

## **There's Racism and Then There's Racism: Margaret Mutu and the Immigration Debate**

Sue Abel and Margaret Mutu\*

On 4 September 2011, the main story on the front page of the *Sunday Star-Times* was headlined “Curb White Immigrants – Academic.” Two subheadings underneath read: “SA, UK and US migrants racist, charges Maori scholar” and “Labour Department bears out ethnic fears.” The article itself, with the by-line ‘By Marika Hill,’ starts:

A Maori academic says immigration by whites should be restricted because they pose a threat to race relations due to their ‘white supremacist’ attitudes. (Hill)

A furore followed. The article was reproduced in other Fairfax media, *Te Karere Ipurangi* (Maori News Online), and a wide range of blogs. Each time it was reproduced, more comments accumulated. Facebook groups were set up: “Margaret Mutu is poison,” “Call for Margaret Mutu to resign NOW,” “Margaret Mutu – a leader with guts and grace.” Online media conducted surveys such as “Were Margaret Mutu’s comments racist?” Weekend newspaper columnists Michael Laws and Rosemary McLeod responded with their (different) takes on the issue. Mutu received a large number of phone calls, and emails from 157 people.

What all these people were responding to, however, is not actually what Mutu said. In the article that follows, we set out Mutu’s account of the misreporting of her views in the *Sunday Star-Times* article and in the current affairs bulletin *Close Up* on the following Monday. We then analyse the negative responses in the first week of emails sent to Mutu. We argue that the bulk of these emails are based on either traditional racism or what is known as modern or symbolic racism, and so they ironically endorse much of what Mutu had to say. This racism, however, in whatever form it takes, can be linked to ignorance of the issues involved. We see such ignorance as a failure of both the education system and the media to educate all New Zealanders about the Crown’s breaches of the Treaty and the continuing impact on Māori of these breaches and of processes of colonisation which are manifested in

---

\* Sue Abel is a Senior Lecturer at the University of Auckland, where she works in both the Department of Māori Studies and the Department of Film, Television and Media Studies. Her research focuses on issues around indigeneity and media, with a particular focus on Māori and media.

Margaret Mutu is the professor and head of Māori Studies at the University of Auckland and chair of Ngāti Kahū’s parliament. She has research interests in Māori language and literature, and a number of contemporary issues affecting Māori and indigenous peoples.

intergenerational post-colonial trauma. The flipside of this is the lack of any understanding of the unearned advantages of the descendants of settlers and, by extension, other white New Zealanders. We argue that both institutions permit what Gayatri Spivak has called ‘sanctioned ignorance’ (167). It is not expected that non-Māori will acquire such knowledge and, indeed, this ignorance is an integral part of mainstream non-Māori “common sense” in New Zealand. The implications for Māori of the perpetuation of this sanctioned ignorance means that both the education system and the media can be seen as institutionally racist.

### **Margaret Mutu’s Story**

Marika Hill usually rings me on Fridays. She rings me reasonably regularly about various issues that are going on, background information for them and the appropriate people to contact. She has rung me on many occasions and I get to expect Marika to ring me on Fridays. She is always lovely to talk to, she asks good questions and she seems to understand what the issues are. So I don’t mind helping her out.

On Friday 2 September she rang me to ask me for a response to a migrant report released by the Department of Labour which found (among other things) that Māori are more likely to express negative attitudes to immigration – particularly from Asia. I told her that this finding reflected Department of Labour’s research, but that based on my own research into Māori-Chinese interactions, I did not agree with that research (Mutu, 2009). Historically, Māori and Chinese people had got on well in New Zealand, and my own interviews with Māori in recent times had revealed that current attitudes were driven by what they read in the media. I explained my research in some detail.

Towards the end of the interview I also explained that the immigration that had been far more damaging and destructive for Māori was that from English-speaking countries, including Great Britain, USA, South Africa. Research, particularly from the Waitangi Tribunal,<sup>1</sup> has shown gross and ongoing human rights violations perpetrated against Māori by whites immigrating to NZ in huge numbers who bring attitudes destructive to Māori. Those who have these attitudes do so because the notion of their inherent superiority is part of their

---

<sup>1</sup>See, for example, *The Orakei Report* 1987, *The Taranaki Report* 1996, *The Muriwhenua Land Report* 1997, *The Wananga Capital Establishment Report* 1999, *The Petroleum Report* 2003, *The Report on the Crown’s Foreshore and Seabed Policy* 2004.

culture where they come from, and they bring with them, as much as they deny it, an attitude of white supremacy. That attitude is condoned by the power structures of this country and so these people feel comfortable in this country.

I took care to explain that there are also Pākehā who immigrate here who do not hold these attitudes and recognise the racism against Māori. A very small number of them speak out against it, objecting to it. Likewise there are Pākehā from this country who do this as well, and they have been and are our strongest allies, but they are a small minority of the Pākehā population. Pākehā who recognise and understand racism against Māori and oppose it are welcome. Hill asked me what should be done about those immigrants with anti-Māori attitudes, and I replied that we should be screening all immigrants for such attitudes.

I do not usually read Sunday newspapers, but on the Sunday my cousin rang me and told me to buy a copy of the *Sunday Star-Times*. When I read the article, I was disappointed at how much it had misrepresented what I had actually said. The clear intention of the article was to engender outrage against me personally. I knew, from past experience, that a lot of my time over the next few days at least would be taken up by the media and that I would have to try to correct the misreporting. I have annotated a copy of the article, and this is attached as an Appendix to this paper.

In the subsequent media interviews which followed, I tried to get several messages across. The first was information about the *Sunday Star-Times* misreporting, and provision of the correct information as I had given it to the journalist. Secondly, I explained Paul Spoonley's 1993 definition of racism, where he says:

Racism is the ideological belief that people can be classified into 'races' ... [which] can be ranked in terms of superiority and inferiority ... racism is the acceptance of racial superiority ... It is often used to refer to the expression of an ideology of racial superiority in the situation where the holder has some power. Thus *prejudice plus power* denotes racism in the modern sense ... racism is essentially an attitudinal or ideological phenomenon. ... A dominant group not only holds negative beliefs about other groups but, because of the power to control resources, is able to practice those beliefs in a discriminatory way ... This ideological concept structures social and political relationships and derives from a history of European colonialism. The idea of 'race' has evolved from its use in scientific explanation

(now discredited) and as a justification in the oppression of colonised, non-European people (3–5).

I have condensed this in Mutu (2011) to “Racism can be defined as the attitudinal or ideological phenomenon that accepts racial superiority, and, when present in those with power, justifies them using that power to discriminate against and deprive others of what is rightfully theirs on the basis of their race” (3). This is the definition I have used in all my dealings with the media. In these dealings I have explained that, following Spoonley’s definition, Māori are not able to practice racism, and more particularly institutionalised racism, because they do not have the power to do so. The third message I tried to get across was the obvious point that it is not racist to talk about racism. Finally, I asked the country to recognise and discuss its own racism so that we can all find a way to fix it.

### **The (News) Media and Racism**

Having acknowledged the joint culpability of both the media and the education system in perpetuating sanctioned ignorance around many issues that impact on Māori and on Māori/non-Māori relations, this paper will focus solely on the media. The power of the news media to contribute to what we see in the world and the ways in which we see it makes news an especially influential segment of the media in general (Allan; Grossberg et al; Zelizer). In particular, it is a given in critical news scholarship that “mainstream” news fuels racist ideology. Pietikainen, for example, has found that:

A wealth of studies on news representation of ethnic minorities has shown that, typically, these are represented within a context of problems, crime and disturbance (Campbell, 1995; Cottle, 2000; Halloran, 1998; Löwander, 1997; Lubbers et al., 1998; Reissigl and Wodak, 2001; ter Wal, 2002; van Dijk, 1991). The uniformity of ethnic representations in news, stretching over decades and appearing in different countries, is a worrying phenomenon: news media seem to favour similar representations in different social, political and cultural situations and with different ethnic minorities. This kind of news publicity is seen to contribute to racism, the fragmentation of society and prevents full participation by citizens from various ethnic groups. (8)

A similar situation exists in New Zealand. Māori are indeed overwhelmingly “represented within a context of problems, crime and disturbance” (Pietikainen 8). Research since the 1950s has continually demonstrated the dearth of stories about the Māori world –

stories presented as an intrinsic part of New Zealand and therefore of interest to all New Zealanders – in “mainstream” news (Cochrane; Comrie & Fountaine; Moewaka Barnes et al.; Thompson). The most recent research covered 21 random days of television news in the period November 2007–April 2008 (Nairn et al.). Māori featured in only 1.59% of the 1757 news items carried by the five English-language television news bulletins. But within that 1.59%, seven stories (or 57% of stories about Māori) were about implied or acknowledged abuse of or violence against Māori children (ibid.). Positive stories about Māori, if they actually get into the news, are buried.

Far too often, important and relevant historical and social context is left out. To fully understand many issues to do with the interaction between Māori and Pākehā (and indeed between any indigenous group and their colonisers), an understanding of the colonial and more recent past is required. This absence of historical context contributes to a lack of understanding of the reasons so many Māori are on the negative side of our social indicators (as, indeed, are indigenous people around the world), and to the lack of understanding of Treaty settlements as small recompense for what iwi have lost in the last 170 years. It also feeds into ideas of “Māori privilege.”

Because so many non-Māori are very likely to get any knowledge they have of te ao Māori, Treaty issues and the impact of colonisation on colonised peoples from non-Māori news, such news contributes to racism against Māori in the wider population.

### **Data and Methodology**

157 individuals sent emails to Mutu in the period between 4 September 2011 and 8 October 2011, when they trailed off. This article analyses the first week in this period, which contains 119 of the emails. Mutu replied to all of these emails, which led to several people emailing more than once, engaging, to some degree or other, in a dialogue with her. Of interest here is that several of these emailers seemed taken aback that she had responded, and the tone of their emails changed. On the whole, though, most maintained their original position.

Because to analyse all of the 119 emails would have taken us far beyond the word limits for this article, we made a decision to analyse only those emails which we deemed negative (although we occasionally make reference to, and even quote, some of the positive

emails as a point of comparison). Accordingly Abel separated out those emails which did no more than disagree (in a more or less reasonable manner) with the inaccurate reporting of Mutu's remarks, on the grounds that Mutu herself disagreed with the remarks as reported. This meant that comments like "I think your comments are racist" were taken out of the database, while "You are a racist bitch" stayed in. 25 were removed, as well as another two in which people were merely asking for information.

The remaining emails were divided up into "Disagree" and "Agree" categories, with (fortuitously) 46 emails in each category. The 46 "Disagree" emails were a mixture of those which contained straight invective and/or those which revealed other attitudes. In the latter case it seemed that Mutu's reported statements had acted as a catalyst for other sentiments and attitudes. Even though some of these emails were reasonable in tone, they all revealed racist attitudes based on white superiority at worst, and at best some form of modern racism.

We follow here Sears and Henry's definition of symbolic racism. Sears and Henry argue that modern racism embodies four specific themes, the beliefs that:

- (a) there is no longer any serious racial or ethnic discrimination against minority groups,
- (b) any remaining racial or ethnic inequality is the fault of members of the minority group, who simply are not working hard enough,
- (c) demands for "preferential treatment" or affirmative action for minorities are unjustified, and
- (d) minority groups have already been given more than they deserve. (260)

### **The Emails**

To avoid the continual use of "[sic]" we need to make it clear here that many of these negative emails contained spelling and other errors, and we have included these as they appeared in the original email texts. One possible way of explaining the high number of such mistakes is to surmise that extremely irate emailers ran off the emails at great speed and pushed "Send" without re-reading them.

We start with the emails which just addressed Mutu in person, and then look at those which broadened out to include comments on Māori in general. The four emails below are an example of the vitriolic nature of some of the responses to Mutu's comments:

I hope you have a crap day and a nice wee car crash.

Your mouth should be washed out with sunlight soap for eternity.

YOU

UGLY

BITCH

Lol u black nigga if the white man hadn't come, u would still be eating each other and living in huts you maori nigga cunts

And from someone who has a strong sense of priorities:

WHAT WERE YOU THINKING BRINGING IT UP NOW. 1 day before the rugby world.

These emails raise the question: How might we account for such anger and hatred? We return to this question at the end of the paper.

Seven people accused Mutu of not being a “real” Māori. The most concise of these was:

YOU LOOK LIKE A TANNED WHITE MOTHER FUCKER mutu, build a bridge and walk over it RACIST MAORI

Five people likened Mutu to Hone Harawira, and four likened her to Hitler. There was a whole cluster of comments around Mutu's professional status, ranging from “what are you teaching our children” to her “supposed education” and her “waste of education” and “willingness to be paid as part of the white man's system.” Her education and professional status were never seen as a positive attribute. On the other hand, this education and status were not even mentioned in the supportive emails. This raises the question of whether there may be an element of “uppity Māori”<sup>2</sup> in the negative responses. There is a tension between

---

<sup>2</sup> The term “uppity” derives from the Southern states of America, where “deference was demanded by whites and any Negro who would not accord it was defined as ‘uppity,’ threatening and in need of correction” (Banton, 121). Banton also argues that these were “bad Negroes.” Good Negroes (Sambos), who did defer, might reap rewards (ibid). This dichotomy echoes the pattern of “Good Māori”/“Bad Māori” or “Wild Māori”/“Tame Māori” that has been identified in New Zealand media (Abel, 1997; McCreanor). There has been no scholarly analysis of the term “uppity Māori,” but the mostly Māori academic audience who listened to this paper when it was presented as a seminar agreed heartily with the argument that there would be resentment against educated Māori as “uppity Māoris.”

the picture of lowlife, bludging, lazy Māori described in many of these emails, and the evidence of a Māori very successful in the Pākehā world, which might fuel a need to attack both Mutu and her success.

Some people made comments which were (probably unexpectedly) revealing:

You are fuelling the hatred that normal Kiwis have towards Maoridom.

This statement suggests that it is normal to hate Māoridom, that anyone who does not is not “normal,” and that those who are part of Māoridom are not “Kiwi.” It is one of many emails which prove Mutu’s point about racism in New Zealand. At the same time, given the argument about the role of the media in fueling racist ideology, it reflects the white-centredness of non-Māori media. We outlined above the negative nature of representations of Māori in non-Māori news. At the same time, because of the absence of Māori either as Māori (in the sense of having a different but equally valid perspective on current issues) or as New Zealand citizens (because they are largely absent from the news as both sources and as providers of vox pops), non-Māori news media constructs a “normal Kiwi” as someone who is white. The email above follows this logic.

In those negative emails which got beyond mere personal invective, what was most evident was the lack of any understanding of the status of indigenous peoples, of the colonial process, both past and present, and of the impact of this on Māori, let alone the notion of intergenerational post-colonial trauma. This last concept is becoming widely recognised in settler states (see, for example, Czyzewski; Cunneen and Libesman; Menzies; Pearce et al.). In the New Zealand context it means that the impact of loss of land, loss of other resources, loss of culture and loss of language have had intergenerational effects which contribute to the fact that, as many of these emails pointed out, many Māori end up on the wrong side of our social indicators. The negative emails, however, saw this as proof of Māori inferiority rather than a result of colonisation.

One of the ways this lack of understanding manifested itself was in a key difference between the negative emails and the supportive emails. While negative emails spoke in terms of “race relations” or “racial harmony,” not one supportive email used this term. Rather, many supportive emails, implicitly or explicitly, tended to speak in terms of “institutional



racism” or “structural racism.” While “race relations” is based on issues of “tolerance,” of interpersonal processes and relations, and set in the here and now, concerns about institutional and structural racism take history into account, and are based around issues of equity. The media plays an important role here. In not providing the historical and social context to their stories of “irrational” Māori protestors and “yet another case of Māori child abuse,” non-Māori news media perpetuate modern racism and are themselves guilty of institutional racism. Some examples of the “race relations” approach are:

Thank you for setting New Zealand’s race relations back 100 years.

Like MOST New Zealanders I find your comments divisive and destructive to the philosophy of racial harmony. We should ask ourselves in whose interest is it to continue to ferment racial disharmony and stir the racial pot.

On the other hand, many of the supportive emails made statements like:

I just wanted to write to you to express my support for your speaking out against institutional racism in this country. I agree with your suggestion that the number of white immigrants should be capped. We are preferentially chosen at the moment and that increases the power differential between Maori and Pakeha people in this country.

Over the past few decades many non-Māori have come some way in understanding our history and how it shapes us now, particularly how blatantly discriminatory laws have resulted in unequal outcomes for Māori and non-Māori. It’s called structural racism and we’ve been having a good look at how it generally works to privilege the dominant culture, and undermine others. I’m not surprised that some Maori are wary of immigration and economic policies they have no control over, which continue to marginalise them in their own land.

### **Anti-Māori Discourses**

Of the 46 negative emails, 26 widened their response out to make general anti-Māori statements. These are grouped below into different discourses, but of course many emails combined several of these. Here is one example of an email which started with a personal attack and moved to a general:

If every white person left the country tomorrow who would pay for you to spout your crap? You would become a real winner like they have in Zimbabwe – ole whitey was really holding them down wasn’t he? And if NZ filled up with Asians like you so love, do you think they

would put up with your greedy insolence and your apartheid system? ... Do you think they would tolerate you climbing in their windows at night? ...

We assume that in the last sentence he is not referring to Mutu herself, but has conflated her with all other Māori.

*Māori would still be savages if the white man hadn't come [i.e. we need white immigrants]*

This discourse was the most widely used in the negative emails. Some examples are:

It is your attitude, that all non-Maori should feel grateful for the Maori 'letting' all other 'immigrants' into this country in the first place. Take note, this 'land' is not yours to give this approval, you stupid bitch. Where is your gratitude for the technology that 'white/yellow' people have brought to this country? My God, the Maori technology didn't even have the most basic of inventions, the wheel, LOL.

So how about us WHITE'S take our housing, vehicles, clothing ect. ect. And leave you BLACK'S to your grass huts and tikki sticks.

Do you not have the ability to understand that your income is because of us, your university is because of us, your law is the uk law thank goodness, your Maori had nothing, no writing, no maths, no money, no education and no loyalty to each other ...

A sense of racial superiority is clearly evident here. One of the supportive emails from an English immigrant noted that she was appalled at the attitudes of local white people, and many emails supported her point.

*The statistics confirm*

This is an allied discourse which draws strongly on that part of modern racism which believes that "any remaining racial or ethnic inequality is the fault of members of the minority group":

The basis on which most of the racism here is purely down to the inherent behaviour and attitudes of Maori, the statistics confirm the notion of most Whit skin people, in which, the majority of Maori are either or both violent criminals anon benefits.

The good thing about immigrants is that the vast majority are here by choice and are prepared to work hard to become productive members of our society. They bring skills and cultural diversity. Unlike those who consider themselves the only true New Zealanders and should be accorded special privileges as a result. They go on to make up racially disproportionate

statistics on the dole queues, prison population, become carrier [career?] criminals, wife bashers or murderers of their own children.

Both of these discourses are based on essentialism in one form or other. One assumes that if white men had not come to New Zealand, Māori culture would have stayed in its “natural” state. The other assumes that modern-day Māori are inherently lazy and violent. They are also based on the premise of white superiority. In fact two emailers were very forthright about this. Here is one of them:

Bring in the white immigrants – they will not fill our jails – hold their hands out for benefits, murder their children, gamble, do drugs, fight etc. Do we whites think we are better than Maori – you bet you sweet life we do!!! Because we are!!! [underlining in original]

These two discourses, then, are based on notions of racial superiority – that is to say, they are (if not usually as explicitly as the previous email) based on assumptions of Māori inferiority as a race. To state the obvious, this is a racist assumption, and ironically these emails demonstrate precisely what they accuse Mutu of doing.

The next two discourses are not based on racial superiority, and are much more prevalent in the public domain. Surprisingly, though, they were not as common in the emails as the more openly racist statements.

### *Māori privilege*

The notion of special privileges for Māori goes back to at least 1985, when a D. McMaster of Auckland filed a claim with the Waitangi Tribunal alleging, amongst other things, that a number of special privileges were accorded to Māori people by virtue of their race but these privileges were at variance with the Treaty of Waitangi. The claim was subsequently withdrawn because, as a Pākehā, McMaster was not entitled to make a claim to the Tribunal. The Māori Privilege discourse has entered the public arena most prominently as a result of Don Brash’s famous Orewa speech of 2004 as leader of the National Party Opposition, and has been reinforced recently by speeches made in his role as leader of the ACT party. Given how common this discourse seems to be in sections of the New Zealand population, there were surprisingly few references to Māori privilege in the negative emails. One writer gave “The Maori rugby team” as an example. Some other examples are:

What really gets me is, if I was unfortunate enough to need emergency medical care at an A&E, and in doing so was to be treated by a Maori doctor or nurse, I would be labelled a Racist if I insisted on a White person to treat me, but why? Why would anyone be happy to be treated by someone who was allowed to achieve a LOWER level of skill and expertise?

Societal benefits are afforded to Maori, but not any other race – racism in every sense of the word.

These statements are examples of symbolic racism in that they are based on the assumption that “Demands for preferential treatment or affirmative action for minorities are unjustified.” The case of indigenous peoples, of course, takes this theme of symbolic racism one step further in that indigenous peoples have to deal with issues of colonisation that other minority groups do not. The statements not only demonstrate ignorance about the reasons why Māori are afforded “societal benefits” but also lack any awareness that white people accrue many societal benefits that are not available to other races. The non-Māori media plays a key role here because it makes whiteness invisible, and presents western values as universal.

*We need to let go of the past and look to the future*

An example of this discourse is:

I understand the hardship that the Maori people have been through and that there is still healing to be done. But the past cannot be changed. We can only look to the future and hope that things improve and that racism is abolished from all parts of society.

While this statement sounds very reasonable, especially as it acknowledges “the hardship that the Maori people have been through,” this particular discourse ignores the devastation of colonisation and the fact that the attempts to partially redress this are still winding their way slowly through the Tribunal. Acting on this discourse would leave Māori still disadvantaged. It is also a particularly monocultural discourse which takes no account of the important role that history and the past plays in te ao Māori. There are therefore both political and cultural misunderstandings here.

This was not the only cultural gap in the negative emails. One Pākehā supporter made a relevant point:

I appreciated your korero on racism on Close Up. The issue is much wider from my experience and it shows how wide the gap is between Maori and Pakeha cultural views. The strongest example of this was around the notion of manuhiri, of non-Māori being guests in Aotearoa New Zealand. This supporter ended his email:

Being an immigrant means I understand the ‘guest’ concept but I would imagine for many New Zealanders it would be looked at from a monocultural view and therefore misinterpreted. This proved to be so, and a number of emails were particularly vitriolic here.

All of the discourses identified above are examples of what John Fiske calls “dislocated racism.” Fiske argues that racism may be considered to be dislocated “when it is apparently to be found only in the behaviours of a racial minority and never in those of the white power structure” (272). Dislocated racism also has the end effect of normalising Pākehā hegemony and white privilege. This brings us back to the question asked earlier: How might we account for, or understand, the anger expressed in some of these emails? What drives someone to send such vitriolic emails and to write their name on the bottom, so that anonymity is not a factor? Rosemary McLeod has suggested that the complaints to the Race Relations Office seem to have the intent of cowing Margaret Mutu into silence (McLeod). But there would seem to be more involved here. Pākehā hegemony in this country has been so naturalised and white privilege is so invisible to white people that those Pākehā who do not understand our history, or have not worked in some way to become more bicultural, must find challenges to their monocultural world view and power extremely threatening – especially when it comes from a Māori. Abel, for example, has noted the apoplectic rage and charges of racism with which white media practitioners responded to Ngāpuhi’s media ban in 2003 (Abel, 2007). In a related vein, Branscombe et al. argue as a result of their own research that when Whites are confronted with suggestions that they benefit from racial inequality, they may respond with increased modern racism in order to justify their privilege (203). This is an area which needs more (and local) research.

In the meantime the institutional racism of the non-Māori media, and its contribution to symbolic racism among the New Zealand population, continues. This is despite the continual updating of research which demonstrates how, and the extent to which, non-Māori media excludes or demonises Māori. Donald Matheson has called for the equivalent of nursing’s cultural safety to be included in journalism education, with a focus on the students’ own cultural identity (103). The ideal outcome here is that the white-centredness of non-

Māori news would decline, and Māori would be included in the news both as members of te ao Māori and as New Zealand citizens. It would also mean that Māori voices such as that of Margaret Mutu would be reported accurately and not be subjected to the commercial need for sensational headlines. While this is an excellent ideal, a more pessimistic outlook would argue that the forces of commercialisation and of socialisation in the existing norms of newsrooms will win out.

### 3 Curb white immigrants<sup>4</sup> - academic

- SA, UK and US migrants racist,<sup>5</sup> charges Maori scholar
- Labour Department survey bears out ethnic fears

By MARIKA HILL

marika.hill@star-times.co.nz

A MAORI academic says immigration by whites should be restricted because they pose a threat to race relations due to their "white supremacist" attitudes.<sup>6</sup>

The controversial comments come in response to a Department of Labour report, obtained exclusively by the Sunday Star-Times, which found Maori are more likely to express anti-immigration sentiment than Pakeha or any other ethnic group.

Margaret Mutu, head of Auckland University's department of Maori studies, agreed with the findings<sup>7</sup> and called on the government to restrict the number of white migrants arriving from countries<sup>8</sup> such as South Africa, England and the United States as they brought attitudes destructive to Maori.<sup>9</sup>

"They do bring with them, as much as they deny it, an attitude of white supremacy<sup>10</sup> and that is fostered by the country," she said.

Race Relations Commissioner Joris de Bres, who migrated here from the Netherlands, has hit out at Mutu's view, saying there is no justification for anybody to discriminate on the basis of colour, race or nationality.

Mutu said Maori were generally supportive of immigration from Asian countries,<sup>11</sup> and she was happy to welcome white immigrants who understood issues of racism against Maori.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> This article is coded here for (a) yellow highlight - yes, this was said in the interview; (b) red highlight - no, this was not said in the interview; (c) green highlight - yes, this was said in the interview but has been taken out of context.

<sup>4</sup> (b) - not said.

<sup>5</sup> (b) - not said.

<sup>6</sup> (b) - not said.

<sup>7</sup> (c) - taken out of context. What was said was that the findings reflected the research carried out.

<sup>8</sup> (b) - not said, but rather that all immigrants should be screened for anti-Māori/white supremacist attitudes.

<sup>9</sup> (a) - yes, said this.

<sup>10</sup> (c) - yes, said this but the rest of the sentence was "that has been so destructive and has wrought massive damage on Māori as the Waitangi Tribunal has so clearly shown."

<sup>11</sup> (b) - not said.

<sup>12</sup> (a) - yes, said this.

"They are in a minority just like Pakeha in this country. You have a minority of Pakeha who are very good, they recognise the racism, they object to it and speak out strongly against it."

The Labour Department migrant report surveyed almost 1000 people on their perceptions of ethnic groups coming here. Maori respondents were the most likely to agree with negative statements about immigrants<sup>13</sup>, such as that they threaten New Zealand culture and steal jobs from Kiwis.

They were also more likely to disagree that immigrants contribute to New Zealand's culture and economy.

The Labour and Immigration Research Centre report also found:

Samoans were the migrant group which received the highest negative rating by all respondents, one in five viewing them negatively.

British and Australian migrants received the highest positive ratings, just 5% disliking the British and 4% viewing Australians negatively.

Pacific Islanders (91%) were most likely to find New Zealand welcoming.

It is not the first time Maori commentators have sparked controversy by suggesting racial immigration policies.

Maori Party co-leader Tariana Turia caused an international backlash when she call for migration to be reduced – particularly from western countries – in 2007. At the time, Turia accused the government of trying to stop the "browning" of New Zealand through immigration.

De Bres said: "We should not stop people coming on the basis on their skin. It's racial prejudice and racial discrimination." He cautioned that racist views were not limited to one ethnic group.

De Bres said he recently attended a celebration at the Maori King's residence where different migrant communities were welcomed onto the marae, proving many Maori are welcoming.

"The positive thing to do is for Maori and migrants to engage more to understand each other."

Massey University sociologist Paul Spoonley said his research showed while other ethnic groups' attitudes toward migrants had been approving, Maori perception had become increasingly negative. Anti-immigration sentiment was fed by Maori fears that multicultural policies were diminishing policies concerning Maori, he said.

Mutu said she was concerned that relations between Maori and other minority groups had deteriorated<sup>14</sup>

"Maori feel very threatened as more groups come in and swamp them."

But Auckland University of Technology Maori history professor Paul Moon said extremist Maori views were held only by a minority and people should be wary of reading too much into the report.

He said Mutu's comments did not equate with the reality of many Maori inter-marrying with Pakeha.

**- Sunday Star Times 4 September 2011**

---

<sup>13</sup> Most of the interview was on this and the fact that Māori are most opposed to Asian immigration. However, research shows that that attitude was largely a result of negative media portrayal of Asian immigration.

<sup>14</sup> (b) – not said. Rather, the concern was that Māori-Asian, and in particular Māori-Chinese, relations had deteriorated.



## Works Cited

- Abel, Sue. *Shaping the News: Waitangi Day on Television*. Auckland: Auckland University Press, 1997. Print.
- Abel, Sue. “‘The Public’s Right to Know’: Television News Coverage of the Ngāpuhi Media Ban.” *New Zealand Journal of Media Studies* 9.2 (2007): 17–27. Web. 6 Dec. 2012.
- Allan, S. *News Culture*. Buckingham: Open University Press, 1999. Print.
- Banton, M. *Racial Theories*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998. Print.
- Branscombe, Nyla R., Michael T. Schmitt and Kristin Schiffhauer. “Racial Attitudes in Response to Thoughts of White Privilege.” *European Journal of Social Psychology* 37.1 (2007): 203–15. Web. 6 Dec. 2011.
- Cochrane, J. “Media treatment of Māori issues.” *Sites* 21 (1990): 5–29. Print.
- Comrie, M., and S. Fountaine. “Knowing Through News: The Information Content of TVNZ News.” Third International Conference on New Directions in the Humanities. University of Cambridge, 2–5 August 2005. Conference Paper.
- Cunneen, C. and T. Libesman. “Postcolonial Trauma: The Contemporary Removal of Indigenous Children and Young People from their Families in Australia.” *Australian Journal of Social Issues* 35.1 (2000): 99–115. Web. 12 Oct. 2011.
- Czyzewski, Karina. “Colonialism as a Broader Social Determinant of Health.” *The International Indigenous Policy Journal* 2.1 (2011). Web. 12 Oct. 2011.
- Fiske, John. *Television Culture*. London: Routledge, 1987. Print.
- Grossberg, L., E. Wartella and D. C. Whitney. *Mediamaking: Mass Media in a Popular Culture*. London: Sage, 1998. Print.

- Hill, Marika. "Curb White Immigrants – Academic." *Sunday-Star-Times* 4 Sept. 2011, A1. Print.
- Huygens, I. "Discourses for Decolonization: Affirming Maori Authority in New Zealand Workplaces." *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*. 16 (2006): 363–78. Web. 12 Oct. 2011.
- IMSED Research, Department of Labour (2010). *Perceptions of Migrants and Immigration: 2010 Community Survey*. Wellington: Department of Labour, 2010. Web. 26 October 2011.
- McLeod, Rosemary. "The Elephant in the Room that Speaks." *The Dominion Post* 15 September 2011. Web. 28 Oct. 2011.
- McCreanor, T. "'Sticks and stones may break my bones ...': Talking Pakeha Identities." *New Zealand Identities: Departures and Destinations*. Eds. J. Liu, T. McCreanor, T. McIntosh, T. and T. Teaiwa. Wellington: Victoria University Press, 2005. Print.
- Matheson, D. "The Interpretative Resources of Aotearoa New Zealand Journalists Reporting on Māori." *New Zealand Journal of Media Studies* 10.2 (2007): 91–105. Web. 14 Nov. 2011.
- Menzies, Peter. "Developing an Aboriginal Healing Model for Intergenerational Trauma." *International Journal of Health Promotion and Education* (April–June 2008). Web. 12 Nov. 2011.
- Moewaka Barnes, A., M. Gregory, T. McCreanor, R. Nairn, F. Pega and J. Rankine. *Media and Te Tiriti o Waitangi 2004*. Auckland: Kupu Taea, 2005. Print.
- Mutu, Margaret. *The State of Māori Rights*. Wellington: Huia, 2011. Print.
- Mutu, Margaret. "Māori Media Depictions of Chinese: From Despised and Feared to Cultural and Political Allies." *The Dragon and the Taniwha*, ed. Manying Ip. Auckland: Auckland University Press, 2009. Print.

Nairn, Ray et al. “‘Maori News Is Bad News’: That’s Certainly So on Television.” *Kōtuitui: New Zealand Journal of Social Sciences Online*. (Under review).

Pearce, M.E. et al. “The Cedar Project: Historical Trauma, Sexual Abuse and HIV Risk among Young Aboriginal People Who Use Injection and Non-injection Drugs in Two Canadian Cities.” *Social Science & Medicine* 66.11 (2008): 2185–94. Web. 12 Nov. 2011.

Pietikainen, Sari. “Indigenous Identity in Print: Representations of the Sami in News Discourse.” *Discourse & Society* 14.5 (2003): 581–609. Print.

Sears, David O., and P. J. Henry. “The Origins of Symbolic Racism.” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 85.2 (2003): 259–75. Web. 9 Nov. 2011.

Spivak, Gayatri. “Can the Subaltern Speak?” *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*. Eds. C. Nelson and L. Grossberg. Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1988. Print.

Spoonley, Paul. *Racism and Ethnicity*. Auckland, New Zealand: Oxford, 1993. Print.

Thompson, R. “Maori Affairs and the New Zealand Press.” *Journal of the Polynesian Society* 62 (1953): 366–83. Print.

Zelizer, B. “Journalists as Interpretive Communities.” *Social Meaning of News*. Ed. D. Berkowitz. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1997. Print.