

2001

‘Almost the same, but not quite.... Almost the same, but not white’ : Maori and Aotearoa/New Zealand’s 1981 Springbok Tour

Malcolm Maclean

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ro.uow.edu.au/kunapipi>

Recommended Citation

Maclean, Malcolm, ‘Almost the same, but not quite.... Almost the same, but not white’ : Maori and Aotearoa/New Zealand’s 1981 Springbok Tour, *Kunapipi*, 23(1), 2001.

Available at: <https://ro.uow.edu.au/kunapipi/vol23/iss1/13>

Research Online is the open access institutional repository for the University of Wollongong. For further information contact the UOW Library: research-pubs@uow.edu.au

‘Almost the same, but not quite.... Almost the same, but not white’ : Maori and Aotearoa/New Zealand’s 1981 Springbok Tour

Abstract

The contradictions exposed by Maori responses to the 1981 Springbok rugby tour are clearly seen on the East Coast of New Zealand’s North Island, as they were in every other iwi.¹ The Springboks were welcomed at Te Poho-o-Rawiri marae at the same time as other Ngati Porou, Rongowhakaata and other local Maori were spreading broken glass across the playing field at Gisborne’s Rugby Park — the visitors were told in no uncertain terms that they would not be welcomed again. Others from the region could not see the problem. Rugby great, George Nepia, said in 1985 ‘we have got what we wanted — the Maori in All Black teams that play in South Africa. I can’t make out why other teams can visit South Africa without all the fuss’ (Romanos 39). Other iwi and regions suffered similar problems, dissension and uncertainty. The Tai Tokerau District Maori Council in the north of the country announced its support for the tour in July 1980. This prompted a vigorous debate in the Far North and an announcement in January 1981 that the Council opposed the tour.

MALCOLM MACLEAN

‘Almost the same, but not quite....

Almost the same, but not white’:

Maori and Aotearoa/New Zealand’s 1981 Springbok Tour

The contradictions exposed by Maori responses to the 1981 Springbok rugby tour are clearly seen on the East Coast of New Zealand’s North Island, as they were in every other iwi.¹ The Springboks were welcomed at Te Poho-o-Rawiri marae at the same time as other Ngati Porou, Rongowhakaata and other local Maori were spreading broken glass across the playing field at Gisborne’s Rugby Park — the visitors were told in no uncertain terms that they would not be welcomed again. Others from the region could not see the problem. Rugby great, George Nepia, said in 1985 ‘we have got what we wanted — the Maori in All Black teams that play in South Africa. I can’t make out why other teams can visit South Africa without all the fuss’ (Romanos 39). Other iwi and regions suffered similar problems, dissension and uncertainty. The Tai Tokerau District Maori Council in the north of the country announced its support for the tour in July 1980. This prompted a vigorous debate in the Far North and an announcement in January 1981 that the Council opposed the tour. (*New Zealand Herald* 1980a; 1980b; 1981). In August 1980, the New Zealand Maori Council announced its opposition to the tour with two District Councils supporting the tour, three opposing it, three unable to decide and one not discussing the issue (*New Zealand Herald* 1980c). Even after the Tai Tokerau Council changed its view in 1981 fewer than half the District Maori Councils had taken a stand against the tour. Indeed, there is little to suggest that the distribution of Maori support for and opposition to the tour was significantly different from the distribution of Pakeha² support and opposition. Among Maori, as across the entire country, the debate was difficult, confused and far from clear.

The political struggles surrounding the on-going sporting contact between New Zealand and South Africa dominated public protest and pervaded public life between 1922 and 1991. Scandal first broke after South Africa’s Springboks played the New Zealand Natives (the Maori team) in 1922. It was bad enough that the

Springboks only narrowly defeated the Maori team (9–8), but the following day the local Napier newspaper published a copy of an article sent back to South Africa by a correspondent travelling with the touring team. It read:

This was the most unfortunate match ever played. Only great pressure brought to bear on the Manager (Mr H.C. Bennett) induced them to meet the Maoris (*sic*), who had assisted largely in the entertainment of the Springboks. It was bad enough having to play a team officially designated 'New Zealand natives', but the spectacle of thousands of Europeans frantically cheering on a band of coloured men to defeat members of their own race was too much for the Springboks, who were frankly disgusted.

(Richards 11)

This brought forward a deluge of complaints from Maori and from the mainstream newspapers alike. In some cases, the critics of the correspondent, Blackett, sought to defend the honour of the 'noble Maori' against the South African. In other cases, including that of Maori anthropologist, Te Rangi Hiroa (Sir Peter Buck), the criticism was that the Maori were 'not of negroid extraction, but of Caucasian descent', and thus were a higher 'race' than South Africa's blacks who should not be compared to them (*New Zealand Herald* 14 September 1921 qtd in Templeton 28) In the same article, Te Rangi Hiroa also called for the cessation of sporting contact between New Zealand and South Africa until the 'colour line' was removed from South African sport.

Between 1928 and 1960 the New Zealand Rugby Football Union claimed it was protecting Maori by refusing to select them as members of All Black rugby teams touring South Africa. By 1960 public discontent had grown to the extent that there was a major public protest campaign. The terms of that discontent had changed by 1970 when the All Blacks next toured South Africa and the South African Government had agreed that Maori could be part of the team, as long as there were not too many of them and they were not too dark. During the later 1960s the protest movement internationally had become more explicitly anti-apartheid: the political demand had become one of isolation of apartheid. During 1973, in response to the growing anti-apartheid movement the New Zealand government cancelled a proposed Springbok tour of Aotearoa/New Zealand citing public safety concerns. As a result, 'sporting freedom' became a key issue during the 1975 general election won by the conservative National Party under Robert Muldoon. The All Blacks toured South Africa in 1976, and an invitation was issued to tour Aotearoa/New Zealand in 1981. It was the single biggest political campaign in post-war Aotearoa/New Zealand, and the largest and most sustained anti-apartheid protests outside South Africa as twice a week, for the eight weeks of the tour, thousands of New Zealanders took part in nationwide anti-apartheid protests.

This essay will examine the question of the relationships between Maori, rugby and dominant masculine and colonial identities to explore the contradictory and difficult relations between Maori and the struggle against apartheid sport. It

presupposes post-coloniality, not as a state already achieved in Aotearoa/New Zealand, but as a political and cultural mind-set to be sought in a developing binationalism. Aotearoa/New Zealand should more properly be seen as a post-colonising society with colonial and post-colonial forms and tendencies coexisting (Fleras and Spoonley). In this essay, Aotearoa signifies the colonised elements of Aotearoa/New Zealand and New Zealand the colonising entity. The essay's four sections consider questions of Maori, colonialism, dominant masculine and national identities and apartheid, and the role of rugby in that dynamic.

COLONIALISM, MAORI AND RUGBY

Nicholas Thomas has called for particularist analyses that develop theoretical positions clearly relevant to the context of study. In an overview of post-colonial writing he suggests that

the field, however, seems less inclined to localise or historicise analysis, than to put Fanon and Lacan (or Derrida) into a blender and take the result to be equally appetising for premodern and modern; for Asian, African and American; for metropolitan, settler, indigenous and diasporic subjects. (Thomas ix)

This problem can be clearly seen in Aotearoa/New Zealand. It is a colony of settlement where the settlers significantly outnumber the Indigenous population, but specifically invoke Indigenous characteristics for cultural and state purposes. There is little in post-colonial analysis that is clearly applicable to this sort of setting where it is the descendents of the metropole who are diasporic, but the indigenous people(s) are significantly isolated from the land and other sites that inform their being. Sociological, historical, and much political discussion of colonial relations in Aotearoa/New Zealand is overwhelmingly primordialist in tenor. This means that the bases of ethnic relations are depicted as permanent and unchanging — as ahistorical.

Thomas argues that the vision of colonialism as a process of economic or political domination legitimised by ideologies of racism does not result in the clearest analysis. He argues for interpretations of colonialism as a cultural process that does not simply mask relations but actively expresses and constitutes them. The smoothness of the process of colonisation is confronted by two sets of influential factors: colonialism's internal contradictions and the intransigence and resistance of the colonised.

In Aotearoa/New Zealand, these factors conflate. The intransigence and resistance of the colonised accentuate and play out the contradictions of colonialism. Although this resistance has been most clearly understood in terms of war, Maori cultural resistance was also profound. Despite repeated claims to the contrary, imperial and colonial troops were overwhelmingly unsuccessful in their attempts to militarily subdue Maori (Belich 1986). As Belich has argued, it was the type of war rather than the battles themselves that defeated Maori. Maori

cultural resistance has also been strong (Walker 1989; Cox 1993). Despite this, the impact of colonisation is horrific. Maori were deprived of their land, fisheries and other *taonga*.³ Economic, social and cultural dispossession was, and in many areas remains, very high.

This was a predicament few twentieth-century Pakeha saw. They remained isolated from Maori communities and few had any direct contact with individual Maori until the great Maori urban migration of the late 1950s and 1960s. Few even now have significant cultural engagement with Maori. Yet New Zealand prides itself on its good 'race relations' and Maori imagery is widely invoked in depictions of the nation — from the corporate logo of Air New Zealand to the opening of the 1990 Commonwealth Games. Thomas points to the tendency in colonies of settlement to cherish Indigenous cultures where they are identified with the mythological, spirituality and caring for the land. They are held to be primordial, metaphysical and natural (Thomas 28–32). In Aotearoa/New Zealand there are strong parallels between many sympathetic representations of the 'native' in the present and the primitivist discourses of earlier times. Culturally dominant icons of national identity are firmly placed in the ongoing appropriation of 'Maoriness'.

Phillips exposes a countervailing movement in the national imaginary with his case that Pakeha masculinity is an underground tendency producing an unofficial identity. It is rough and beyond the pale of acceptability (Phillips 1996a). That this analysis is Pakeha-specific suggests that colonial relations are ideologically gendered. Sara Mills has argued that 'representations of women [were] central to the process of constructing a male national identity in the colonial period, but that paradoxically has been based on an excising of women's involvement in colonialism'. This process required that women in the colonial exercise remain 'signifiers, but not ... producers of signification' (Mills 58–59). The development of the notion of the colony as female and weaker was associated with the exclusion of women from the process of colonisation. Ironically, among those labelled female by New Zealand colonialist discourse are those very same Maori men who so often defeated the imperial and colonial armies in battle.

The tendency of colonialist discourses to depict (male) natives as violent, shifts focus from the Europeans' own violent colonial role and acts. This attributed violence of the male native is juxtaposed to the sexualisation of women. In the Pacific, the desirable forms of this sexualisation are restricted to Polynesian women (as dusky maidens) while some men (mainly Polynesian) were ennobled through classical allusion. The point is that colonialist discourses are not necessarily pejorative. Maori were admitted to an upper echelon of the hegemonic order that is New Zealand and of 'native peoples' as easily civilisable. According to Nicholas Thomas, Maori could only ever become, in the words of Homi Bhabha, 'almost the same, *but not quite* ... *Almost the same but not white* [because] to be Anglicised is *emphatically* not to be English' (qtd in Thomas 1994, 40). The liminal status

accorded to Maori by the discourse of the noble savage inadvertently produced a hybridity which threatened and subverted colonial hegemony. While Bhabha points to this sense of liminality, and eloquently argues 'the difference between being English and being Anglicised', his globalising conclusions of colonial discourses as mimicry are not easily applicable to colonial relations in Aotearoa/New Zealand (Bhabha 322). Bhabha's notion of mimicry, at least as it seems to be often applied, fails to make sense of 'native's point of view' (Geertz 1977) — in this case, the meaning of rugby union within particular Maori networks or communities. This criticism does not imply the legitimacy of a particularly Geertzian hermeneutic, but suggests the validity of Thomas' call for particularist post-colonial critiques. For Thomas, in the same way that colonial artefacts are appropriated or redefined, colonial discourses are also reformed and refashioned in the light of Indigenous formations such that 'they are projected back at Europeans with a variety of serious and parodic intentions, and enter into discourses of tribal, customary and national identities' (Thomas 64). There is little in analyses of New Zealand sport that points to this discursive reformulation and refashioning. McConnell, for instance, has recently noted that 'Maori have adapted to Pakeha sport with varying rates of involvement', and that colonial social practices have prevailed (230). McConnell is right to point to the significant role sport has played in the colonialist disciplining of the Maori body, and a more detailed examination of this refashioning and reformation than he is able to develop allows the exposure of the challenge posed to dominant masculine and national identities by Maori rugby (and other martial) success (MacLean 1999).

MAORI, RUGBY AND HEGEMONY

Commentaries on New Zealand rugby tend to operate outside any understanding of processes of cultural domination and thus validate patterns of social dominance. Spiro Zavos (1992), for instance, holds firmly to notions of a rugby community operating a doctrine of inclusion rather than assimilation, integration or bribery. He does not see the contradiction between this assertion and the evidence he marshals to build his case. The elision of evidential contradiction is a key tactic in the construction of hegemonic discourses. This tactic, where the force and potency of claims over-ride that contradiction allows the naturalisation of 'common sense'. For instance, Zavos endorses Michael King's claim that 'apart from warfare, the one national activity to which Maoris (*sic*) contributed in a measure resembling their full potential was rugby football' by pointing to the leadership roles Maori have held in rugby from the outset (King 1986, qtd in Zavos 1992, 78).

Zavos argues, after King, that rugby provided a place where a positive sense of 'Maoriness' existed in Maori communities, and where Pakeha could see Maori activity they understood and of which they approved. This is a reinvocation of Keith Sinclair's argument that rugby stimulated national pride and brought people

together. Zavos attacks Phillips as anti-rugby, claiming he sees the sport as the cause of brutalised Pakeha men. In making this assertion, Zavos asks why rugby did not do the same to Maori men (Zavos 1992, 78). This is an excellent case of masculinist and colonialist hegemonic discourse. He ignores the social context and the role rugby plays in that framework. He does not ask about the implications of King's comment that Maori only held high public profile in rugby and war, or in what sphere of public life Maori were not high profile. In asking what characteristics of these spheres facilitate Maori elevation and success, attention returns to colonialist discourses on the noble savage and the warrior.

King points to the problem that Zavos ignores. In understanding and approving of Maori rugby Pakeha are sustained by the view that Maori, by their supposedly savage nature, were expected to fight. Neither war nor rugby requires intellectual work or significant social competence, but brawn and physical ability. In nineteenth-century social and racial thought, significant elements of which continue in the present, Maori were childlike, in need of guidance and direction, and incapable of full social membership or citizenship. These myths of empire are at the core of Pakeha understandings of Maori and their place in the world.⁴ They are the basis of Pakeha perceptions of their/our cultural dominance and superiority. Any rereading of the image of Maori that questions these myths threatens that perception, and as a result threatens the perceived and actual dominance it sustains. Rugby success could be admitted comfortably and Maori men granted card carrying membership of the dominant masculinities but for one cultural characteristic: as the defeated people, as the colonised, they are feminised by colonial discourses.

Rugby's intimate association with masculine identities is clear in the specific creation of a national identity equated with the legitimate form of dominant masculinity where the cultural traits of rugby are the core. Obversely, these cultural factors also sustain the illegitimate and subversive elements of the 'hard man's' masculinity. This association has been stressed and vaunted since the earliest discussion of rugby in Aotearoa/New Zealand. In June 1890 *Zealandia* welcomed the development of rugby union stating that New Zealand was no longer 'a nation of milksops, effeminate fops, [and] luxurious dandies' (qtd in Sinclair 143). We can see support for, or involvement in, rugby as a sort of utopian engagement where pleasure is derived from watching through fetishistic scopophilic lens. This allows the process of watching to become the invention of the nation and the fraternal community (Mulvey; Williams 93–119).

There are hints of this psychoanalytic approach in J.O.C. Phillips explanation of rugby as a masculinised cultural icon in Aotearoa/New Zealand (Phillips 1996a; 1996b). Phillips is concerned to explain the nature and basis of Pakeha masculinity, and specifically makes it clear that Maori are not part of his analysis. He sees Pakeha identity as being formed from two sources: a desire to protect muscular power from urban decadence, and a desire to discipline masculine spirit within

respectable bounds. He points directly to the Victorian ideal where rugby in New Zealand was designed to produce the gentleman who was also manly.

Whereas Phillips' view of rugby sees it initially as disciplining and restricting, its conflation with a series of other myths — such as the defeat of the Maori and the spirit of the pioneers — makes rugby into a powerful component of the dominant ideology. He suggests that after 1971 rugby began to lose its hold on the New Zealand male as declining All Black success weakened the sense of national pride that accompanied their tours, and as other sources of leisure became available. Most significantly, though, the place of rugby in male identity became less important as the 'bloke' came increasingly under siege by revisions of the national imaginary (Phillips 1996a).

Rugby itself inflicted considerable damage and undermined its hold on a national psyche and identity during this period through a persistent engagement with South Africa. The period between 1976 and 1981 was vital to this cultural shift. After protest, the 1976 tour went ahead coinciding with the popular anti-apartheid rising in Soweto. During 1981 the New Zealand was wracked by protest against the Springbok presence. The belligerence of the New Zealand Rugby Football Union, Prime Minister Robert Muldoon and other sectors of the New Zealand elite in advocating, organising and defending contact with the apartheid regime was too much for many New Zealanders, and rugby rapidly lost its sheen.

THE APARTHEID CONNECTION⁵

The question of ongoing sporting contact with South Africa stimulated the biggest mass political movement of the 1970s and 1980s in Aotearoa/New Zealand. The only issue to provoke a sense of social division and emotional response at a similar level was the campaign for homosexual law reform in 1984 and 1985. This in itself is highly significant suggesting a widespread defence of perceived forms of legitimate masculinity. Widespread discontent over a range of issues from increasing state power to Muldoon's political style coalesced into action against the Springbok tour. Despite these influencing factors the protests were against sporting contact with South Africa (King and Phillips 11–12). Opposition to apartheid in sport had a long gestation in Aotearoa/New Zealand but only began as a specific social movement after 1959.

The 1960 All Black tour of South Africa was a turning point. In this instance it was the exclusion of Maori from the touring party that prompted significant controversy. The campaign, based around the impact that apartheid was seen to have on New Zealand's race relations, was significant because of the seriousness with which New Zealand rugby was viewed and the high degree of Maori support for rugby. This controversy was bound in a clash of loyalties towards two crucial elements of New Zealand identity: rugby and Maori. In assessing the 1960 tour campaign, which was organised around the slogan 'No Maoris (*sic*) No Tour', Thompson is critical of the leadership for failing to seek international support.

This meant that the issue was treated as a purely domestic concern harming race relations in New Zealand. Under these circumstances it was not possible to connect with the emerging international anti-apartheid movement because the issue was not South Africa as such, but the preservation of New Zealand's alleged high quality race relations.

Although the New Zealand and South African governments thought they were making progress, the situation had changed by 1970 with anti-tour groupings becoming anti-apartheid and developing strong links to the international movement. This produced a fundamental shift in the attitude of New Zealand's anti-tour campaign and in the nature of the debate about sporting contact with South Africa. The focus of debate had shifted from whether Maori players would be allowed to tour to a concern that sporting contact with South Africa was seen to give succour to the apartheid regime and make New Zealand complicit in the oppression of the Black majority (Lapchick 1975; Chapple 1984, 8–14).

Maori student leader Syd Jackson succinctly expressed this political change at a public meeting in the Auckland Town Hall to oppose the 1970 tour. Jackson argued that 'no Maori should go to South Africa for how can we, when seeking equality, go to a country which actively denies another coloured people the rights we either enjoy, want extended or we are striving to achieve for ourselves' (Chapple 1984, 9). This argument presaged debates to emerge during the 1970s. The key to understanding this period, and the passions exposed by the campaign against apartheid, is the potency of both identity and affinity politics. These political forms were played out by both Maori, as in Jackson's speech, and many Pakeha in their defence of apartheid and identification with white South Africa. Challenges were issued that questioned the naturalised discourses of the New Zealand nation and masculinity as connections were built between campaigns around domestic issues and then extended to those focusing on international concerns. Not only was sporting contact with apartheid a concern but also the cultural formation that prioritised rugby mores came under increasing scrutiny.

Throughout the 1970s the New Zealand anti-apartheid movement considered a wide range of other contact with South Africa both sporting and non-sporting, but the cultural centrality of rugby to elites in both countries made it the key site of struggle (Nauright and Black 1995: 1998; Grundlingh). Increasing criticism of New Zealand's race relations combined with growing international anti-colonial sentiment to make any form of contact with apartheid the focus of significant attention. South Africa had been isolated by many sports bodies although the culturally vital rugby was the last to go and remained in isolation for no more than five years (1986–91). South Africa's sporting policies were increasingly seen as fundamentally tainted by apartheid and the mantra that normal sport is impossible in an abnormal society was widely adopted. As the cultural, social and sporting isolation (that is, all but economic and military contacts) of South Africa became more comprehensive during the 1970s, those who stayed within

the South African laager were seen to both benefit from and provide support to apartheid. Accordingly, both the New Zealand Government and rugby administrators were seen as complicit in New Zealand's shame through maintaining contact.

MAORI, RUGBY AND APARTHEID

The background to, and history of, the anti-apartheid movement in Aotearoa/New Zealand until the middle of the 1970s is well known. The commonsensical ideology that sport and politics are separate had, and retains, wide support, and the cultural significance of rugby made these tours a crucial event for many in Aotearoa/New Zealand. New Zealand's self-satisfied complacency that it was still the world's social laboratory; that it had the best race relations in the world; and that women had little about which to complain had been questioned, but little else had happened to shake these beliefs. Throughout the later 1970s the questioning grew louder and in some specific areas — particularly regarding elements of colonial and patriarchal relations — actions defied those certainties. The anti-apartheid movement still had only a small core of activists but there was an increasingly sympathetic constituency for its message. The factors preventing action against the 1956 tour — the dominance of rugby in the national self-image, latent racism that made apartheid tolerable, and lack of appreciation for anti-colonial and Black nationalist feeling — had weakened (Pearson 1979). Rugby remained a crucial, if weakened, element in the predominant national identity, but increasingly public discussion of racism in New Zealand and several years of high profile activity around anti-colonial issues had severely undermined the hold the other two factors had over political opinion.

These circumstances and the growing international isolation of South Africa made apartheid a key issue. Other concerns arose during the 1970s. Rising unemployment and increasingly restrictive immigration controls had led to concerns about Pacific Island 'overstayers' resulting in deportations, dawn raids on Pacific Island households by Police and immigration officials, and Pacific Islanders being questioned in the street (Ross; Fleras and Spoonley 197–201). Yet in 1978, Immigration Minister Frank Gill defended policies that allowed migration by Rhodesian and South African whites on the ground that they were 'our kith and kin' (MacDonald). Gill's comments reinforced the impression many people had that state policies were becoming increasingly racist.

By the end of the 1970s, the campaign against contact with apartheid therefore combined a number of elements facilitating broad support. It retained a strong focus on an international issue while prioritising the issue of race (at home and abroad) and also targeting rugby union as central to the campaign. In combining these dynamic elements, the anti-apartheid movement could draw support from those focusing on international concerns, women critical of patriarchal and patriarchical cultural mores, and Maori seeking to focus on issues of domestic

racism, as well as build support for larger black struggles. In addition, the increasingly comprehensive international isolation of the apartheid regime and the strengthening boycott movement multiplied the number of sports people opposing contact, albeit often from self-interest. Others were concerned that New Zealand was increasingly out of step with world opinion and risked becoming a pariah, especially in a world where market diversity was crucial for an exporting nation. Finally, the tour was to be held in an election year: an election it was widely expected National Party would lose (Shears and Gidley 1981; Newnham 1981).

The questions of apartheid rugby, dominant masculine and national identities and the clamour of socio-political and cultural change converged around 1981 but dissolved rapidly soon after. An analysis of these events and the question of Maori rugby can inform and develop a post-colonial understanding of Aotearoa/New Zealand. T.P. McLean places his understanding of the role of Maori rugby firmly in the hegemonic discourses centred on the myth of the best race relations in the world. In discussing the 1888-89 New Zealand Natives tour of Britain he argues

That, surely, was one of the romantic developments of all sport — the mingling, within so short a space, of natives and newcomers in an expedition which, while not truly representative, identified New Zealand Rugby to the world long before any other nation's game had become known outside its own shores. How different might have been the history of South Africa, one cannot help thinking, if the peoples native to that country had been permitted and encouraged, as were Maoris (*sic*), to join the sport brought in by the foreign settlers. (McLean 11)

His argument is a common case in rugby writing. He sees rugby as a tool not for making one people, but 'two peoples mutually growing and mingling and concentrating their efforts into the good of one community — of which a not-insubstantial part was to turn out to be Rugby' (McLean 11). Zavos has made the same case in a discussion of the form and nature of the anti-apartheid movement. He argues that rugby has traditionally been more inclusive. In doing so, he quite properly points to the exclusion of Maori from hierarchies of the state, from leadership positions in the church (failing to note that the Anglicans have had a Maori Bishop of Aotearoa for many years) and argues that the major anti-apartheid organisations 'never had Maori in leadership positions' (Zavos 1986, 192-93). In making this argument, Zavos assumes that HART and CARE⁶ equalled the anti-apartheid movement. This was not the case. These organisations certainly provided the structural core, but every other major protest action since the 1960 All Black tour saw the development of broad oppositional coalitions where Maori played key leadership roles.

The dominant ideological theme running through these discussions of the Maori-rugby nexus is one which is shaped by and shapes colonialist discourses. These discourses seldom include any discussion of questions of masculinity, or

even any hints that these issues may be a concern in developing analyses of the contours of colonialism in Aotearoa/New Zealand. In maintaining these silences, popular rugby writing grants legitimacy to the all-one-people view of New Zealand. Zavos stresses rugby's inclusiveness while McLean highlights the 'natural gifts of strength, courage and audacity' which have seen Maori readily and successfully 'assimilated into and [become] proficient at rugby' (McLean 13). In these ways the potential challenge to dominant masculinities of Maori rugby proficiency is circumvented. This silence also allows Maori men to claim a place, or at least indicates that a place may be available, in that dominant masculine formation. It thus accounts for significant elements of their silence and ambivalence over rugby contact with South Africa.

Pakeha analysts have tended to see the 1981 tour in ways that do not give significance to this complex colonial relationship, if they even recognise Maori support for the tour as in part a product of the complex patterns of colonialist making of meaning. Maori are assumed to have supported the 1981 tour on the same basis as the rest of the population, such that ethnicity is not a factor in the reasons for tour support or otherwise. Ethnicity does not appear to have been a factor in opinion surveys. The position of Maori is only a minor part of Geoff Fougere's highly influential early analysis of the tour campaign, and is based in economic rather than colonial relations (Fougere). For Fougere, understanding the 1981 tour rests on questions of national and gendered identities where social changes mean that rugby is no longer seen as a valid basis for national identity.

The 1981 tour is a metaphor of the Muldoon era with its complex but essentially paternalistic ethnic politics. Fougere's argument that opinion on the tour did not conform to the 'usual map of New Zealand opinion' does not allow a deep reading of the issues or the debates. (Fougere 12). It is limited because it fails to engage with New Zealand's colonial existence — a key factor underpinning the 'usual map'. The proposition that ethnicity and colonial relations were not an issue in tour support does not mean that there is not an issue to consider. The very fact of the potency of All Black-Springbok rugby makes colonial heritage and colonial relations a vital part of the nostalgic basis of tour support.

NOTES

- 1 Tribes, although *iwi* may also be used for bone, strength, people or nation.
- 2 Pakeha are New Zealanders of European descent. The term is highly contested.
- 3 *Taonga* is best translated as 'treasures', and carries with it a sense of more than material assets. Language, for instance, is held to be a *taonga*. Less obviously, the practice of the use of *taiaha* — sparring with spear-like wooden shafts — was recently described as a *taonga* (McConnell 231).
- 4 This view is becoming widely accepted, and has been forcefully advanced in Belich, 1986: 291–335; 1996: 213–17, 229–46.

- 5 There is no good single history of anti-apartheid struggles in Aotearoa/tNew Zealand. This synopsis is drawn from Thompson 1964, Thompson 1975, Templeton 1998, and Richards 1999. Other references are included where necessary.
- 6 HART — originally the Halt All Racist Tours — movement combined with the National Anti-Apartheid Council in 1980 to become HART: the New Zealand Anti Apartheid Movement. It was a single issue campaign group opposing any form of contact with South Africa. CARE — the Citizens Association for Racial Equality — was formed in the early 1960s. It had a broad mandate, campaigning on a wide range of anti-racist issues. HART and CARE were the institutional core of anti-apartheid campaigns in Aotearoa/New Zealand, but were not in any sense *the* movement.

WORKS CITED

- Belich, James 1986, *The New Zealand Wars and the Victorian Interpretation of Racial Conflict*, Auckland UP, Auckland.
- 1996, *Making Peoples: A History of the New Zealanders from Polynesian Settlement to the End of the Nineteenth Century*, Allen Lane, Auckland.
- Bhabha, Homi 1987, 'Of Mimicry and Man: The Ambivalence of Colonial Discourse', *October: the First Decade*, ed. Annette Michelson, Rosalind Krauss, Douglas Crimp and Jan Copjec, MIT Press, Cambridge MA, pp. 317–25.
- Chapple, Geoff 1984, *1981: The Tour*, A.W. & A.H. Reed, Auckland.
- Cox, Lindsay 1993, *Kotahitanga: the Search for Maori Political Unity*, OUP, Oxford.
- Fleras, Augie and Paul Spoonley 1999, *Recalling Aotearoa: Indigenous Politics and Ethnic Relations in New Zealand*, OUP, Oxford.
- Fougere, Geoff 1981, 'Shattered Mirror', *Comment*, November, pp. 12–14.
- Geertz, Clifford 1977, "'From the Native's Point of View": On the Nature of Anthropological Understanding', *Symbolic Anthropology: A Reader in the Study of Symbols and Meanings*, ed. Janet L. Dolgin, David S. Kemnitzer and David M. Schneider, Columbia UP, New York, pp. 480–92.
- Grundlingh, Albert 1996, 'Playing for Power: Rugby, Afrikaner Nationalism and Masculinity in South Africa', *Making Men: Rugby and Masculine Identity*, ed. John Nauright and Timothy Chandler, Frank Cass, London, pp. 181–204.
- King, Michael 1986, *Maori: A Photographic and Social History*, rev. ed. Reed, Auckland.
- King, Peter, and Jock Phillips 1982, 'A Social Analysis of the Springbok Tour Protesters', *Counting the Cost: The 1981 Springbok Tour in Wellington*, ed. David Mackay, Malcolm MacKinnon, Peter McPhee and Jock Phillips, Victoria University of Wellington, History Department Occasional Paper No. 1, Wellington, pp. 3–14.
- Lapchick, Richard Edward 1975, *The Politics of Race and International Sport: The Case of South Africa*, (Centre on International Race Relations,

- University of Denver, Studies in Human Rights No 1) Greenwood Press, London.
- Macdonald, Barrie 1986, 'The Lesa Case, and the Citizenship (Western Samoa) Act 1982', *New Zealand and International Migration: A Digest and Bibliography*, no.1, ed. A.D. Trlin and P. Spoonley, Department of Sociology, Massey University, Palmerston North, pp. 73–80.
- McConnell, Robin 2000, 'Maori, the Treaty of Waitangi and Sport: A Critical Analysis', *Sport in New Zealand Society*, ed. Chris Collins, Dunmore Press, Palmerston North, pp. 227–40.
- McLean, T.P. 1982, 'Maori Rugby Emerging as a Force', *Tu Tangata*, 9, Dec, pp. 11–13.
- Mills, Sara 1991, *Discourses of Difference: An Analysis of Women's Travel Writing and Colonisation* Routledge, London.
- Mulvey, Laura 1992, 'Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema', *The Sexual Subject: A Screen Reader in Sexuality*, ed. Screen, Routledge, London, pp. 22–34.
- Nauright, John and David Black 1995, 'New Zealand and International Sport: The Case of All Black-Springbok Rugby, Sanctions and Protest Against Apartheid 1959-1992', *Sport, Power and Society in New Zealand: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives* (ASSH Studies in Sports History No 11), ed. John Nauright, Australian Society for Sports History, Sydney, pp. 67–93.
- 1998, *Rugby and the South African Nation*, Manchester UP, Manchester.
- Newnham, Tom 1981, *By Batons and Barbed Wire: A Response to the 1981 Springbok Tour of New Zealand*, Real Pictures, Auckland.
- New Zealand Herald* 1980a, 'Bok Tour Backed by Maoris [*sic*]', 7 July, p. 1.
- 1980b, 'SA Tour Vote 'Not Valid'', 8 July, p. 3.
- 1980c, 'Maori Leader Against Tour', 15 Sep. p. 1.
- 1981, 'No To Boks', 19 Jan. p. 1.
- Pearson, M. N. 1979, 'Heads in the Sand: the 1956 Springbok Tour to New Zealand in Perspective', *Sport in History: The Making of Modern Sporting History*, ed. Richard Cashman and Michael McKernan, U of Queensland P, St Lucia, pp. 272–92.
- Phillips, J.O.C. 1996a, *A Man's Country? The Image of the Pakeha Male — A History*, 2nd ed. Penguin, Auckland.
- 1996b, 'The Hard Man: Rugby and the Formation of Male Identity in New Zealand', *Making Men: Rugby and Masculine Identity*, ed. John Nauright and Timothy Chandler, Frank Cass, London, pp. 70–90.
- Richards, Trevor 1999, *Dancing on Our Bones: New Zealand, South Africa, Rugby and Racism*, Bridget Williams Books, Wellington.
- Romanos, Michael 1985, 'Nepia was the Supreme NZ Whizz-Kid: Rugby Great Reveals His True Age', *Tu Tangata*, 27, Dec, p. 39.

- Ross, Tamara 1994, 'New Zealand Overstaying Islander: A Construction of the Ideology of Race and Immigration', Unpublished MA Thesis, Victoria University of Wellington, Wellington.
- Shears, Richard and Isobel Gidley 1981, *Storm Out of Africa: The 1981 Springbok Tour of New Zealand*, Macmillan Auckland.
- Sinclair, Keith 1986, *A Destiny Apart: New Zealand's Search for National Identity*, Allen and Unwin/Port Nicholson Press, Wellington.
- Templeton, Malcolm 1998, *Human Rights and Sporting Contact: New Zealand Attitudes to Race Relations in South Africa, 1921–1994*, Auckland UP, Auckland.
- Thomas, Nicholas 1994, *Colonialism's Culture: Anthropology, Travel and Government*, Polity Press, Cambridge.
- Thompson, Richard 1964, *Race and Sport*, Oxford UP, Oxford.
- 1975, *Retreat From Apartheid: New Zealand's Sporting Contacts with South Africa*, Oxford UP, Oxford.
- Walker, Ranginui 1989, *Ka Whawhai Tonu Matou Struggle Without End*, Penguin, Auckland.
- Williams, Linda 1989, *Hard Core: Power, Pleasure and the 'Frenzy of the Visible'*, U of California P, Berkeley.
- Zavos, Spiro 1992, 'Kea Kaha', *Metro*, Jan. pp. 74–80.
- 1996, *Winters of Revenge: The Bitter Rivalry Between the All Blacks and the Springboks*, Viking, Auckland.