempted to provide the students with as balanced a perspective of the New Zealand Wars as possible. It was important for them not only to understand the conflict from a Māori perspective, but also from a perspective of those wearied by violence. "Prior to rehearsals, the directors and cast spent five days on a marae with the people of Parihaka to seed the production and undertake research on the Land Wars" (Guest 266). This experience gave the cast a pertinent perspective that complemented the anti-war sentiment found within *Troilus*.

During the Land Wars, following what was roughly 40 years of intermittent conflicts, a pacifist movement began in 1881 at Parihaka. Here land sales were resisted by simply removing survey markers and non-violent action. While there was a heavy-handed arrest of all involved, the adherents of the movement

maintained their stance of non-violence. Parihaka was such a significant location for the production that: “The company later returned to Parihaka to complete rehearsals, and then opened *Troilus and Cressida* there” (Guest 266). The Toi Whakaari production was one that tried to capture not only the sensibility of the conflict at the time but also provide the weary feeling of later in the New Zealand Wars. By 1868 all imperial troops had left New Zealand, disillusioned with the actions of Governor George Grey and his policies of Land Confiscation. By this period the combat was primarily between armed constabulary supported by regiments of pro-government Māori, and various resisting tribes. The ties to Parihaka, the birthplace of Māori passive resistance promotes the anti-war sentiment inherent in *Troilus and Cressida*.

The production required some creative casting choices as it consisted of eight men and eight women. “This meant we would have to cast some of the women in male roles or think about those roles differently” (Ruth 34) The production, therefore constructed different identities for particular characters to not only fit the cast, but to also have relevance to the setting within the New Zealand Wars. For Agamemnon the production

came up with a Queen Victoria/Britannia figure trying ineffectually to marshal and unite the many factions of her troops, susceptible to flattery, volatile, not at all inspiring respect but commanding a certain show of obedience—from all but Achilles (Ruth 34)

In this representation there was the visible amalgamation of two of the most visible images of the British Empire, Britannia and Queen Victoria. In performance there was also, in terms of her speech, a hint of Miranda Richardson’s performance as “Queenie” in the television series *Blackadder*. She is therefore an ultimate display of imperial action with all of the jingoistic connotations, coupled with a (for the

time) familiar depiction of a volatile and unpredictable monarch. In attitude, this Agamemnon was also reminiscent of British and colonial officers in New Zealand fiction as well as history. The ego, lack of respect, and volatility is reminiscent of Colonel Elliot from *Utū*, as well as his inspirations G. S. Whitmore and Thomas McDonnell, both of whom were known as arrogant and, in the case of McDonnell, particularly bombastic.

In addition, the play revised Nestor, the man too old to fight, as a nun to maintain the role of “holder of inherited wisdom” (Ruth 34). This change provided a different interpretation of the character by first making Nestor a woman, and second, a religious figure. This religious aspect likely was an allusion towards the missionaries who acted on behalf of the colonial government during the New Zealand Wars, often as spies such as John Morgan who passed on information to George Grey during the Raupatu.

While on the side of the Trojans, Priam was reimagined as a “kuia giving a very particular dynamic to her relationship with her sons and their arguments for and against continuing the war” (Ruth 34). Priam’s characterisation gives a different tone to the role as it is not a father, but a mother sending her sons off to war implying a closer bond with the children and in resisting the British. She is not a King defending his people but a mother protecting her offspring. As a female leader, resisting colonial authority it is also possible to draw comparisons between Priam and the titular character of Ihimaera’s novel *The Matriarch*. Much like Riripeti, this Priam was stern in her sons’ resistance against the encroaching European control. Walking amongst them with strong, controlled gestures, she was a toa wahine, a warrior woman. Priam’s role and position in the plot as a strong and fierce Māori woman is far more prominent than Bianca’s in the productions of *Othello*, and draws from a similar position as Rachel House’s performance in

Manawa Taua. Priam was not an easily cowed or seduced Māori maiden of the historical romance novels, is a strong and defiant leader.

Much like the productions of *Othello*, the costumes played a pivotal role in the staging of the production. They were able to construct intertextual allusions and form present comments on various characters, which may not be present in dialogue. The costumes were designed as

a witty cross-pollination of the cultures, with Māori wearing military coats and kilts as well as more traditional clothing. At the beginning Hector was very European in dress, advising a settlement with the Pākehā. The process of the play saw him gradually discard these until in the end he fights in rapaki with taiaha and patu, choosing the way of his ancestors (Ruth 35).

This change can be understood as Hector reconnecting with his cultural roots, rejecting the coloniser and wholeheartedly supporting his people. It was also a way of showing Hector's gradual changing of mind over the course of the play from actively seeking peace to fully committing to the conflict.

As already mentioned with regards to Agamemnon/Brittania, for the British/Greeks a different interpretation of their costuming was taken.

When it came to the Greek, or British camp, Tony's choices were even more extreme, with Agamemnon combining Queen Victoria and Britannia and Menelaus wearing cuckold's horns as part of his helmet (Ruth 35).

Menelaus' costuming deserves some discussion. The cuckold horns upon Menelaus' helmet make him a very visible source of ridicule. Furthermore, the Greek warriors, Menelaus, Diomedes, Ulysses, and of course Achilles had outfits that resemble different factions of the British army. Menelaus resembles a colonial soldier much like the ones serving in Africa, he even has the trademark white helmet (with the addition of his cuckold horns/plumes), this appearance is unsurprising given he is

the Greek leader whose cuckolding led to the Trojan War. Ulysses was attired like a member of the navy, which given his later *Odyssey* is an unsurprising choice. While Achilles resembles a stereotypical red-coated British officer, with a carefully crafted image of a stylised moustache and beard, and fully buttoned white shirt. Some of this appearance, particularly with the deliberately maintained facial hair is likely an allusion to Gustavus von Tempsky, which is unsurprising given the parallels to Titokowaru's War and the production's setting. By the end of the play, however, his appearance was far more dishevelled, with his shirt unbuttoned and open with his hair messed, showing the true savagery that he conceals beneath a veneer of civilisation. Dressed in a fashion that was quite restrained and careful in his performance.

Among the other warriors in the service of Britannia/Agamemnon was a Māori Ajax, implied to be kūpapa. The differing representatives to the forces at Agamemnon's disposal serves to highlight the fact that the army on the side of the government was not one single military faction. The war was fought not just by soldiers, but by sailors and kūpapa as well.

In terms of other European characters, Thersites is reimagined as a photographer, which is understandable given his criticism of various characters. His costume resembles the New Zealand colonial photographer Walter John Burton. The costume particularly evokes his on screen depiction by Peter Vere-Jones in Michael Black's 1981 period film *Pictures*. Walter was highly critical of colonial experiment, particularly in regards to treatment of Māori. He was also a heavy drinker, much like this depiction of Thersites. Although, in contrast to Walter Burton, Thersites' drunkenness is played for comedic effect, as opposed to tragedy.

On the Māori/Trojan side, there is an interesting case of Europeanisation with Padarus. Not only was he dressed in suits, rather than military garb or

traditional Māori dress, but he also plays a bazouki. The inclusion of this Greek instrument is interesting, and coupled with the suits shows that despite their conflict with the Greeks/British, the Trojans/Māori do not believe in a rejection of all things Pākehā, but rather a rejection of Pākehā rule and a desire for self-determination.

The production was not without its weaknesses in execution, however. Ruth discussed these criticisms saying “both in the costuming and in the direction, the suggestion being that we gave insufficient weight to the British side” (35). Yet this slight weakness on the presentation of the British side was overshadowed by the play’s triumphs. There are numerous representations from a European perspective in both history and Shakespeare. Given the decolonising nature of the production the focus on Trojans/Māori is understandable. Even some initial apprehension from various groups upon having a student translate scenes into Te Reo Māori, were dispelled. Ruth was told by an elder from Parihaka “that the Māori in the work was beautiful and had the classical resonance of Shakespeare’s English” (Ruth 34).

This production’s success in blending te reo foreshadows the acclaim received by the 2012 *Troilus and Cressida* directed by Rachel House and performed at the Globe Theatre entirely in te reo Māori. Houlahan describes this production as a culmination of a decades-long process, aligning Shakespeare with issues of cultural survival, underpinning a determination to enhance the Maori language and its protocols (*tikanga*). The delight of the Globe audiences and the world-wide publicity surrounding them even suggests that this difficult, tragical satire in Maori was a cultural triumph (“The Tragedies in Australasia and the Pacific” 807).

The translation of Shakespeare within these more recent productions defies the “loss of language” message of *Savage Hearts*, where Shakespeare is a virus overwriting the cultural “software” of indigenous people. Instead Shakespeare is

reclaimed and revised, acting as a vehicle for the Māori language in a way that te reo would not previously have been accessible. This is not only a way for Māori to see their language's relevance, but to expose Pākehā to the language in a context which they would likely have some familiarity. The 2012 Globe performance of the Māori *Troilus and Cressida* and its reception showed the success of not only a Shakespeare play that incorporates te reo, but is fully immersed in it.

Conclusion

These productions each have their own attunement to the New Zealand Wars and fit themselves into a contemporary context blending both Māori and Pākehā concepts and ideas. In regards to film, *Utu* was a far more collaborative endeavour than the other films from Chapter Four. Geoff Murphy worked closely other members of the production, in particular Merata Mita the actress, casting director, and a film maker in her own right. The collaborative nature of theatre enables a broader recreation of history compared to the novels, which emerge from the singular perspective of the author.

The drawback to theatre, however, is a far more limited potential audience and circulation. The cultural capital of Shakespeare ameliorates this typically smaller reach by engaging with a pre-existing audience and adds to the legitimacy of a work, by engaging with a topic that has recently regained ground. Shakespeare assists in drawing attention to and constructing a perspective of the New Zealand Wars. The advent of theatre builds on from the work of Ihimaera and continues to defy conventions of the literary tradition. While Helen and Desdemona are European ladies, their role within the narrative is very different. The Māori maiden of the historical romance is gone, replaced with tougher toa wahine (even *Othello's* Bianca). These women have more in common with Merata Mita's performance as Matu and Ihimaera's eponymous matriarch Riripeti than the women of the New

Zealand Wars romances. The theatre as a disruptive space that enables the allied Māori to take centre stage as the principle character rather than a side kick at best or minor character showcasing indigenous savagery at worst. *Utu* demonstrates that film too has this capacity, though it is underutilised. In the past the New Zealand Wars were consigned to the periphery of Aotearoa New Zealand history; the works of Shakespeare enable them to be drawn into the centre stage. Indeed, by blending the two a wholly New Zealand “thing” is created. Using the New Zealand Wars as a setting in a Shakespeare production (or Shakespeare in a New Zealand Wars production) is not just a stylistic conceit like setting *Much Ado About Nothing* on a naval base in Gibraltar. It is a deliberate and concerted effort to draw attention to and criticise aspects of New Zealand history and society. A Shakespeare play is not just a representation of events happening in Europe far away, it can be grounded in Aotearoa New Zealand, on a subject that continues to be relevant to New Zealanders (both Māori and Pākehā) today.

Chapter Six: Conclusion

This thesis aimed to examine representations of the New Zealand Wars at a macroscopic level, looking at as many key texts, films and performances as possible. While previous analyses have compared small clusters of texts, they were typically of specific chronological periods or a single media. My research has taken multiple media (novel, film, and theatre) and examined them together in order to provide a broader field of vision. By also examining many of the media chronologically, I charted common trends and progressive changes to representations of the New Zealand Wars across Aotearoa's history. There are, of course, other media and representations of the New Zealand Wars that could open up further productive lines of inquiry. Graphic novels such as Chris Groz's *Kimble Bent Malcontent* also feature as representations of the conflict and an exploration of the use of both image and text to tell the story would be a useful addition to understanding the continued influence and impact of the conflict.

The body of the thesis charts the construction of the New Zealand Wars narrative, which continues to derive from historical romance in the vein of Sir Walter Scott and James Fenimore Cooper. Many characters in the representations echo the types that emerged in the nineteenth-century New Zealand Wars romance. The traveller or settler hero, the doomed Māori maiden, the antagonist Māori warrior, and the European lady as a beacon of civilisation, are the most common recurring characters from 1861 into the twenty-first century. These conventions persist despite the influence of post-colonial thought and the Māori Renaissance reassessing pre-existing conventions. Writers such as Olga Stringfellow and Witi Ihimaera, and directors like Cathy Downes, Annie Ruth and Rangimoana Taylor, do, however, challenge many of these earlier conventions. These writers and directors introduce more complex Māori characters, stronger female characters, and

interrogate the effects of colonisation. Unfortunately, these writers and directors' representations remain in the minority, so despite the changes that have occurred, the historical romance continues to be recycled.

The novels depicting the New Zealand Wars have experienced a stronger relationship with history over time. While earlier novelists such as Jules Verne, Sygurd Wiśniowski, and Mona Tracy were lax with their engagement with history, later writers adhered closer to historical record. Writers such as Olga Stringfellow, Maurice Shadbolt, and Witi Ihimaera were particularly deliberate in their use of history, though Shadbolt treated history as subservient to narrative. They were influenced by the changes in Aotearoa at the time of writing, such as the urbanisation of Māori and the rise of Māori activism. They were also affected by the histories presented by scholars such as James Belich and Ranginui Walker. Though early films were strongly tied to the works of James Cowan, later films took a metahistorical angle towards history. These later films were influenced by history in much the same way as Shadbolt and Ihimaera, but were also subject to international film making trends such as the post-colonial western and the period costume drama. Meanwhile, theatre constructed fictional scenarios within specific historical moments, such as *Othello* on a Waikato River gunship or on beaches in Northland. Another representation uses the metahistorical; *Troilus and Cressida* echoes various moments while embodying the non-violent and anti-war message of Parihaka.

While the historical romance was the strongest influence on these representations, there were distinct differences in the perspectives of storytelling. These perspectives are indicative of the author or director's own background. For non-Anglophone Europeans, such as Verne and Wiśniowski, there is a clear criticism of British colonial enterprise and even some support for Māori resistance.

However, Verne and Wiśniowski still held many views of the time period that would be considered racist in a contemporary context.

Over time there has been an increase in diverse perspectives. Until well into the twentieth century, the vast majority of these novels and films were all from the perspectives of relatively young European men. Even so, William Satchell made progress in presenting a greater degree of the Māori world within his novels and created a protagonist who is not seeking ‘fortune and glory,’ but instead questions the dominant discourse of settlement. From the middle of the twentieth century changes began in terms of whose story was told and whose voices were heard. From Stringfellow’s 1959 novel *Mary Bravender*, Pākehā women broke free of the colonial bonds of passivity to be heroines of their own narratives. Ihimaera made strides in ensuring the visibility and heroism of Māori men and women resisting government control. Lastly, in the early twenty-first century, Jim Moriarty in two productions was central to acting out the internal struggle of a Māori man allied with the colonial government. As the understanding of the New Zealand Wars has developed so too has the drive for different perspectives in the narratives. Some bumps in the road may occur, such as *River Queen* increasing depiction of one European woman at the expense of all other female characters. However, this representation was still greater than the invisibility of women in many prior texts, so on the whole the area of representation has diversified.

Māori writers such as Ihimaera, directors such as Cathy Downes and Rangimoana Taylor, as well as actors such as Merata Mita, Wi Kuki Kaa, and Jim Moriarty present different perspectives on story telling. Ihimaera, Mita, and Kaa are indicative of a changing historical moment, for the 1970s and 80s were a time of great Maori activism and led to renewed attention on the New Zealand Wars. The later work of Downes, Taylor, and Moriarty coincide with a time when

Waitangi tribunal treaty settlements are awarded and the Māori language has gained wider acceptance. Their engagement with the material is as much indicative of the historical moment in which they are writing or producing as it is of the complex issues of indigeneity and ethnicity. For them the narratives are not fixed in the nineteenth century, the conflict stretches into the twenty-first century. They present not only the past but allude to or outright depict its effect on the present. Their representations grapple not solely with the New Zealand Wars but the Land Wars as well. This style of storytelling does not just contend with the conflict but also the trauma that the Wars inflicted on Māori.

The timeline in Appendix One shows how pervasive literary, filmic, and stage representations of the New Zealand Wars have been. Following 1959 the longest gap between representations is four years. When the media that I do not specifically focus on such as art, short stories, and poetry are taken into account, the time scale is potentially shorter. Philip Steer argued that literary representations of the conflict emerge in clusters. This is not the case in a wider examination of media. From the mid-twentieth century onwards, there are no clusters, instead there are regular depictions emerging in a variety of media. As the available media for representing the conflict increased, the gap between representations closed. After the mid-twentieth century the New Zealand Wars became firmly entrenched in the New Zealand cultural landscape and new representations have emerged periodically.

The future of the New Zealand Wars in fiction is changing. Just as it expanded from novel to cinema and then cinema to theatre there are other avenues the New Zealand Wars have entered. In 2011 graphic novels became a new media for depicting the conflict. Currently only two examples exist, *Kimble Bent Malcontent* (2011) by Chris Grosz, and *Wars In The White Cloud: Wairau, 1843* (2016) by Matthew Henry McKinley. However, McKinley has plans for an entire

series. These new depictions show that representations of the conflict are capable of branching out into different media and are not limited to a specific pool. Other future possibilities include videogames, as I have heard from other historians of undergraduate students modifying existing videogames to construct their own unofficial representations to engage with history.

This thesis is written at a time when the New Zealand Wars have a high public profile. Historians such as Vincent O'Malley and Tom Roa are vocal about the necessity to engage with the conflict, particularly in schooling. Over the course of my PhD I have been asked on two occasions to provide talks about the New Zealand Wars to South Auckland Health service staff. There is a hunger for this knowledge and many misconceptions about the conflict still exist. Land and memory are at the heart of all representations of the conflict. For a person to truly engage with the land, they must have an awareness of its memory. Representations of the New Zealand Wars are part of how the memory is perceived. Popular culture can reach a far broader audience than history books, though James Belich and Tainui Steven's documentary *The New Zealand Wars* is comparable to the reach of film. Furthermore, the representations greater contact with historical record enables memory to be better transmitted and passed on.

The New Zealand Wars, and by extension the Land Wars, are crucial to understanding the realities of contemporary Aotearoa. The effects of the conflict cannot be treated as an issue solely between Māori and the Crown. Treaty settlements, days of commemoration, effects of land confiscation and language alienation affect everyone living in the country. When these effects are brought to the fore an audience better understands that the Land Wars are still ongoing. The New Zealand Wars are sometimes relegated as just being "Māori history", but as Nēpia Mahuika states "New Zealand history *is* Māori history" (5). The New

Zealand Wars and the ongoing Land Wars are not a Māori -Government issue or even a Māori-Pākehā issue, they are a New Zealand issue. The New Zealand Wars will continue to be represented and the Land Wars will still be evoked by various parties in various ways whether it be film, theatre, literature, or other forms such as art, poetry, short stories, graphic novels, or even videogames. Representations of the conflict have affected the popular understanding of the New Zealand Wars and informed audiences on the Land Wars in the past and will continue to shape judgements, opinions, policies in the decades ahead.

References

- A'Court, Stephen. *Photographs of Downstage Theatre Production of Othello* 2007. Alexander Turnbull Library, reference PADL-000564, Wellington.
- Allen, Chadwick. *Blood Narrative: Indigenous Identity in American Indian and Maori Literary and Activist Texts*. Duke UP, 2002.
- . *Trans-Indigenous: Methodologies for Global Native Literary Studies*. U of Minnesota Press, 2012.
- Anderson, Atholl, Judith Binney, and Aroha Harris. *Tangata Whenua: An Illustrated History*. Bridget Williams Books, 2014.
- Arvidson, Ken. "The Waikato Chapters of *Season of the Jew*: Some Annotations." *Ending the Silences: Critical Essays on the Works of Maurice Shadbolt*, edited by Ralph J. Crane, Hodder Moa Beckett, 1995, pp. 115-29.
- Asbjørnsen, Peter Christen and Jørgen Moe. *East of the Sun and West of the Moon: Old Tales from the North*.
<http://www.gutenberg.org/files/30973/30973-h/30973-h.htm>. Accessed 27 November 2018.
- Austen, Jane. *Persuasion*. Penguin, 1975.
- Babington, Bruce. *A History of the New Zealand Fiction Feature Film*. Manchester UP, 2007.
- Baldick, Chris. "Romanticism." *Oxford Dictionary of Literary Terms*. Oxford UP, January 1 2008. Oxford Reference. <http://www.oxfordreference.com>. Accessed 20 Nov. 2018.
- Baume, Eric. *Half-Caste*. Falcon Press, 1950.
- Belich, James. *I Shall Not Die: Titokowaru's War 1868-1869*. 3rd Edition. Bridget Williams Books, 2010.
- . *The New Zealand Wars and the Victorian Interpretation of Racial Conflict*. 2nd Edition. Penguin, 1998.

- Bennett, Andrew and Nicholas Royle. *Introduction to Literature, Criticism and Theory Second Edition*. Pearson Education, 1999.
- Bentley, Trevor. *Pakeha Maori*. Penguin, 1999.
- Bevington, David. "Additions and Reconsiderations." *Troilus and Cressida*. Bloomsbury Arden Shakespeare, 2015, pp. 125-42.
- Bhabha, Homi K. *The Location of Culture*. Routledge, 1994.
- "Bildungsroman." *Encyclopædia Britannica*. Encyclopædia Britannica Inc, 2018, <https://www.britannica.com/art/bildungsroman>. Accessed 15 November 2018.
- Binney, Judith. *Redemption Songs: The Life of Te Kooti Arikirangi Te Turuki*. Bridget Williams Books, 1995.
- Binney, Judith, Gillian Chaplin, and Craig Wallace. *Mihaia: the Prophet Rua Kenana and His Community at Maungapōhatu*. Auckland UP, 1979.
- Black, Michael, director. *Pictures*. Pacific Films, 1981.
- Braithwaite, Errol. *The Evil Day*. Collins, 1967.
- . *The Flying Fish*. Collins, 1964.
- . *The Needle's Eye*. Collins, 1965.
- Brown, Ruth. "After Belich." *Journal of New Zealand Literature: JNZL*, no. 9, 1991, pp. 70-80, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20112196>. Accessed 18 Feb 2017.
- Bruster, Douglas. *Shakespeare and the Question of Culture: Early Modern Literature and the Cultural Turn*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.
- Byrnes, Vanessa. "Appendix A." *Removing the 'Cloak of Invisibility': New Zealand Directors Discuss Theatre Directing Praxis*, PhD Thesis, University of Waikato, 2014.

- Calder, Alex and Stephen Turner. "Introduction." *Journal of New Zealand Literature: JNZL*, no. 20, Special Issue: Settlement Studies, 2002, pp. 7-17.
- Calder, Alex. *The Settler's Plot: How Stories Take Place in New Zealand*. Auckland UP, 2011.
- Campbell, Russell. "In Order That They May Become Civilised: Pakeha Ideology in *Rewi's Last Stand*, *Broken Barrier* and *Utui*." *Illusions* No. 1, Summer 1986, pp. 4-15.
- Cheeseman, Clara. *A Rolling Stone*. Richard Bentley and Son, 1886.
- Conrad, Joseph. *Heart of Darkness*. Open Road Media, 2014.
- Coppola, Francis Ford, director. *Apocalypse Now*. Omni Zoetrope, 1979.
- Cooper, Annabel. *Filming the Colonial Past: The New Zealand Wars on Screen*. Otago UP, 2018.
- Cowan, James. *The Adventures of Kimble Bent: A Story of Wild Life in the New Zealand Bush*. Whitcomb and Tombs, 1911.
- . *New Zealand's First Century: the Dominion's Scene and Story: the Pageant of Nation-making*. New Zealand Government Department of Tourist and Publicity, 1939.
- . *The New Zealand Wars: A History of the Maori Campaigns and the Pioneering Period: Volume II: The Hauhau Wars*. Government Printer, 1983, <http://nzetc.victoria.ac.nz/tm/scholarly/tei-Cow02NewZ.html>. Accessed 10 June 2017.
- . *Tales of the Maori Bush*. Reed, 2006.
- Crane, Ralph J. "Windows Onto History: 'Mediocre Heroes' in Maurice Shadbolt's New Zealand Wars Trilogy." *Ending the Silences: Critical Essays on the Works of Maurice Shadbolt*, edited by Ralph J. Crane, Hodder Moa Beckett, 1995, pp.100-14.

- . "Tickling History: Maurice Shadbolt and the New Zealand Wars." *Journal of New Zealand Literature: JNZL*, vol. 9, 1991, pp. 59-70, *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/20112195. Accessed 22 March 2018.
- Crosby, Ron. "The Arawa Flying Columns—An Early Use of Special Forces in New Zealand." *Tutu Te Puehu*, edited by John Crawford and Ian McGibbon, Steele Roberts Aotearoa, 2018, pp. 358-86.
- . *Kūpapa: The Bitter Legacy of Māori Alliances with Crown*. Penguin Books, 2015.
- Curtis, Richard and Ben Elton, creators. *Black Adder II*. Mandie Fletcher, director, BBC One, 1986.
- Delorea Jr., Vine. *We Talk, You Listen; New Tribes, New Turf*. Macmillan, 1970.
- Devanny, Jean. *Lenore Divine*. Department of English, U of Otago, 2012.
- Dixon, Robert. *Writing the Colonial Adventure: Gender; Race and Nation in AngloAustralian Literature*. Cambridge UP, 1995.
- Downes, Cathy, director. *Othello*. Performed by Jim Moriarty, Court Theatre. 2001.
- Dunne, Derek. *Shakespeare, Revenge Tragedy and Early Modern Law*. Springer Nature, 2016.
- Duran, Eduardo and Bonnie. *Native American Postcolonial Psychology*. State U of New York P, 1995.
- Elias, Amy J. "Metahistorical Romance, the Historical Sublime, and Dialogic History" *Rethinking History*, vol. 9, no. 2/3, June/September 2005, pp. 159-72.
- Fenimore Cooper, James. *The Last of the Mohicans*. Whitcombe & Tombs, 1950.
- Fox, Alistair, Barry Keith Grant, and Hilary Radner, editors. "Introduction." *New Zealand Cinema: Interpreting the Past*. Intellect, 2011, pp. 13-45.
- Fox, Alistair. "Hybridity and Indigeneity in Contemporary Maori Literature: Witi Ihimaera." *Littératures d'Aujourd'Hui: Contemporain, Innovation, Politique, Théorie Littéraire: Domaines Européen, Latino-Américain*,

Francophone et Anglophone, edited by Jean Bessière. Honoré Champion, 2011, pp. 91-101.

---. "Rudall Hayward and the Cinema of Maoriland: Genre-mixing and counter-discourses in *Rewi's Last Stand* (1925), *The Te Kooti Trail* (1927), and *Rewi's Last Stand/The Last Stand* (1940)." *New Zealand Cinema: Interpreting the Past*, edited by Alistair Fox, Barry Keith Grant, Hilary Radner. Intellect, 2011, pp. 45-65.

Freeman, Lynn. "A Problematic Play." *Capital Times*, 16 May 2007, <https://www.theatreview.virtuozzo.co.nz/reviews/review.php?id=753>. Accessed 7 June 2017.

Gabriel, Mike and Eric Goldberg, directors. *Pocahontas*. Walt Disney Pictures, 1995.

Gallagher, Tag. "Shoot-Out at the Genre Corral: Problems in the "Evolution" of the Western." *Film Genre Reader II*, edited by Barry Keith Grant. U of Texas P, 1995, pp. 246-60.

Geary, David, Christian Penny, and Anna Marbrook. *Manawa Taua/Savage Hearts*. Playmarket, 1994.

Gibb, Sasha, director. *Romeo and Tusi*. Whitireia Performance Centre, 2013.

Gibbons, Peter. "Cultural Colonization and National Identity." *New Zealand Journal of History*, vol. 36, no. 1, 2002, pp. 5-15.

---. "Non-fiction." *Oxford History of New Zealand Literature in English*, 2nd edition, edited by Terry Sturm, Oxford UP, 1998, pp. 25-104.

Gilderdale, Betty. "Tracy, Mona Innis." *Dictionary of New Zealand Biography*, first published in 1998, *Te Ara – The Encyclopedia of New Zealand*, <https://teara.govt.nz/en/biographies/4t24/tracy-mona-innis>. Accessed 25 Feb 2019.

Goldie, Terry. *Fear and Temptation: The Image of the Indigene in Canadian, Australian, and New Zealand Literature*. McGill-Queen's UP, 1989.

Gorst, John. *The Maori King, or, The Story of Our Quarrel with the Natives of New Zealand*. MacMillan, 1864.

- Gower, Patrick. "Make Titokowaru a National Hero." *Newshub*, 7 September 2018, <https://www.newshub.co.nz/home/new-zealand/2018/09/patrick-gower-make-t-tokowaru-a-new-zealand-hero.html>. Accessed 15 October 2018.
- Grace, Alfred A. *Tales of A Dying Race*. Chatto and Windus, 1901.
- Griffith, D. W., director. *The Birth of the Nation*. David W. Griffith Corp, 1915.
- Grossman, Edith Searle. *Heart of the Bush*. Sands and Company, 1910.
- Guest, Bill. *Transitions: Four Decades of Toi Whakaari, New Zealand Drama School*. Edited by Ginny Sullivan. Victoria UP, 2010.
- Haggard, H. Rider. *King Solomon's Mines*. Cassell and Company, 1885.
- Haydon, Edward R., Letter. "Māori Othello." *The Press*, 4 May 2001, <http://www.knowledge-basket.co.nz.ezproxy.waikato.ac.nz/databases/newztext-uni/search-newztext/view/?sid=1779549&d1=fairfax%2Ftext%2F2001%2F05%2F07%2Fdoc00303.html>. Accessed 20 September 2016.
- Hayward, Rudall, director. *The Last Stand*. Frontier Films, 1940.
- , director. *The Te Kooti Trail*. Whakatane Films, 1927.
- Henty, G. A. *Maori and Settler: A Story of the New Zealand War*. Blackie & Son, 1891.
- Hendry, Jonathan, director. *Othello*. Performed by Jim Moriarty, Downstage Theatre, 2007.
- Hewitson, Michele. "This year's feast." *The Listener*, 10 December 1994, p. 44.
- Houlahan, Mark and Elizabeth Schafer. "Editorial: Unsettling Will." *Contemporary Theatre Review*, vol. 19, no. 3, p. 265-68. Accessed 20 November 2016.
- Houlahan, Mark. "Shakespeare in New Zealand." *The Oxford Companion to New Zealand Literature*, edited by Robinson and Nelson Wattie. Oxford UP, 1998. 489-91.

- . "Shakespeare and the Sea of Stories." *Storytelling: Critical & Creative Approaches*, edited by Jan Shaw, Phillipa Kelly, and L. E. Semler, Palgrave, 2013, pp. 155-66.
- . "Shakespeare in the Settlers' House." *Journal of New Zealand Literature: JNZL*, no. 20, Special Issue: Settlement Studies, 2002, p. 112-24.
- . "Unsettling the Bard: Shakespeare in Australasia and the South Pacific." *The Oxford Handbook of Shakespearean Tragedy*, edited by Michael Neill and David Schalkwyk, Oxford UP, 2016, pp. 795-810.
- House, Rachel, director. *Troilus and Cressida*. Translated by Te Haumihiata Mason, The Globe, 2012.
- Hutcheon, Linda. *A Poetics of Postmodernism: History, Theory, Fiction*. Taylor and Francis, 1988, Proquest Ebook central, <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/waikato/detail.action?docID=179040>. Accessed 18 June 2017.
- Ihimaera, Witi. *The Matriarch*. Penguin, 2009.
- . *Sleeps Standing Moetū*. Vintage, 2017.
- . *Woman Far Walking*. Huia, 2007.
- Isaac, Tony, producer. *The Governor*. TV One, 1977.
- Jackson, Peter, director. *The Fellowship of the Ring*. New Line Cinema, 2001.
- . *The Return of the King*. New Line Cinema, 2003.
- . *The Two Towers*. New Line Cinema, 2002.
- Jones, Alison with Kuni Jenkins. "Rethinking Collaboration: Working the Indigene-Colonizer Hyphen." *Handbook of Critical and Indigenous Methodologies*, edited by Norman K. Denzin, Yvonna S. Lincoln, Linda Tuhiwai Smith, Sage, 2008, pp. 471-86.
- Jones, Lawrence. "The Novel." *Oxford History of New Zealand Literature in English*, 2nd edition, edited by Terry Sturm, Oxford UP, 1998, pp. 105-99.

- . "Out of the Rut and into the Swamp: The Paradoxical Progress of Maurice Shadbolt" in *Ending the Silences: Critical Essays on the Works of Maurice Shadbolt*, edited by Ralph J. Crane, Hodder Moa Beckett, 1995, pp. 1-37.
- Keenan, Danny. *Contested Ground: Te Whenua I Tohea – The Taranaki Wars 1860-1881*. Huia, 2010.
- . "Heroes and Villains." *The Listener*, April 19 2003, pp. 30-31.
- . "Hone Heke—His Mana Endures." *Mana Magazine*, vol. 51, 2003, pp. 83-86, <http://newzealandwars.co.nz/wp-content/uploads/2013/10/Mana-Issue-51-Hone-Heke.pdf>. Accessed 30 June 2018.
- . "Kupapa—Saints or Sinners?" *Mana Magazine*, vol. 45, April-May 2002, pp. 78-79.
- . *Wars Without End: The Land Wars in Nineteenth-Century New Zealand*. Penguin, 2009.
- Keown, Michelle. *Pacific Islands Writing: The Postcolonial Literatures of Aotearoa/New Zealand and Oceania*. Oxford UP, 2007.
- Kingston, Ewan. "VAGUE, CONFUSING, DISTRACTING, AND CULTURALLY RISKY." *The Lumiere Reader*, 21 May 2007, <https://www.theatreview.org.nz/reviews/review.php?id=772>. Accessed 16 June 2016.
- Kondracki, Jerzy A., Norman Davies et al. "Partitioned Poland." *Encyclopædia Britannica*. Encyclopædia Britannica Inc, 2018, <https://www.britannica.com/place/Poland/Partitioned-Poland>. Accessed 28 February 2018.
- Kurasawa, Akira, director. *Throne of Blood*. Toho Co., 1957.
- Lusted, David. *The Western*. Routledge, 2003.
- Macassey, Olivia. "Cross-currents: *River Queen*'s National and Trans-national Heritages." *New Zealand Cinema: Interpreting the Past* edited by Alistair Fox, Barry Keith Grant, Hilary Radner, Intellect, 2011, pp. 119-33.

- Mahuika, Nēpia. “New Zealand History *Is* Māori History: Tikanga as the Ethical Foundation of Scholarship in Aotearoa New Zealand.” *Journal of New Zealand History*, no. 49, vol. 1, 2015, pp. 5-30.
- Maniapoto, Moana. “Ranginui Walker — no beating about the bush with him.” *E-Tangata*, 6 Mar 2016, <https://e-tangata.co.nz/news/ranginui-walker-no-beating-about-the-bush-with-him>. Accessed 24 April 2018.
- Mann, Michael, director. *The Last of the Mohicans*. Morgan Creek Productions, 1993.
- Marama, Benny, director. *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. Hamilton Gardens, 2018.
- Marryat, Emilia. *Amongst the Maoris: A Book of Adventure*. Frederick Warne and Company, 1874.
- McEldowney, Dennis. “Introduction.” *Tikera or Children of the Queen of Oceania*, by Sigurd Wiśniowski, Auckland UP, 1972, pp. vii-xx.
- McMahon, Cian T. “Transnational Dimensions of Irish Anti-Imperialism, 1842-54.” *Irish and Scottish Encounters with Indigenous Peoples Canada, United States, New Zealand, and Australia*, edited by Graeme Morton and David A. Wilson, McGill-Queen's UP, 2014, pp. 92-107.
- McMillan, N. A. C. “Gustavus Von Tempsky.” first published in the *Dictionary of New Zealand Biography* 1990, updated March 2006, *Te Ara* - the Encyclopedia of New Zealand, <https://teara.govt.nz/en/biographies/1t90/tempsky-gustavus-ferdinand-von>. Accessed 19 June 2018.
- Middlemiss, Grant. *The Waikato Gunboats: The Story of the Gunboats Used During the British Invasion of the Waikato*. Grant Middlemiss, 2014.
- Middleton, Thomas. *The Revenger's Tragedy*. Edited by Gretchen E. Minton, Bloomsbury Arden, 2018.
- Ministry for Culture and Heritage. “Legacy of War: settling the Waikato-Tainui Claim.” *The Treaty in Practice*, updated 7 July 2014, <https://nzhistory.govt.nz/politics/treaty/the-treaty-in-practice/waikato-tainui>. Accessed 12 December 2017.

- . "Overview of NZ in the 19th Century 1870-1900." *NZ in the 19th Century*, updated 4 August 2014, <https://nzhistory.govt.nz/classroom/ncea3/19th-century-history-1870-1900>. Accessed 14 Jan 2018.
- . "The Second World War and Māori Urbanisation." New Zealand Race Relations, updated 4 Aug. 2014, <https://nzhistory.govt.nz/classroom/nz-race-relations/effects-of-second-world-war>. Accessed 15 Oct. 2018.
- . "Statute of Westminster Passed." Events: 11 December, updated 24 Nov 2016, <https://nzhistory.govt.nz/statute-of-westminster-passed-confirming-nz-autonomy>. Accessed 20 Nov 2018.
- . "Te reo Māori Recognised as Official Language." *Events: 1 August*, updated 3 Aug. 2017, <https://nzhistory.govt.nz/maori-becomes-an-official-language>. Accessed 15 Oct. 2018.
- Mitchell, W. J. T. "Representation." *Critical Terms for Literary Study*, edited by Frank Letricchia and Thomas McLaughlin, U of Chicago P, 1995, pp. 11-22.
- Moffat, Kirstine. "Five Imperial Adventures in the Waikato." *Journal of New Zealand Literature: JNZL*, vol. 29, no. 2, 2011, pp. 37-65.
- . "Introduction." *Lenore Divine*, written by Jean Devanny. Department of English U of Otago, 2012, pp.ix-xlix.
- . "The River and the Ocean: Indigeneity and Dispossession in Vincent Ward's *River Queen*." *Moving Worlds*, vol. 8, no. 2, 2008, pp. 92-106.
- Monin, Paul. "The Challenge of Writing Race-Interaction History in the Era of Maori Resurgence and the Waitangi Tribunal: A Report from the Coal Face." *Journal of New Zealand Literature*, vol. 20, 2002, pp.79-92.
- Moorefield, John C. *Te Aka Māori-English, English-Māori Dictionary and Index*. 3rd Edition, Longman/Pearson, 2011.
- Morton, Graeme. "Introduction." *Irish and Scottish Encounters with Indigenous Peoples Canada, United States, New Zealand, and Australia*, edited by Graeme Morton and David A. Wilson, McGill-Queen's UP, 2014, pp. 3-21.

- Murphy, Geoff. *A Life On Film*. HarperCollins, 2015.
- ., director. *Utu*. Utu Productions, 1983.
- Neill, Michael, editor. "Introduction." *The Oxford Shakespeare: Othello: The Moor of Venice*, Oxford UP, 2006, pp. 1-180.
- . "Shakespeare Upside Down." *World and Stage: Essays for Colin Gibson*, edited by Greg Waite, Jocelyn Harris, Heather Murray and John Hale, Otago Studies in English. University of Otago, 1998, pp. 135-58.
- New Zealand Psychology Society Inc. "Bicultural Issues." *The Bulletin*, 99, Sept 2001, 27-28.
- "A New Zealand Story. 'Rifle and Tomahawk'." *New Zealand Herald*, 19 Nov 1927,
<https://paperspast.natlib.govt.nz/newspapers/NZH19271119.2.177.48.6>.
 Accessed 26 February 2019.
- Nicholson, Roger. "Romancing the Past: History, Love, and Genre in Vincent Ward's River Queen." *Journal of Popular Romance Studies*, vol. 2, no. 1, 2011, <http://hdl.handle.net/2292/17312>. Accessed 25 June 2016.
- O'Malley, Vincent. *The Great War for New Zealand: Waikato 1800-2000*. Bridget Williams Books, 2016.
- Orsman, H.W., editor. *The Reed Dictionary of New Zealand English Third Revised Edition*. Reed Books, 2001.
- Penn, Arthur. *Little Big Man*. Cinema Center Films, 1970.
- Penny, Christian, Anna Marbrook and Heather Lee, directors. *Manawa Taua/Savage Hearts*. Watershed Theatre, 1994.
- Perris, Simon. "Witi Ihimaera and the Dread Goddess." *Journal of New Zealand Literature: JNZL*, vol. 33, 2015, pp. 85-109, *JSTOR*,
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/43303619/>. Accessed 23 March 2018.
- Pickles, Katie. "Colonisation, Empire and Gender." *The New Oxford History of New Zealand*, edited by Giselle Byrnes, Oxford UP, 2009, pp. 219-42.
- Pratt, Mary Louise. "Arts of the Contact Zone." *Profession*, 1991, pp. 33-40.

- Pye, Douglas. "The Western (Genre and Movies)." *Film Genre Reader II*, edited by Barry Keith Grant, U of Texas P, 1995, pp. 187-202.
- Rae, Bernadette, "Theatre Company Sweats It Out." *New Zealand Herald*, 13 October 1994, sec. 2, p. 2.
- Reeves, William Pember. *Ao Tea Roa: The Long White Cloud*. 4th Edition. Golden Press, 1980.
- Reinholt, Karin. "Othello." *Salient*, vol. 12, 28 May 2007, p.44.
- Richardson, Lee Anne M. *New Woman and Colonial Adventure Fiction in Victorian Britain*. Florida UP, 2006.
- Ricketts, Harry. "Maori Moor." *The Listener*, 26 May 2007, <http://www.noted.co.nz/archive/listener-nz-2007/maori-moor>. Accessed 7 June 2017.
- Romaine, Suzanne. "Contested Visions of History in Aotearoa New Zealand Literature: Witi Ihimaera's The Matriarch." *The Contemporary Pacific*, vol. 16, no.1, Spring 2004, pp. 31-57, *Project Muse*, <https://doi.org/10.1353/cp.2004.0027>. 15 March 2018.
- Rourke, Josie, director. *Much Ado About Nothing*. The Globe, 2011.
- Ruth, Annie and Rangimoana Taylor, directors. *Troilus and Cressida*. Toi Whakaari, 2003.
- Ruth, Annie. "He Wahine, He Whenua, E Ngaro Ai Te Tangata: By Women and Land are Men Lost: Troilus and Cressida 2003." *Illusions*, vol 38, 2006, pp. 33-36.
- Said, Edward. *Culture and Imperialism*. Knopf, 1993.
- Satchell, William. *The Greenstone Door*. Whitcombe & Tombs, 1914.
- Savage Paula. "Mair, Gilbert." *Dictionary of New Zealand Biography*, first published in 1990, updated January 2012, *Te Ara - the Encyclopedia of New Zealand*, <https://teara.govt.nz/en/biographies/1m4/mair-gilbert>. Accessed 15 Jan 2019.
- Scott, Walter. *Ivanhoe*. Edinburgh UP, 1998.

- . *Waverley: or, 'Tis sixty years since*. Oxford UP, 1981.
- Selwyn, Don C., director. *The Maori Merchant of Venice*. He Taonga films, 2001.
- Shadbolt, Maurice. "Homer Nods Too." *JNZL: Journal of New Zealand Literature*, 9 (1991), 54-59 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20112194>. Accessed 23 March 2018.
- . *The House of Strife*. Hodder & Stoughton, 1993.
- . *Monday's Warriors*. Hodder & Stoughton, 1990.
- . *Season of the Jew*. Hodder & Stoughton, 1986.
- Shakespeare, William. *Macbeth*. Edited by Sandra Clark and Pamela Mason, Bloomsbury Arden Shakespeare, 2015.
- . *Romeo and Juliet*. Edited by René Weis, Bloomsbury Arden Shakespeare, 2012.
- . *Troilus and Cressida*. Edited by David Bevington, Bloomsbury Arden Shakespeare, 2015.
- Sharrad, Paul. "Struggle and Strategy: Literature and New Zealand's Land Wars." *Wasafiri*, vol. 12, no. 25, 1997, pp. 11-18, *MLA*, doi.org/10.1080/02690059708589522. Accessed 22 March 2018.
- Silverstone, Catherine. *Shakespeare, Trauma and Contemporary Performance*. Routledge, 2011.
- Sinclair, Keith. *The Origins of the Maori Wars*. 2nd Edition, Auckland UP, 1961.
- Smallman, Elton Rikihana. "National day to remember the New Zealand Wars to start in 2017." *Stuff*, 31 October 2016, <http://www.stuff.co.nz/national/85915559/national-day-to-remember-land-wars-starts-in-2017>. Accessed 21 February 2017.
- Smallman, Elton Rikihana and Vernon Small. "Otorohanga College students deliver Land Wars petition to Parliament." *Stuff*, 8 December 2015, <http://www.stuff.co.nz/waikato-times/news/74876330/otorohanga-college-students-deliver-land-wars-petition-to-parliament>. 21 February 2017.

- Smythe, John. "Could Be More Gripping", *Theatreview*. 15 May 2007, <https://www.theatreview.org.nz/reviews/review.php?id=740>. Accessed 17 October 2016.
- . "For 'Moor' Read 'Māori' in This Fine Adaptation of Shakespeare." *The National Business Review*, 2001, pp. 42, <https://www-knowledge-basket-co-nz>. Accessed 20 September 2016.
- Sobchack, Vivian. "'Surge and Splendor': Phenomenology of the Hollywood Historical Epic." *Film Genre Reader II*, edited by Barry Keith Grant, U of Texas Press, 2012, pp. 332-59.
- Somerset, Guy. "The Incredible Likeness of Being." *The Listener*, 14 November 2009, <https://www.noted.co.nz/archive/listener-nz-2009/the-incredible-likeness-of-being>. Accessed 28 February 2019.
- Soutar, Monty. "He Iwi Piri Pono—Loyalty to the Crown, an Iwi Perspective." *Tutu Te Puehu*, edited by John Crawford and Ian McGibbon, Steele Roberts Aotearoa, 2018, pp. 290-308.
- . *Ngāti Porou Leadership – Rāpata Wahawaha and the Politics of Conflict*. PhD Thesis, Massey University, 2000.
- Spillman, Joseph. *Love Your Enemies: A Tale of the Maori Insurrection in New Zealand (Tales of Foreign Lands)*. 7th Edition, B Herder, 1930.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason: Toward a History of a Vanishing Present*. Harvard UP, 1999.
- Stafford, Jane. "'One of these curiously compounded works criticism stops at': New Zealand's First Novel and the Problems of Acclimatisation." *Journal of Commonwealth Literature*, vol. 45, no. 3, 2010, pp. 359-70, Sage, <https://doi-org.ezproxy.waikato.ac.nz/10.1177/0021989410376222>. Accessed 12 May 2015.
- Stafford, Jane and Mark Williams. *Maoriland*. Victoria UP, 2006.
- Statistics New Zealand. "How is our Māori population changing?" Published 17 November 2015,

http://archive.stats.govt.nz/browse_for_stats/people_and_communities/maori/maori-population-article-2015.aspx. Accessed 25 March 2018.

- Steer, Philip. "History (Never) Repeats: Pakeha Identity, Novels and the New Zealand Wars." *Journal of New Zealand Literature: JNZL*, vol. 25, 2007, pp. 114-37.
- Stephens, Tainui, director. *The New Zealand Wars*. Landmark Productions, 1998.
- Stoney, Henry Butler. *Taranaki: A Tale of War*. W. C. Wilson, 1861.
- Stringfellow, Olga. *Mary Bravender*. Collins, 1960.
- Swainson, William. *New Zealand and its Colonisation*. Smith, Elder & Co., 1859.
- Swarbrick, Nancy. "Waikato places - Hūnua to Te Kauwhata", *Te Ara: The Encyclopedia of New Zealand*, updated 11 June 2011, <https://teara.govt.nz/en/map/27130/hunua-to-te-kauwhata>. Accessed 17 October 2016.
- Tantau, Kelly. "Benny Marama's Modern Shakespeare Meets te Reo Māori for Festival." *Stuff*, Feb. 16 2018, <https://www.stuff.co.nz/entertainment/88182281/Benny-Maramas-modern-Shakespeare-meets-te-reo-M-ori-for-festival>. Accessed 20 September 2018.
- Taylor, Apirana. *Whaea Kairau: Mother Hundred Eater*. Playmarket, 1995.
- Taylor, Regan, creator. *Solothello*. Circa Two, 2016.
- Taylor, Richard. *Te Ika A Maui, or, New Zealand and its Inhabitants*. Wertheim and Macintosh, 1855.
- Thompson, Ayanna. "Introduction." *Othello Revised Edition*. Bloomsbury Arden Shakespeare, 2016, pp. 1-116.
- Thompson, Mervyn. "Songs to the Judges." *Selected Plays*, Pilgrims South, 1984, pp. 147-85.

- Tompkins, Joanne. “‘It all depends on what story you hear’: Historiographic Metafiction and Colin Johnson’s *Dr. Wooreddy’s Prescription for Enduring the Ending of the World* and Witi Ihimaera’s *The Matriarch*.” *MFS Modern Fiction Studies*, no. 4, vol. 36, 1990, pp.483-98.
- Thomson, Arthur S. *The Story of New Zealand*. Spottiswoode and Co., 1859.
- Tracy, Mona. *Rifle and Tomahawk*. Whitcombe and Tombs Ltd, 1927.
- Turner, Stephen. “Being Colonial/Colonial Being.” *Journal of New Zealand Literature: JNZL*, no. 20, Special Issue: Settlement Studies, 2002, pp. 39-66.
- Verne, Jules. *Among the Cannibals*. Ward, Lock, & Co., 1899.
- Wakefield, Rowan, ‘Theatre As It Should Be’ *New Zealand Herald*, 26 October 1994, sec. 1, p. 13.
- Walker, Ranginui. *Ka Whawhai Tonu Mātou Struggle Without End*. Penguin, 2004.
- . *Nga Tau Tohetohe The Years of Anger*. Penguin, 1987.
- Wanhalla, Angela. “Family, Community and Gender.” *The New Oxford History of New Zealand*, edited by Giselle Byrnes, Oxford UP, 2009, pp.447-64.
- . *In/visible Sight: The Mixed-Descent Families of Southern New Zealand*. Bridget Williams Books, 2009.
- . “The Politics of “Periodical Counting”: Race, Place and Identity in Southern New Zealand.” *Making Settler Colonial Space: Perspectives on Race, Place and Identity*, edited by Tracey Banivanua Mar and Penelope Edmonds, Palgrave Macmillain, 2010, pp. 198-217.
- Ward, Vincent, director. *River Queen*. 20th Century Fox, 2005.
- Warrington, Lisa. “Look here, upon this picture, and on this’: Representations of *Hamlet* in Aotearoa/New Zealand, 1993-2006.” *Contemporary Theatre Review*, vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 305-16, *Taylor and Francis*, <https://doi->

org.ezproxy.waikato.ac.nz/10.1080/10486800902986087. Accessed 20 November 2016.

- Wattie, Nelson. "The New Zealand Land Wars in the Novels by Shadbolt and Ihimaera." *Crisis and Creativity in the New Literatures in English*, edited by Geoffrey V. Davis and Hena Maes-Jelinek, Rodopi, 1990, pp. 433-47.
- Williams, Haare. *Parihaka Its Rape and Its Healing*. Nga Taonga Sound and Vision, 1994.
- Williams, Mark. "On the Beach: Witi Ihimaera, Katherine Mansfield and the Treaty of Waitangi." *Tropes and Territories: Short Fiction, Postcolonial Readings, Canadian Writing in Context*, edited by Dvořák, Marta and New, W. H., McGill-Queen's UP, 2007, pp. 333-45.
- Wilson, Janet. "Literature as Resistance in the Maori Renaissance: Patricia Grace, Witi Ihimaera, Alan Duff." *Global Community: Global Security*, edited by Randall E. Osborne and Paul Kriese, Rodopi, 2008, pp.173-86.
- Wiśniowski, Sygurd. *Tikera or Children of the Queen of Oceania*. Translated by Jerzy Podstolski, Auckland UP, 1972.

Appendix One: Timeline

Year	Event	Representation Published/Performed
1840	Treaty of Waitangi Signed	
1843	Wairau Affray	
1845	Kororāreka (April) Ōhaeawai (July) George Grey appointed Governor	
1846	Ruapekapeka (January) Tāmami Wāka Nene negotiates peace Fighting near Wellington as Ngāti Toa resist expansion of settlement	
1847	Fighting around Whanganui as up-river tribes attack settlement	
1855	Thomas Gore Brown appointed Governor	
1858	Coronation of Te Wherowhero as the first Māori King	
1860	First Taranaki War Grey returns as Governor Tawhiao crowned second Māori King	
1861	First Taranaki War Ends	<i>Taranaki: A Tale of War</i> by Henry Butler Stoney (novel)
1862	Founding of the Pai Marire faith	
1863	Duncan Cameron crosses the Mangatawhiri sparking the Waikato Invasion Engagement at Titi Hill (October) Battle of Rangiriri (November)	
1864	Rangiaowhia (February) Ōrākau (April) Establishment of Aukati (April) Battle of Moutoa Island (May) Kereopa Te Rau travels to the East Coast (December)	
1865	Killing of Carl Völkner Native Land Court established	
1866	Exile of Te Kooti	
1867	Imperial soldiers withdraw from New Zealand Creation of Māori seats in Parliament	
1868		<i>The Children of Captain Grant</i> by Jules Verne (novel), later split into three novels with <i>Among the Cannibals</i> as the third

Year	Event	Representation Published/Performed
1869	Siege of Ngatapa (January) Siege of Tauranga Ika (February) Tūhoe give support to Te Kooti (March) Te Kooti's first visit to the King Country (July)	
1870	Battle at Ohinemutu (February)	
1872	Te Kooti's second visit to the King Country	<i>Tikera or the Children of the Queen of Oceania</i> by Sygurd Wiśniowski (novel) <i>Henry Ancrum: A Tale of the Last War in New Zealand</i> by J H Kirby (novel)
1873	Te Kooti granted sanctuary by King Tawhiao	
1874		<i>Amongst the Maoris</i> by Emilia Marryat (novel)
1881	King Tawhiao declares peace	
1883	Te Kooti formally pardoned	
1884	Invasion of Parihaka	
1887		<i>Hine-Ra or the Maori Scout</i> by R P Whitworth (novel)
1891		<i>Maori and Settler</i> by G A Henty (novel)
1892		<i>Jem Peterkin's Daughter</i> by W B Churchward (novel)
1893	Āpirana Ngata is first Maori to gain a university degree	
1895		<i>Ngamihi or the Maori Chief's Daughter</i> by R H Scott (novel) <i>Love Your Enemies: A Tale of Maori Insurrection in New Zealand</i> by Joseph Spillman (novel)
1896		<i>The Rebel Chief</i> by H Nesbit (novel)
1899		<i>War to the Knife or Tangata Maori</i> by Rolf Boldrewood (novel)
1907	New Zealand becomes a Dominion	
1914	World War I	<i>The Greenstone Door</i> by William Satchell (novel)
1916	Arrest of Rua Kenana Battle of Gallipoli	
1925		<i>Rewi's Last Stand</i> directed by Rudall Hayward (film)
1927		<i>Rifle and Tomohawk</i> by Mona Tracy (novel) <i>The Te Kooti Trail</i> directed by Rudall Hayward (film)

Year	Event	Representation Published/Performed
1939	World War II	<i>Rewi's Last Stand</i> Novelisation by Rudall Hayward and A W Reed (novel)
1940		<i>The Last Stand</i> directed by Rudall Hayward (film)
1947	New Zealand adopts Statutes of Westminster enabling New Zealand Citizenship independent of Britain	
1954	Native Land Court's name changed to Māori Land Court	
1959		<i>Mary Bravender</i> by Olga Stringfellow (novel)
1960		<i>Black Noon at Ngutu</i> by Frank Bruno (novel) <i>Sleep in the Woods</i> by Dorothy Eden (novel)
1961		<i>Brown Conflict: A Tale of White Man and Maori</i> by Leo Fowler (novel)
1964	New Zealand enters Vietnam War	<i>The Flying Fish</i> by Errol Braithwaite (novel)
1965		<i>The Needle's Eye</i> by Errol Braithwaite (novel)
1967		<i>The Evil Day</i> by Errol Braithwaite (novel)
1968		<i>At the End of the Harbour</i> by Elsie Locke (novel)
1970	Ranginui Walker completes PhD thesis	
1972	Ngā Tamatoa petition for Māori to be taught in schools New Zealand withdraws from Vietnam	<i>Again the Bugles Blow</i> by R L Bacon (novel) <i>Te Raukura: Feathers of the Albatross</i> by Harry Dansey (play)
1975	The Aotearoa Land Hikoi Waitangi Tribunal Established	<i>Fire in the Forest</i> by J E Sanders (novel)
1977		<i>The Governor</i> by Tony Isaac (television series)
1979	James Belich completes MA thesis <i>Titokowaru's War and Its Place in New Zealand's History</i>	
1981	Springbok tour protests	<i>Pictures</i> directed by Michael Black (film)
1982	Establishment of kohanga reo language programmes Belich writes PhD thesis <i>New Zealand Wars 1845-1870: An Analysis of Their History and Interpretation</i>	<i>Cork of War: Ngati Toa and the British Mission</i> by Ray Grover (novel)

Year	Event	Representation Published/Performed
1983		<i>Utu</i> directed by Geoff Murphy (film)
1984		<i>Songs to the Judges</i> by Mervyn Thompson (play)
1985	Waitangi Tribunal empowered to consider Crown actions back to 1840	
1986	Constitution Act defines New Zealand Parliament legal authority securing full independence from Westminster	<i>The Matriarch</i> by Witi Ihimaera (novel) <i>Season of the Jew</i> by Maurice Shadbolt (novel)
1990	150 th Anniversary of the Treaty of Waitangi	<i>Monday's Warriors</i> by Maurice Shadbolt (novel) <i>Blood of Tainui</i> by B Gadd (novel) <i>The Strongest God</i> by Heretaunga Pat Barker (novel) <i>Victoria in Maoriland: A Novel</i> by Margeret Blay (novel) <i>The Hanging Sky</i> by Shirley Corlett (novel) <i>Irirangi Bay</i> by Riwia Brown (play)
1994	Initial Raupatu claims heard	<i>Manawa Taua/Savage Hearts</i> performed by Theatre at Large (play) <i>House of Strife</i> by Maurice Shadbolt (novel)
1995	Waikato-Tainui compensation for the Raupatu	<i>Whaea Kairau: Mother Hundred Eater</i> by Apirana Taylor (play)
1997		<i>Tommo and Hawke</i> by Bryce Courtenay (novel)
1998	<i>The New Zealand Wars</i> documentary airs on New Zealand televisions	
2001		<i>Othello</i> performed by Court Theatre (play)
2002		<i>Vagabonds</i> by Lorae Parry (play)
2003		<i>Troilus and Cressida</i> performed by Toi Whakaari (play)
2005		<i>River Queen</i> directed by Vincent Ward (film)

Year	Event	Representation Published/Performed
2007		<i>Othello</i> performed by Downstage Theatre (play)
2009		<i>Isle of Tears</i> by Deborah Challinor (novel)
2011		<i>Kimble Bent Malcontent</i> by Chris Grosz (graphic novel)
2012		<i>On The Upside Down of the World</i> by Arthur Meek (play) <i>Irirangi Bay</i> by Awanui Simich-Pene (television film) <i>Dog and Bone</i> by Jim Moriarty (play)
2013		<i>The Greenstone Trail</i> by Winston Cowie (novel)
2015	Students from Ōtorohanga College present a petition to Parliament to organise a day of remembrance for the New Zealand Wars.	<i>A Flame Flickers in the Darkness</i> by Winston Cowie (novel) <i>A Sea of Green Unfolding</i> by Lizzi Tremayne (novel)
2016		<i>Wars in the White Cloud: Wairau 1843</i> by Matthew Henry McKinley (graphic novel)
2017		<i>Sleeps Standing/Moetu</i> by Witi Ihimaera with Hēmi Kelly (novella)

Appendix Two: Glossary of Māori Words and Terms

Definitions adapted from:

Moorefield, John C. *Te Aka Māori-English, English-Māori Dictionary and Index*. 3rd Edition, Longman/Pearson, 2011.

Walker, Ranginui. *Ka Whawhai Tonu Mātou Struggle Without End*. Penguin, 2004.

Ariki	paramount chief, high chief, chieftain, lord, leader, aristocrat, first-born in a high-ranking family
Atua	ancestor with continuing influence, god, demon, supernatural being, deity, ghost
Aukati	border, boundary marking a prohibited area
Awa	river
Hapū	sub-tribe
Hiko	march or walk
Iwi	tribe
Kāinga	village, settlement, habitation, home
Kapa haka	Māori performance dance group
Kaumatua	adult, elder, person of status
Kuia	grandmother, female elder
Kūpapa	Māori who fought on behalf of the New Zealand Government during the New Zealand Wars
Mana	prestige, authority, control, power, influence, status, spiritual power, charisma
Mana whenua	territorial rights, authority over land or territory
Marae	the open area in front of the <i>wharenui</i> , where formal greetings and discussions take place
Maunga	mountain, peak
Pā	fortified village, fort, stockade, blockade, city
Pai Mārire	post-contact religion derived from Christianity founded by Te Ua Haumene.
Pākehā	New Zealander of European descent
Rangatahi	youth

Rangatira	chief, chieftainness, high born
Raupatu	conquest, confiscation
Ringatū	post-contact religion founded by Te Kooti Arikirangi Te Turuki.
Tā moko	traditional tattooing - Māori tattooing designs on the face or body done under traditional protocols.
Taiaha	long wooden weapon - of hard wood with one end carved and often decorated with dogs' hair
Tangata Whenua	local people, hosts, indigenous people Taua – Fighting group
Taurekareka	captive taken in war, slave, prisoner of war
Te Ao Māori	the Māori world, can also refer to the Māori worldview.
Te Reo Māori	the Māori Language
Tikanga	correct procedure, custom, habit, lore, method, code, practice, convention, protocol
Tino rangitiratanga	self-determination, sovereignty, autonomy, self-government
Toa	warrior
Tohunga	educated class of Māori society, included priests, healers, master carvers, tattooists, and genealogists
Tūpara	double barrelled gun
Tūpuna	ancestor
Tūtūā	commoner, low born
Utu	reciprocity, payment, revenge
Wahine	woman
Waiata	song, chant, psalm
Whakapapa	genealogy, genealogical table, lineage, descent
Whāngai	foster child, adopted child
Whare	house
Whenua	land
Wairuatanga	spirituality