

Parallel Quotidian Flows: Maori Television On Air

Jo T. Smith

Parallel Quotidian Flows: Maori Television On Air

Abstract:

Acting CEO of Maori Television Services (MTS) Wayne Walden has stated that the key objective of the station is to “normalise Maori language and tikinga (culture)” and to provide a training ground so that young Maori can “move on to the mainstream networks” (*Canvas*, March 27-28, 2004, p. 9). As such, the station is part of a process of cultural revitalisation that seeks to heal the impact of European colonisation, provide a viable future for its youth and promote Maori language as a part of the culture of everyday life in New Zealand. Accordingly, MTS can be seen as a strategy of decolonisation that must, by necessity, inhabit the very thing it might seek to critique or interrupt, in this case, the mediated public sphere of Aotearoa/New Zealand. This paper considers how the entry of MTS into the nation’s broadcast system might act as a parallel televisual presence interrupting dominant narratives of New Zealand nationhood. To do this, the paper reflects on how channel surfing between mainstream New Zealand television and MTS might introduce incremental changes in New Zealand’s national imaginary. By way of example, the paper discusses MTS’s *DIY Marae* and the TV One series *Explorers*, a series that rehearses and celebrates the received history of European settlement. Using these examples the paper considers how the national imaginary enabled by broadcast technologies asserts the enduring history (and future) of colonial settlement and how MTS might add an insurgent element to this narrative of nationhood through its production of a parallel quotidian flow that expresses te ao Maori.

Introduction

In March of 2004 Aotearoa/New Zealand’s first indigenous television broadcaster, Maori Television, went to air. The Maori Television Service (MTS) emerged from a long history of negotiation with the New Zealand Crown to recognise and accept that “the principles of the Treaty impose a continuing obligation on the Crown” to assist in the preservation of the Maori language by the use of radio and television (Minister of Maori Affairs document, accessed 21/11/04). As such, MTS is an initiative driven by the tenets of equal representation, democracy and Treaty partnership, and the focus on media industries highlights the increasingly central role that audiovisual culture plays in the negotiation of community relationships, social power and cultural survival. Indeed, as part of a global indigenous media movement, Maori Television has a role to play in disrupting the hegemony of New Zealand settler society and in affirming an indigenous form of social agency. As Epifanio San Juan argues (in the context of US racial politics, but it is also applicable to the cultural politics of New Zealand), “racial politics today is no longer chiefly mediated by biological and naturalistic ascriptions of value, but rather by symbolic cultural interpellations [...] pivoting around the affirmation of a ‘common culture’” (1998: 131). Given its history of European colonisation, what gets counted as “common” to Aotearoa/New Zealand is often a homogenous and Eurocentric expression of cultural belonging, a homogeneity that extends itself through the very technological, social and economic processes of society. Television is key to the dissemination of these narratives of a “common” national imaginary, as well as a prime site for introducing incremental shifts in quotidian life in Aotearoa/New Zealand.

As a technology that organises the flow of everyday life, television promises to be a powerful tool for MTS’s cultural transformation and regeneration of not only Maori culture, but also the national culture of Aotearoa/New Zealand. As the MTS website states:

The aim of our channel is to play a major role in revitalising language and culture that is the birthright of every Maori and the heritage of every New Zealander. (<http://corporate.maoritelevision.com/about.htm>. Accessed 4th March 2006.)

In MTS's reference to "the heritage of every New Zealander" we find a working presupposition that suggests that both Maori and non-Maori are implicated in the practices handed down by a colonial past, and that Maori culture and language have a part to play in the nation's future. The "New Zealander" envisaged by MTS is thus a citizen of a nation state that is cognisant of Maori values, language and culture, a cognisance produced in part by the televisual mediations of MTS.

However, as Faye Ginsburg has argued in another context, media technologies present a form of "Faustian dilemma" for social collectivities that have historically been the objects of a technological metropolitan gaze (1992: 360). In Aotearoa/New Zealand this dilemma might be a question of how one can preserve or revitalise te reo Maori using the very tools (print and audiovisual media) that have contributed to its marginalisation in New Zealand society. In addition to the historical aftermath of colonisation, the contemporary geopolitics of local media industries necessarily conditions the output of the indigenous free-to-air channel. That is to say, television is a capital-intensive technology tied to generating audience share, and MTS must find a balance between maintaining a broadcast regime based upon specific forms of cultural knowledge within an environment where commercial imperatives prevail. This requires a risky balancing act between the concerns of "culture" and those of capital. In terms of the double-edged sword of symbolic cultural interpellations, the emergence of MTS not only symbolises progress toward a more egalitarian and bicultural society that may affirm Maori cultural identity; the State can exploit this kind of initiative (or more plainly, this form of bicultural branding) as a demonstration of political progress while maintaining other institutional practices that deny Maori agency. Given these conditions, what are the transformative potentials of MTS on air?

This paper examines MTS's necessary complicity with technologies of representation and their commercial imperatives. The paper argues that MTS's aim to revitalise te reo Maori is a practice of incorporation that poses a counter discourse to prevailing national orthodoxies. MTS broadcasts a communication system shaped by te ao Maori and indigenous interests, creating an indigenous public sphere that parallels that of the mainstream. Accordingly, MTS's will to cultural transformation (to revitalise te reo and tikanga) produces a parallel quotidian flow within the national imaginary that presents a televisual symbol of bicultural national identity that is janus-faced in character.

While MTS might pose a challenge to existing paradigms for understanding indigenous social agency and political power, it does so within a larger social context. As I shall argue, the dominant broadcast culture of Aotearoa/New Zealand is built upon the national orthodoxies of a colonial consciousness that is tied to capital gain. Operating within this context, MTS bears a burden of representation that risks quantifying and standardising the many life-worlds that constitute te ao Maori, (the postcolonial audiovisual dilemma if you will). Given these contradictions, the paper concludes that indigenous agency, or the will to cultural transformation, lays not so much in MTS's powers to represent its people than in its spectral presence in the national programming schedule, a presence which inserts micro-level pauses in mainstream quotidian flows, and hence national orthodoxies, and which provide us with glimpses of our bicultural futures. Comparing programming from the State broadcaster with select examples from MTS, the paper examines how MTS might transform the everyday culture of Aotearoa/New Zealand.

Narratives of Nationhood on Primetime

Television content highlights the nature of the battle over what gets to count as "common" culture in New Zealand and MTS poses a refreshing reverse-shot to the prevailing norms of common New Zealand ("Kiwi") television culture. These national orthodoxies can be traced back to the history of colonial occupation where European laws, and the religious and cultural norms of European society justified

colonial occupation. As a settler society founded on a history of colonisation, a dominant tendency of mainstream television is to naturalise the settler-subject in the landscape and to assert an instrumental relationship over the land via this settler-subject. The repetition of such tropes helps to secure European dominion over a territory previously inhabited by another people. Settler identity, based as it is upon the violence of colonisation, is a precarious identity that must be constantly secured through claims to a sense of “oneness” with the occupied territory, an assertion of settler “indigeneity” that displaces other claims to indigeneity (in this case, the prior claims of tangata whenua). The nature of the conflict over what gets to count as “common” to a nation’s imaginary is thus a battle over the coding of social spaces and how these spaces become an invisible part of the quotidian life of a nation. This battle is a contemporary expression of a process initiated by colonisation and which Robert Young describes as a form of “writing geography” (1995: 170). As Young has argued, the practices of settlement and colonial invasion are fundamentally spatial phenomena linked to the more global processes of capitalism:

This description of the operations of capitalism as a territorial writing machine seems not only especially suited to the historical development of industrialization, but also describes rather exactly the violent physical and ideological procedures of colonisation, deculturation and acculturation, by which the territory and cultural space of an indigenous society must be disrupted, dissolved and then reinscribed according to the needs of the apparatus of the occupying power. (1995: p. 170)

The diverse array of territorial writing machines deployed by any occupying power (be they physical, symbolic, technological or otherwise), must be continually active in coding, decoding and recoding social spaces so as to secure a meaningful relationship to the territory and resource at stake. In terms of the imaginary space of the nation, media industries such as television dominate the flow of quotidian life and help to code the imagined space of the nation-state according to a settler cultural compass. The national state-funded television network, TVNZ, serves as a reminder of the symbolic cultural interpellations that inform the everyday life of this contemporary settler nation.

Two recent media examples from the national channel TV One give us a brief outline of these prevailing norms. In 2004 the TV One station identity campaign drew upon the idea of national homogeneity and unity (“one-ness”) to celebrate its role as the national broadcaster. Four months after MTS went to air, TV One also screened the *Explorers* series that, in the words of the broadcaster, “retraces some of the epic journeys by our early explorers as they forged their way through unmapped country across NZ” (TV One website). The TV One ad campaign celebrates the diverse natural resources available to the nation, and the laconic and relaxed approach that New Zealanders take to their national assets. The *Explorers* series metaphorically reenacts the carving up of iwi lands at a moment in contemporary New Zealand politics when issues over customary title and Crown responsibilities (the Foreshore and Seabed debate) were rife. These mainstream media moments highlight the nature of the battle over what gets to count as a common part of everyday culture in New Zealand and the prevailing norms that MTS unsettles.

In 2004 TV One ran a series of station identities, one of which celebrated the national trope of stripped back “Kiwi” simplicity. With the opening line, “From a land where understatement is an understatement” this advert highlighted the perceived cultural tendency towards laconic humour that forms part of common New Zealand culture. The promotion juxtaposes a range of examples of the nation’s natural resources (ancient glacial streams, “staggering” alpine scenery, and the “awesome” beauty of our larger land mass), with the simple linguistic terms used to describe them (bridge number 1, lookout, and South Island). Various “everyday” New Zealanders (including Pakeha, Maori and Asian subjects) feature in the foreground of these land and river-scapes and these people point out the various signposts that describe the vistas. With facial expressions that range from the wry to the unashamedly proud, these everyday New Zealanders celebrate the national tendency to keep things simple. The fact that the advert celebrates understatement is premised upon a tacit understanding of the obvious, that “we” the nation belong to a truly unique environment. Through the editing of image, signpost and dialogue (plus the jaunty

back-ground music), the advert harnesses the sublime effects of the natural landscape to the service of a national myth-making agenda that secures the symbolic “one-ness” that the national broadcaster is purportedly capable of representing. This lesson in simplicity then, offers a self-congratulatory celebration of New Zealand’s capacity for understatement that is bound together by editing techniques and linguistic play to demonstrate a literal writing of the territory depicted in the promo.

Accordingly, that which appears as simple is in fact the result of a complex battle over what symbolic cultural interpellation prevails within the national imaginary. The technologies of representation available to the settler-subject far outweigh the technologies available to those whose histories of relating to the land predate European settlement. The myth of one-ness that the TV One advert promotes mystifies the prior history of iwi settlement and is a timely repetition that echoes the declaration by William Hobson at the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi; “He iwi tahi tatou (Out of many we are one)”. Hobson’s pronouncement declared New Zealand to be a social totality that could build a new nation under a system of shared rule. Homogenous and totalising, this pronouncement obliterated the distinctiveness of each Treaty partner’s understanding of the signing, a contestation over meaning that would return to haunt the occupying powers and which is now reiterated in the recent station ID.

While the promo erases “the many” to produce one homogenous empty time of place based upon the celebration of the present, to re-read the TV One promo from the viewpoint of iwi belonging might be to see the palimpsest nature of the naming of the nation space. As San Jaun’s earlier quote suggests, contemporary race relations consist of a battle in the symbolic realm to insert social meaning into the landscapes, resources and objects of the everyday. The advert asserts a simplistic sense of one-ness with a natural landscape that incorporates a diverse range of cultural identities. But this myth of one-ness mystifies the prior history of indigenous relations and the localised nature of tribal life as it is registered in place names. To those who know a small part of iwi history, the understated place-name “South Island” is Te Wai Pounamu

in another context, a name that describes the natural resources of the place and represents another form of writing geography. So too, the “North Island” can be doubled by the place name Te Ika o Maui, which references the trickster god Maui and his feat of fishing up the island. These names express more partial and relational links between land and people, and when placed in relation to the more simple and understated New Zealand names, the nation must then be thought in double-time (Bhabha 1994: 139-170) where the national space is haunted by a historical excess that conditions present and future manifestations of the nation. This double-time is not made present in the TV One promo, even though the inclusion of the term “pa” gestures to this other history. Mainstream television as “territorial writing machine” continues in the State-funded series called *Explorers* that aired on TV One four months after the launch of MTS. *Explorers* makes a similar gesture towards the recognition of prior iwi occupation, but it too privileges a narrative of national belonging whose origins lie with colonial settlement.

Explorers is a literal repetition of settler narratives of encounter with a foreign landscape in that the series is based on journal accounts of four British adventurers - Charles Heaphy, William Colenso, A.J. 'George' Barrington, and Thomas Brunner (two of whom were surveyors for the New Zealand Company). Describing the project prior to its completion, NZ on Air chief executive Jo Tyndall claimed:

The Explorers will contrast the way those landscapes greet today's traveller, with the historic perspective provided by early diary entries that help to demonstrate how much attitudes have changed from the 'clash of cultures' of the time. It will give the perspective of the people who live there now, and those who lived there then, who had trodden the paths in advance of the European settlers. (*NZ On Air website 2003*)

The pitch suggests that the “before and after” shots of coloniser and colonised encounters will form part of the series’ focus (something the “clash of cultures” quote suggests), and that the series will give accounts of those who trod the paths in advance of the British adventurers. However, when the final promo for the series announced

that *Explorers* “retraces some of the epic journeys by our early explorers as they forged their way through unmapped country across New Zealand”, one can observe a fundamental contradiction in that the use of the descriptor “unmapped country” denies the prior presence of Maori and iwi symbolic relationships to the land (that were certainly marked and mapped by the presence of tupuna). Indeed, the opening remarks of the first in the series by host Peter Elliot underscores the fact that the series celebrates the European subject and his relationship to this new land with only a passing recognition of iwi settlement.

The first installment of *Explorers* opens with a shot of mountainous terrain, with the camera panning to reveal Peter Elliot perched on the side of a hill. Elliot goes on to acknowledge the fact that New Zealand has been discovered many times before, by many different people, each claiming it as their own. This is one of the various “bicultural gestures” that the series performs (others include Elliot receiving a blessing from the descendants of Brunner’s guide Kehu of Ngati Tumatakokiri). This acknowledgedgement of iwi history is then undercut by Elliot’s suggestion that rather than discoverers being the significant agents of national history, that it is to the explorers of this land to whom “we are most indebted”. These explorers are described as those people who “set off to quantify, harness, evaluate the land” and who came back greatly changed by the experience. Elliot never elaborates upon the nature of this debt that the national “we” might owe to these men. Is the debt something to do with the journals that these men leave behind and which throw light on the early days of settlement? Is the debt to do with the search that some of these men made for flat land to sell to new settler arrivals? What is certainly clear is that this debt is a contract made between the British adventurer and the national “we” who prevail after the fact of settlement, a “we” that excludes those dispossessed of land by the NZ Company. When Elliot states that he will, as he puts it, “walk a few miles” in these adventurer’s boots, the audience is implicitly invited to take up a similar position and align themselves with these adventurers. Told from the point of view of journal entries by these men, the series invites its audience to re-enact a narrative of settlement that underscores national tropes of European “Man Alone”

exploits in the face of an alienating wilderness. The viewpoint of tangata whenua remains an off-screen space.

Explorers explicitly repeats a history of European occupation that secures present-time settlement. What is remarkable about this series is that it screens at a time when MTS enters the mediated public sphere and when debates about who has ownership rights to the nation’s foreshore and seabed highlight competing worldviews on land, resources and community. *Explorers* is a state-funded, state-screened broadcast that reasserts an instrumental relationship to the land, at a moment when the Crown seeks to protect the Foreshore and Seabed as a commodity under state ownership, without due recognition of iwi political and social economies. At a time when civil disobedience threatens to intensify via community-based negotiations of the abstract rule of governance, the powers of Maori television to code social spaces and quotidian life according to other rhythms and world-views becomes increasingly important. While these TV One examples promote a homogenous narrative of national history, the emergence of MTS suggests that with the broadcast of Maori programming content on a distinctively Maori channel, the national imaginary might be forced to invoke itself in terms of a double-time.

Reverse Quotidian Flows

MTS’s tactic to revitalise te reo and tikanga Maori extends itself to every level of the channel’s organisation, including its station ID. Where TV One offers a dumbed-down homogenous “one-ness” to identify itself to the nation and to call the nation into being, MTS offers a more complex mode of address. The station logo reads, “Maori Television – Ma ratou, ma matou, ma koutou, ma tatou. Maori Television - For them, for us, for you, for everyone” and the website reiterates the inclusive address of the station when it states:

Maori Television is New Zealand’s channel

– we have something for everyone.

You’ll see New Zealand life, New Zealand stories and

New Zealand people. (<http://www.maoritv.com/>)

suburbs, while *DIY Marae* uses the genre to complete community projects and, at times, to provide an account of the community's life and some of its tribal history. Conventional DIY programmes open with a generic establishing shot of the "home" (signaled in perhaps a shot of a front door, the house in the street, the house in relation to its garden), *DIY Marae* takes the time to situate its "home" within the geographical context of the country. In the case of the makeover of Te Pakira marae in Rotorua (screened 20/04/04), the opening sequence includes a map of the North Island and a signpost demarcating where Te Pakira is located. This episode also included archive footage of the marae (based as it is in one of the most widely photographed regions of Aotearoa) and commentary from kuia and children. This kind of attention to the location and identity of each *DIY* project emphasises the diverse traditions within an iwi-based community, while the respect paid to kuia (some of whom receive a makeover as well), express the cultural norms of te ao Maori. *DIY Marae* thus offers a point of difference to the makeover genre that depicts, and accordingly normalises, marae life-style on TV.

Where mainstream versions of DIY TV remain fixated on the content of the house or the aestheticisation of the indoor/outdoor flow, or the romantic relationship between husband and wife, *DIY Marae* asserts another economy of belonging to landscape and resources. The series unfolds according to the rhythms of a communal life style where links between people expand beyond that of the nuclear family, and extend to include those personalities and ancestors who have passed on. Mainstream versions of DIY makeover television depict couples that achieve a sense of completion and belonging through the active construction of a domestic space and the purchase of commodities to decorate those spaces, demonstrating a form of belonging based on consumer relations. *DIY Marae* invokes the larger historical context to produce the community's identity as one that derives from a long history, a shared present, and collective future. In this instance MTS's televisual function as a territorial writing machine works to assert an indigenised form of reality TV that highlights and disrupts the more naturalised relations to homes, commodities and families that mainstream DIY shows promote. The sense of "place" and the larger

MTS's mandate to revitalise te reo and Maori tikanga is pitched at an audience that is not exclusively Maori. The channel logo provides an array of possible viewing positions for its audience and this range involves a tacit acknowledgement on the part of the viewer that there are categories other than the one that they might identify with, that exist alongside their own. This is a form of symbolic cultural interpellation that provides a spatialised and relational identificatory position that allows for, and indeed insists upon, diversity. That which appears common to this mode of address is the assumption of difference and a relational proximity to those differences. This form of writing geography potentialises another form of bicultural politics framed from the viewpoint of te ao Maori.

Unlike the TV One promo there is no didactic compulsion to identify as any "one" particular subject, and indeed this mode of address emphasises the ability of the viewer to shift between various positions. The subtle distinctions of identity and collectivity offered in the MTS station ID offers a point of difference from that of the State broadcaster and asserts another kind of social ordering that constitutes a challenge to the imaginary totalities produced by TV One. The station logo's emphasis on relational differences and its conjuring of an open-ended and continually shifting collectivity asserts a different kind of writing geography from that of the mainstream provider, and these differences continue in the social, cultural and ideological dimensions of MTS's refashioning of tried and tested TV genres such as the cooking show genre (*Kai Time on the Road*) and reality TV formatting (*Miire 10 DIY Marae*). By re-writing these familiar TV narratives, MTS produces a palimpsest text where commercial imperatives and cultural knowledge mesh, a risky mesh that contains peril as much as potential for indigenious agency.

Miire 10 DIY Marae involves a makeover of a communal building and community grounds, its stated purpose being to achieve the marae's five-year development plan in a few days. Where mainstream versions of DIY TV emphasise the nuclear family (often in a competitive and combative relation to another family), and the family home in the

historical context invoked in *DIY Marae* highlights the contingent sense of “home” signaled in the mainstream version, a sense of belonging that is only achieved through the active reconstruction of a space (any space wherever) in terms of labor and ingenuity, as well as through the purchase of commodities. Accordingly, *DIY Marae* produces reverse quotidian flows that pose a challenge to the national orthodoxies of private property, nuclear family structures and the use of houses as a benchmark of social success. While these reverse quotidian flows serve a pedagogical function in teaching the audience aspects of iwi life, by producing different discourses of “home” the simple act of visualisation functions to incorporate te ao Maori into a mediated public sphere whose performative function (its ability to ‘stage’ cultural difference) has a janus-faced dimension.

State-funded Indigenous TV and the promise of cultural transformation

To recall Faye Ginsburg’s warning that the use of technologies of representation involve a “Faustian dilemma” for those subjects previously the objects of such technologies, the indigenous public sphere created by MTS is a newly emergent cultural space within an existing media-sphere controlled by national and international interests. The janus-faced dimension of MTS’s broadcasting powers concern the state’s ability to utilise MTS images of Maori empowerment as symbols of a healthy bicultural nation-state at the same time as it resists challenges to its policies in other forums. Ex-MTS programming manager Joanna Paul describes the channel as a “working partnership” that is “the first of its kind for the industry”, and her essay title (“Challenges lie ahead for MTS in the Aotearoa public sphere”) suggests that MTS contributes to a Treaty partnership expressive of an “Aotearoa public sphere” that might replace the more monocultural “New Zealand” public sphere (Paul 2005: 43). Yet these moves towards greater Treaty partnership require a greater incorporation of the norms of a public sphere derived from Westernised political values that involve “rational modes of argumentation, face to face talk, consensus, [and] equality” (King and Goodwin 2005: 6). To replace the symbolic interpellation of “New Zealand” with that of “Aotearoa” is an

aspirational form of biculturalism that only serves to cover over the irreducible differences between Maori and Pakeha rather than lay bare those differences for dialogue and dispute. Recalling the palimpsest nature of name places in this contemporary settler state, perhaps it is more productive to attend to the complexities of the mediated public sphere and its performative dimensions than to search for simple solutions.

While *DIY Marae* provides a performative and theatrical mode of public sphere discourse, it too is implicated in the double-edged sword of representational politics. As a broadcast technology MTS is implicated in, and attractive to, the workings of capital and state interests, each of which combine cultural knowledge with a market logic of exchange and equivalence, leading to the commodification of culture. Indeed, this mesh between culture and capital is also the site mined by indigenous interests, as one Maori commentator on the general principles of a Maori Television station demonstrates when she states:

Not only will the Maori channel assist the Maori language and cultural cause, but it will also confirm the uniqueness and distinctiveness of Aotearoa, amongst the growing globalization of media products in this country. (Halkyard-Harawira 1997)

This kind of “brand” logic links representational politics (MTS’s drive to revitalise Maori culture) to the workings of capital, and one can see this at play in *DIY Marae*. MTS indigenises the Reality TV format and participates in a form of identity politics designed to celebrate its culture, but it does so with the eye firmly on the market and with the recognition that easily recognisable formats generate an assured target audience. This suggests that any expression of indigenous agency involves a necessary complicity with the larger systems that surround and inform it. While *DIY Marae* brings the rural community into view in ways that complicate a national imaginary based upon the nuclear family or the cult of individuality, the show still provides the “money-shot” characteristic of the Reality TV genre: that is, the shot that celebrates the promise of capitalist transformation.

Maori can move on to the mainstream networks (Corbett 2004: 9).

This strategy of normalisation suggests at least two possible outcomes. One possible outcome is that Maori labour will be regulated, disciplined and standardised by mainstream media's conditions of production, and that professional norms of the existing industry and the commercial imperatives underpinning the industry will win out over the alternate rhythms and modes of belonging peculiar to te ao Maori. The alternative is that Maori labour will introduce incremental shifts in the modes of mainstream production and that these shifts might constitute the more micro-level dimensions of cultural transformation.

Conclusions

MTS's drive to revitalise te reo and tikanga is an immediate imperative and can be justified as a tactic of decolonisation that can help to heal the impact of European colonisation on the social and cultural structures of Maori society. Yet in visualising these cultural differences onscreen, MTS risks 'staging' cultural identity in a manner that reduces iwi life worlds to empty televisual representation that nonetheless express regulatory force. What this approach risks is the reassertion of a reactive and didactic model of Maori cultural identity that homogenises the tribal nature of te ao Maori. By privileging the normalisation of te reo Maori the channel risks promoting a certain hierarchy of value within the category "Maori" (where fluent speakers accrue more social value than non-fluent speaker). The televisual presence of te ao Maori (MTS's ability to model ways of being Maori and examples of Maori cultural practice) also risks representing standards and norms against which audiences might measure themselves, and fall short of. In addition, Wayne Walden's assertion that MTS will provide the necessary pathways through which Maori can enter mainstream media industries also suggests a conservative agenda that reiterates the existing institutional structures of New Zealand society. However, to list these risks does not mean to negate the powerful contribution that MTS makes to diversify the range of life worlds available to media consumers. As MTS continues in its production of a parallel quotidian

The final "transformation" sequence of each *DIY Marae* programme is literally a "money-shot" in that one can see the labor, time and financial resources that have contributed to a more aesthetically pleasing and functional marae area. The pleasure of witnessing the "before" and "after" shots comes not only from the recognition of a community's effort, and the progress made on their communal property, but from the role played by the shows sponsor (Mitre 10) in providing equipment and resources. That is to say, the pleasure generated by the money-shot is derived from the spectacle of consumption (the consumption undertaken by the marae community as well as the spectator watching the programme). While MTS reshapes the genre in terms of a collective relationship to land and resources, the final outcome is still the celebration of capital's ability to transform one's conditions of existence through the purchase of goods and services. The symbolic cultural interpellations produced by *DIY Marae* may offer another worldview on the concept of "home" or "belonging", yet this point of difference still remains harnessed to the logic of exchange and equivalence that characterises capital. Accordingly, *DIY Marae* and MTS participate in the persistent capitalist drive to translate everyday life into audiovisual terms so that difference and diversity ensure the proliferation and extension of capital's territorialising powers. The panoptic nature of Reality TV (in the case of *DIY Marae*, this involves a "marae cam"), and the necessary complicity with the workings of capital, inculcates *DIY Marae* in a process of self-surveillance, regulation and discipline that can be put to the service of the occupying power at the same time as providing the conditions necessary for indigenous agency.

The logic of incorporation that seeks to refashion Reality TV through a Maori worldview is also echoed in CEO Wayne Walden's vision for MTS in general. As the NZ Herald reports:

The key objective of Maori Television [Walden says] is to normalise Maori language and culture (tikanga). Plus, Maori Television will provide a training ground from were young

flow to public life of Aotearoa/New Zealand, this initiative offers up potential circuit breakers in the common narratives of nationhood, breaks that challenge the imaginary totalities produced by the state broadcaster.

Given New Zealand geopolitics (small population, mixed public service and commercial broadcast imperatives) the simple proximity of MTS to TVNZ in the media sphere (to which we might add TV3, Prime and Sky) adds a different media flow that introduces micro-level shifts in the national imaginary. When viewed in parallel, MTS and other TV broadcasters demonstrate the double time of this settler nation-state and its link to more global cultural flows. Reading across these parallel quotidian flows one might perceive a new kind of imagined national community that might not be premised on the homogenous dream of an abstract "one-ness" as touted by TVNZ, but perhaps might be a kind of bicultural community yet to come, whose shape can be glimpsed in the gaps between mainstream television broadcasting and MTS on air.

*This material was originally presented as part of a conference panel on MTS that included Dr Chris Prentice and Dr Vijay Devadas. Thanks to Chris Prentice and Simone Drichel for comments and feedback on an earlier draft of this paper.

Bibliography

Bennion T (2003) 'The Claim of the Crown is Weak' *Maori Law Review: A Monthly Review of Law Affecting Maori* 1-3.

Bhabha H (1994) *The Location of Culture* Routledge London and New York

Blythe M (1994) *Naming the Other* Metuchen NJ The Scarecrow Press

Corbett J (2004) 'Taking a commercial break' *Canvas* 27-28 March 8-10

Ginsburg F (1991) 'Indigenous Media: Faustian Contract or Global Village?' *Cultural Anthropology* Vol 6 No 1 92-112

Halkyard-Harawira H (1997) 'Hui on Maori TV' *Ministry of Economic Development*

http://www.med.govt.nz/pbt/broadcas/maori_tv/index.html#TopOfPage (Accessed 1/12/04)

King B and Goodwin I (2005) 'Elusive Issues of Identity' *Pacific Journalism Review* 11 (1) 5-7

Mutu M (2004) 'Maori Issues' *The Contemporary Pacific* 16 (1) 158-163

Paul J (2005) 'Challenges lie ahead for MTS in the Aotearoa public sphere' *Pacific Journalism Review* 11 (1) 42-46

San Juan Jnr E (1998) *Beyond Postcolonial Theory* St Martin's Press New York

Turner S (2005) 'A Political Economy of Identity: the Kiwi Nation' Presented at the *Biculturalism or Multiculturalism* conference hosted by the School of Culture, Literature and Society at the University of Canterbury 1-3 September

Tyndall J (2003) 'Different Journeys' http://www.nzonair.govt.nz/news_detail.php?pid=854&sid=800 (Accessed 10/11/05)

Young R (1995) *Colonial Desire* Routledge London and New York