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ABSTRACT

National identity is linked to food. Exemplifying that, many people associate Turkey with pide, Italy with focaccia and, of course, France with the baguette. But what about Aotearoa New Zealand, what bread signifies a New Zealand/Kiwi identity? This paper explores a contender for that role, a bread commonly associated with Māori, Aotearoa New Zealand’s tangata whenua: parāoa rēwena. This research asked eight expert chef/bakers about their views and experiences of parāoa rēwena. Four of the participants self-identified as Māori, and four as Pākehā. Working within a qualitative paradigm and using thematic analysis, this research revealed bifurcated views about parāoa rēwena that clearly differentiated the opinions and experiences of our participants. Within these differences, our findings revealed that the self-identifying Pākehā participants tended to hold imperial views reflecting colonial dominance, whereas the self-identifying Māori participants expressed a more holistic approach to and mindset about parāoa rēwena. Consequently, this paper proposes that parāoa rēwena becoming the national bread of Aotearoa New Zealand is more likely to occur as an initiative promoted by Māori and not Pākehā. In this way, within an exploration of parāoa rēwena, this paper reflects the politics of palatability in Aotearoa New Zealand as a metaphor of the relationship between Māori and Pākehā.
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INTRODUCTION

As a dietary staple, bread can symbolise national identity. However, that association, in nations like France, did not happen by chance. There, the link between food and national identity can be traced back to the reign of Louis XIV (1643–1715). The Sun King and his minister, Jean-Baptiste Colbert (1619–1683),
made concerted efforts to link food and fashion to French national identity (de Jean 2005). Those efforts resonate today within the nation’s food and fashion industries because France is still perceived to be the home of style and sophistication (de Jean 2005). Aiding the Sun King’s culinary aspirations were the chef-authors of his day. They included La Varenne and François Vatel (Neill, Berno, and Williamson 2015). These authors formalised France’s cuisine ancienne, albeit by ‘borrowing’ much of it from others, particularly the Italians (Christensen-Yule and Neill 2017). Notwithstanding that, the style and supposed sophistication of French food dominates the western culinary psyche. Reflecting that today, French bakers, supported by President Macron, seek the French baguette’s inclusion within UNESCO’s Intangible Cultural Heritage list (Brehaut 2018). However, France is not the only nation maximising food, particularly bread, to confer national identity: Italy takes pride in focaccia; Turkey has pide, and Germany has pumpernickel bread (Christensen-Yule and Neill 2017). Consequently, as these examples show, breads not only reflect notions of actancy (Woodward 2007) within the values and emotions imbued to each bread, but also considerations of Billig’s (1995) banal nationalism, because the ‘virtues’ these breads embody, as links to national identity, are often unquestioned and taken for granted. As two academics engaged in culinary practice and theory delivery, within a tertiary education provider, our interest in researching this topic reflects our wider research within the nexus of food, identity, and national identity.

New Zealanders are big bread eaters. Statistics reveal that, within a population of approximately 5 million people, New Zealanders purchase approximately 125 million loaves of bread per year and 45 million packs of bread rolls/.wraps/muffins from supermarkets alone (Hamish Conway, sales manager, Goodman Fielder New Zealand, October 5, 2021, pers. comm.).

Many of the bread types mentioned above reflect themes of identity and geography, affirming consumer values and thoughts about identity. Reflecting this, in Aotearoa New Zealand, ‘Vogel’s [bread is] an undisputed Kiwi icon […] and the] Tip Top Bakery has been nourishing Kiwi families with our fresh bread since 1951’ (Lee 2018, paras. 2–3). Another example reflecting geography/terroir (the combination of soil, climate, plant materials constituting the taste of food or wine), is ‘MacKenzie High Country bread [which] is baked in the spirit and traditions of High-Country New Zealand’ (Lee 2018, para. 4). Interestingly, while Kiwi bread brands maximise localized themes in branding, their companies are owned by offshore interests (Lee 2018).
By reflecting the local, yet considering the global, this paper explores the comparative lack of *parāoa rēwena* or, *rēwena* bread (Māori bread) within Aotearoa New Zealand’s culinary landscape. To do that, this paper considers the experience and knowledge of the eight bread bakery experts (four self-identifying Māori and four self-identifying Pākehā), and their considerations particularly on how a lack of experience and education in bread making has resulted in *rēwena*’s comparative absence from the marketplace. While this paper acknowledges the commercial marketplace lack of *parāoa rēwena*, we also observe that this absence is finding remedies, particularly the manner in which *rēwena* bread is beginning to take pride of place within commercial hospitality. Exemplifying that, Wellington’s fine-dining Māori restaurant Hiakai serves *parāoa rēwena*, as does the *Huhu Cafe* in Waitomo, and *Karaka Café* in Wellington.

While this research uses the monolithic constructs of Māori and Pākehā, we note that this derives from the need to identify the parties signing the Treaty of Waitangi (Neill 2018). As King (2003, 168) explained, ‘the Māori text of the Treaty of Waitangi used the expression ‘tangata Māori’– ordinary people – to denote them’. Additionally, as Orsman (1997, 567) noted, Pākehā ‘was a generic term for all whites’. Later, Mikaere (2004, 38) observed that ‘Pākehā are the products of an invading culture’. Cognisant of that, our position supports Macpherson’s (2015, 377) observation that ‘in fact, national survey data suggest that as much variety exists within these populations as it does between them, and that a long history of ethnic intermarriage means that many New Zealanders live multiple identities that they invoke and employ in different circumstances’. Consequently, this position embraces Matahaere-Atariki’s (2017, 1) observation that in understanding identity ‘is always an interpretation of an interpretation, it is neither fixed nor immutable’.

This paper is structured in the following way. First, our paper provides a brief history of Aotearoa New Zealand emphasising the impact of colonisation upon Māori. Then, this paper presents considerations of the Māori diet and *kai* (food) pre-colonisation. Next, the research introduces *parāoa rēwena*, or *rēwena* bread (Māori bread), its ‘bug’, and the impact of settler-introduced ingredients upon Māori bread making. Penultimately, our paper presents the research methodology and the findings distilled from the eight baker/chef experts. Concluding this research is the discussion and conclusion.

**AOTEAROA NEW ZEALAND AND COLONISATION**

Māori were Aotearoa New Zealand’s first human inhabitants (King 2003). DNA evidence traces Māori settlement back at least 800 years (Durie 2003). It was not
until the 1840s, when The New Zealand Company brought the first registered migrants to Aotearoa New Zealand, that settler-colonist numbers increased (Phillips 2015). Then, Aotearoa New Zealand was promoted to potential settlers as a ‘rural idyll [ideally suited to] the bourgeois Victorian family [and as] a labourer’s paradise’ (Bell 1997, 146). Part of that paradise’s lure was the opportunity to own land (McAloon 2008). That, and being ‘somewhere new’, combined to produce a mythologised, classless, egalitarian society (Bell 1997). While offering new beginnings for settler-colonists, their arrival was to the detriment of Māori.

Soon, worldview differences between settler-colonists and *tangata whenua* emerged. Reflecting that, Pihama *et al.* (2014, 249), noted that European settlers ‘interrupted and disrupted the intergenerational transmission of *tikanga* (protocols), *reo* (language) and *mātauranga Māori* (Māori knowledge).’ Additionally, settler perceptions of land ownership, particularly the notion of private ownership, marginalised Māori (McAloon 2008), and consequently, ‘by 1865, the Crown had acquired [from Māori] the South Island, Stewart Island, and much of the North Island either by purchase, confiscation or it had been claimed as ‘wasteland’ (Te Puni Kōkiri 2007, 6). As Armstrong (2016, 7) noted,

> During the late 19th and early 20th centuries, the policies of the New Zealand government in relation to Māori were based on the premise that it would be ‘better’ for Māori if they could learn the ways of the European.

Since colonisation, Māori have endured a process of acculturation. Fueling that was the 1867 Native Schools Act. It provided for ‘more than 160 Native or Māori schools in the country’ which operated between 1867 and 1969 (The University of Auckland 2017, para. 1). There, all lessons were in English and Māori expression in any form was actively discouraged. That reinforced Pākehā dominance. Additionally, diseases introduced by settler-colonists decimated Māori. Armstrong (2016) claimed that, at that time, Māori chiefs believed that intermarriage with Pākehā might assuage disease, and thus encouraged its practice, further contributing to Māori acculturation. While colonisation brought direct benefit to Pākehā, for Māori it brought alienation from their culture, land, and worldview (Durie 2003). While some of those issues are being addressed by claims to the Waitangi Tribunal (King 2003; McAloon 2008; Waitangi Tribunal 1997), Māori are still disproportionally marginalised in contemporary Kiwi socioculture. That marginalisation reflects history. For example, during the 1930s depression, ‘Māori were denied the dole on a belief that they could look after themselves better than Pākehā by living off the land’ (O’Regan and Mahuika
Similarly, there was the widespread perception that Māori could take care of themselves by ‘go[ing] home to the pa’ (King 2003, 343).

While notions of equity through biculturalism as noted in the Treaty of Waitangi (signed in 1840) have not been fulfilled, contemporary Māori have shown outstanding cultural resilience in the face of their iniquitous marginalization. Within that awareness, this paper proposes that the status of rēwena bread reflects the historic and ongoing subordination of Māori culture and reflects Grey and Newman’s (2018, 719) suggestion that ‘culinary colonialism as the extension of Settler jurisdiction over, and exploitation of, Indigenous gastronomy’ provides valuable insight into the place of rēwena bread in Aotearoa New Zealand’s contemporary culinary landscape.

UNDERSTANDING MĀORI KAI

As a verb, kai denotes eating and drinking; as a noun, it denotes a meal or food (Moorfield n.d.). Leach (2010) proposed that kai particularly referenced starch-based foods. Consequently, kai has come to be ‘considered the essential foundation without which a meal was not a proper meal’ (Leach 2010, 16). Pre-colonisation, Māori enjoyed a diverse diet that included ‘whitebait, the seaweed karengo, huhu grubs, pikopiko (fern shoots), karaka berries, and toroi – a dish of fresh mussels with pūhā (sow thistle) juice’ (Royal and Kaka-Scott 2013, para. 7), native pigeon, and sometimes dog meat. Colonisation introduced new foods: ‘wheat, potatoes, maize, carrots, cabbage, and other vegetables […] sheep, pigs, goats, and poultry’ to the Māori diet (Royal and Kaka-Scott, 2013, para. 8). While Māori held a more than adequate diet pre-colonisation, Durie (2003), Morris (2010), and Neill, Berno, and Williamson (2015) proposed that the exposure of Māori to new foodstuffs not only changed their diet but also contributed to their loss of identity and their subordination to Pākehā. In that way, Māori food generally, and rēwena bread specifically, can be ‘read’ as a metaphor reflecting contemporary and historic representations of Māori and Pākehā. Morris (2010) expanded this notion. She proposed that Māori food’s lack of palatability for Pākehā reflected the ‘spoilt identity’ of Māori (for Pākehā) because of their activism. Knight (2017, para. 17), writing in The New Zealand Herald, and noting Morris’s (2010) work, suggested that ‘Māori restaurants failed because Pākehā diners were racist.’ Notwithstanding these observations, Knight (2017) also described the food enthusiasm of Jarrad and Belinda McKay. Their business, ‘Puha and Pākehā,’ offered a NZ$230 per-head Māori fine-dining experience at Auckland’s prestigious SkyCity. As part of the dinner, parāoa rēwena was served with tītī (muttonbird) butter.
INTRODUCING PARĀOA RĒWENA

Today, rēwena bread references its root word ‘riwai;’ (potato). Pre-cooked potatoes not only form part of the bread’s dough, but constitute its starting point or starter, in the form of a yeast and lactobacillus ‘bug.’ Notwithstanding that, Māori made an unleavened bread long before the introduction of a yeast-based bug. That bread was called pungapunga or pua (Prendergast et al. 2000). Pungapunga was made by using the protein-rich pollen from raupō flower spikes (the bulrush plant, Typha orientalis: Lim 2014). Gathered before dawn or after dusk, the raupō was placed on mats to dry. Then, the pollen was stripped of its down, sifted and mixed with water to form a ‘firm-ish’ yet still liquid batter. Then, the mix was poured into small leaf-lined plaited baskets and steamed in a hāngi (an underground oven). The finished bread was yellowly brown with a granular texture, biscuit aroma, and a slight but sweet ginger flavour. Making pungapunga was labour intensive and embodied deep meaning for Māori. Often, its production occurred under the watchful eye of a tohunga (artistic expert/spiritual leader). Mana (status) was gained for its maker because of the time it took to make (Burton 1982). Consequently, as Burton (1982, 5) related, pungapunga was ‘reserved either as gifts, or for [consumption in] times of war.’ In pre-colonial time, Māori used starch from kumara, the rhizomes of wild bracken-fern (Pteridium esculentum), and fern roots (Fuller 1978; Leach 2010). While pungapunga has been referred to as the original Māori bread (Burton 1982; Leach 2010; Veart 2008), it holds little resemblance to the breads that Māori began to make with settler-introduced ingredients, particularly wheat-flour and sugar (Gobbetti and Gänzle 2012).

While pungapunga was unleavened, pre-colonial Māori were familiar with fermentation. Māori fermented foods included seafood, berries (hinau, tawa, and karaka), and corn (Morris 2010; Whyte et al. 2001). However, the traditional Māori diet did not include sugar. As Leach (2010, 26) recounted, ‘There were very few sweet foods to be found in Aotearoa’ and, consequently, pre-colonisation, Māori sourced sugar from the semi-poisonous tutu berry (Coriaria spp.), and ‘the nectar from flax flowers, … fuchsia, bush lawyer or various Coprosma berries.’ However, with colonisation (circa 1840s), it was not long before Māori began to use the products that the newly arrived colonists brought to Aotearoa New Zealand. Soon, Māori began to grow wheat and to adapt the methods of production and ingredients that the settler-colonists used to make bread. For many early Christian colonists, the uptake of leavened bread by Māori was perceived as a metaphor of their embrace of Christianity (Albala and Eden 2011). That connotation reflected the settler’s symbolic connection between leavened bread and Holy Communion.
Parāoa rēwena’s bug

For many Māori, it is the rēwena bug (the living fermenting dough starter) that is the most highly prized aspect of parāoa rēwena. Its treasure is bound within considerations of whakapapa (genealogy). Within that whakapapa denotes the sharing of the bug between whānau (family) and their wider social networks. Symbolically, the bug highlights the transfer of mātauranga (traditional knowledge), and tikanga (Māori values and customs), mana (status) within the cycle of human life, nurture, and care shown through sharing (manaakitanga). However, within that potent blend, the bug offers a challenge. In receiving a bug, its new owner becomes aware of the tradition of keeping the bug alive. That obligation reinforces constructs of tikanga and mātauranga. In those ways, gifting a bug signifies a rite of passage because its giver recognises the recipient’s skill and knowledge in maintaining the bug and passing it onto others (Hereaka 2015; Māori Television 2017).

A parāoa rēwena bug is made from riwi (potatoes with or without their skins). The potatoes are boiled in water, then mashed in their cooking liquid. Their skins are removed at this point. Often, sugar and flour are added to the potato mix. Then, the mixture is left at room temperature to naturally ferment. That fermentation relies on naturally occurring airborne yeasts and lactobacilli. Then, more flour, water, and salt are added. The mixture is then kneaded into a soft dough. After kneading, the dough is rested in a warm place. There, the yeasts, and lactobacilli ferment causing the dough to rise. At this point, many Māori take a small amount (either from the fermented bug or from the dough’s bulk amount) of the dough to create their next bug. This new bug is then fed with small amounts of unsalted potato water and flour (some add sugar) on alternate days (Māori Television 2017). As Whiti Hereaka (2015, 212) highlighted in her 2013 play, Rēwena, the bug is considered sacred: ‘It needs to be fed, it needs to multiply, [it is a precious] taonga [a treasure], so you need to treat it with respect, with aroha [love].’ Then, the risen loaf is baked until cooked. Baking soda can be used to make rēwena. Its inclusion reflects the influence of early settlers’ preparation of damper-style breads that contained baking soda. However, the use of baking soda is contested. In Rēwena (Hereaka 2015), protagonist Maggie suggested that baking soda killed the bread’s unique flavour. However, later in the play, she acknowledged that those who do not like rēwena’s sourdough taste would appreciate how baking soda ‘helped’ create the bread’s sweetness. Science supports that claim. Baking soda (one gram per kilogram of dough) provides enough soluble alkali to mask the bread’s sourness, yet emphasise its sweetness (Wertheim, Oxlade, and Stockley 2006). Consequently, rēwena bread can be characterised within both its sweet and sourdough flavour profiles.
METHODOLOGY AND PARTICIPANTS

Eight individual audio recorded interviews were conducted with expert chef/bakers using an array of unstructured (Corbetta 2003; Qu and Dumay 2011), semi-structured (Adams 2015; DiCicco-Bloom and Crabtree 2006; McIntosh and Morse 2015; Qu and Dumay 2011), and structured questions (Corbetta 2003; Segal et al. 2006). Each interview lasted for approximately one and a quarter hours. Using thematic analysis (Braun and Clarke 2006), emergent themes were distilled from the transcripts and each participant was given the opportunity to read their own transcribed interview to check its validity. That process empowered them to not only check the accuracy of their transcript, but provided the opportunity to add to or amend any part of their contribution. We profile the eight expert participants, who hold a total of 177 years of bakery experience, in Table 1. Primary research ethics approval was considered and approved by the Auckland University of Technology Ethics Committee (AUTEC) under number 15/241.

Table 1. Overview of participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant name/tribal affiliation</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Years of baking experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grant Kitchen/ Ngati Hikairo</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maurice McClutchie/ Not disclosed</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beronia Scott/ Ngati Whātua (Orāki)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanley Tawa/ Not disclosed</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Fernside/ (self-identified as Pākehā)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean Brettschneider/ (self-identified as Pākehā)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>30+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geoff Scott/ (self-identified as Pākehā)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Griffiths/ (self-identified as Pākehā)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This research focused on our participants’ understandings and experiences of parāoa rēwena within their lived and professional bakery experiences. Within that, the research aim was to understand the reasons behind rēwena bread’s comparative marketplace absence.

FINDINGS

From a systematic distillation of the participants’ transcripts using thematic analysis (Braun and Clarke 2006), themes emerged from the data. What be-
came obvious, early on in that process, was that a difference of opinion and experience emerged between the self-identified Māori and most of the self-identified Pākehā participants, however one Pākehā participant, Patrick Griffiths, (owner of Ringawera Bakery on Waiheke Island), held similar views to the Māori participants.

Stanley Tawa, a lecturer in cooking and baking at the Ara Institute of Canterbury, traced his interest in bread and baking as follows:

I think, as with all things, it starts when you are in your childhood. My mother used to make rēwena, cartwheel bread, scones, and everything like that. She always made these things from scratch.

Stanley linked rēwena to Christianity. For him rēwena implied something leavened. ‘[It’s] the first thing I think of because we were brought up in a Christian context.’ Grant Kitchen linked rēwena to whakapapa:

[I] always grabbed my grandmother’s starter […] my [most] vivid memory [is being] three years old. I remember its sweetness. It was an interesting flavour. My grandmother’s bug is still going. It’s a hundred years old.

Similarly, Maurice McClutchie, an industrial baker, remembered:

Eating bread at every meal growing up – I’m a bread lover. My aunt and grandmother taught me to make parāoa rēwena from a potato bug starter. I remember eating parāoa rēwena from around age seven on the marae. I remember the starch and sour taste.

Stanley observed the bread’s regional variations:

My wife is Ngāti Porou [an iwi or tribe]. Her nanny would put a lot of sugar in the bread. It made it sweeter. She would say to me that ‘your parāoa is quite kawa [sour].’ I’d almost consider it to taste a little like Parmesan […] My mum and my aunty would make it in the morning and leave it in the hot water cupboard for two or maybe four hours. [Rēwena parāoa is] steeped in tikanga and is very much about sharing and manaakitanga, about teaching, and about nurturing. All these things that I feel are very, very important. I like to think of rēwena as the ‘real’ New Zealand bread. The real Kiwi bread, the real Māori bread.
Grant expressed similar views, relating them to the bug: ‘My grandmother’s bug incorporated *mana*’. Grant’s grandmother was a *kuia* (respected tribal elder). For her *rēwena* was an actant *aide de memoir*:

I was around about seven. It was on the *marae* [a tribal meeting place]. That’s where you’d find a lot of traditional food preparation for specific *huis* [meetings] like *tangi* [funerals], weddings, and all that sort of thing.

Beronia Scott, chef and member of the Komiti Marae Orākei Trust, had similar associations. She recounted:

On the *marae* my aunty Mona always made bread. It was usually for a *hāngi* at a funeral on the *marae*. I remember that she’d bring her little plastic bucket with the bug in it and then she [would] hide it. [Well] not hide it, but she would go into a corner of the kitchen and just have a little area and everything there. Her trays and bowls would be ready, her flour was there, just everything. She just quietly works away during the *tangi* and makes bread.

Maurice also linked *rēwena* to his *marae*:

I remember listening to many *kaumātua* at the *marae* telling stories about their bugs, the ‘pongy’ smell of them. Later, when I made the bread, it was almost as good as my *koro’s* [grandfather’s]. But my nan would make it daily. Making bread is therapeutic, especially for my nana and *koro*. It’s like a baby. You need to look after a bug in similar ways.

Beronia encapsulated the intimate relationship between *rēwena, mana, whaka-papa*, and *te ao Māori* as she reflected on the death of a loved one:

When my cousin died it felt I was the one continuing her work […] and Auntie Mona always came at funeral time or big gatherings with her bucket of bug. I’d seen it, but that was all. When my cousin died and when I now had to look at everything that was going on, it was me in the kitchen making bread. For us, bread is very important. We love bread.

Stanley shared a similar narrative:
She’s passed away now, and it brings back memories of them [the bugs], and also my wife’s grandmother who, as I said, she had a bug, a rēwena bug, for probably eighty years that had been used and passed on and passed on. […] It’s part of my culture and what I’ve learnt and [I’m] passing on that.

At the marae, Stanley observed the significance of rēwena:

You would find it on the tables [at a marae event]. Rēwena takes time to make. Because you understand that, the amount of work that goes into it, it’s something to me of value, rather than just having a slice of white bread that’s been buttered placed in front of you. So, people have taken time, they are acknowledging, bestowing mana upon you. They are saying, ‘We have gone to this extra effort’ and this is how we show that – in the bread.

However, Stanley noted that ‘ninety-five percent of my students would not know what it [parāoa rēwena] is.’ His concern was ‘to do the authenticity of the bread justice’ based on his whānau’s experiences of bread making. Authenticity was important to him. ‘There are reasons why sometimes you traditionally stick to things.’ Stanley recognised the bread’s commercial potential within considerations of its authenticity. ‘It’s unique [to New Zealand]; it’s something we can call our own.’ However, he also linked any sale of the bread to a Māori customer base, proposing ‘Maybe sell it in Rotorua, obviously there is a higher Māori population [there].’ Maurice agreed with rēwena’s commercial potential, ‘but on an artisan level. Production on an industrial level would be more challenging because of the many automated processes. [So] maybe it’s better suited to a small plant.’ Maurice also identified urban Māori as rēwena’s potential customers, ‘because rēwena was common food at the marae.’

Adding to those views, Andrew Fernside, owner of Wild Wheat bakery, noted, ‘For a white New Zealander, it [parāoa rēwena] isn’t my cultural roots, but it is our New Zealand cultural roots.’ Dean Brettschneider, author of multiple international, bestselling bakery texts, remembered how his nana made scones, ‘which was actually very English […] but I guess from a Māori point of view they didn’t make scones, they made rēwena bread.’ Geoff Scott described his complete ignorance of the bread in his earlier life:

I’d never had rēwena as a kid or an adult so I cannot say that I can identify the flavours [of it] because I haven’t eaten it often enough. I really have just heard about it. But through later family contacts
I have tried to learn more about Māori cuisine, generally. If I had my time again, I would spend some time with a traditional Māori household where bread is made by someone who makes it regularly and has been making it for years. I’d find out from a ‘this is the way my mother taught me’.

Dean’s *parāoa rēwena* moment arrived when he decided to include a New Zealand bread recipe in one of his published cookbooks. However, Dean’s sour-dough bread knowledge was limited by his European training and knowledge of San Franciscan bread styles. Consequently, Dean acquired his *rēwena* bread knowledge outside of his formal training:

> It was never anything I learnt at polytechnic. No one ever made me make or introduced me to [*parāoa rēwena*] bread as a baker […] and while I wrote about it, it was not in depth.

After graduating and gaining industry experience, Dean returned to his local polytechnic as a lecturer where he repeated what he was taught as a student. ‘We didn’t teach *rēwena* bread. It wasn’t part of our curriculum to teach. Looking back, I really should have included it.’

Contrasting Dean and Geoff, and their limited experience and knowledge of *rēwena* bread, was Patrick Griffiths. Patrick was exposed to *parāoa rēwena* on school visits to local marae. Patrick admitted that ‘*rēwena* has always fascinated me as a concept.’ Consequently, he began experimenting with making *rēwena* at home. Those experiences encouraged him to try out recipes in his bakery:

> [I wanted to see if] I could produce it in a much more long-term, ongoing situation. I wanted to know and figure out what would be the combination that would work for me. I think of *rēwena* as the ‘real’ New Zealand bread.

Similarly, Andrew Fernside began to experiment with *rēwena* in the early days of his bakery business. For him, a simple Google search provided his base knowledge. Andrew observed that ‘*rēwena* bread looked like a damper as opposed to a bread, a proper bread, and that’s how I approached it to begin with.’ Later, he decided that ‘I’m going to use my sourdough knowledge and base it on my potato starter.’ Andrew was already producing a potato sourdough and a kumara sourdough bread for his retail outlet. Those breads sold well. That created a dilemma: ‘Do I create a hybrid of two already successful products, or do I just leave them as they are?’ After some recipe experimentation, he offered
parāoa rēwena as a monthly special. However, it was not a popular customer choice. Consequently, he discontinued its production, deciding to stick with his existing products. Andrew’s concerns were added to by Dean’s observation that there was a hierarchy of bread. As Andrew shared:

I’m travelling the world and I’m a New Zealander. I always hang my hat on that. [As a display of New Zealandness,] I’d probably make a pavlova or a lamington before I would make a loaf of rēwena bread […]. You can say ‘This is rēwena bread,’ and they just look at you and go, ‘It’s a loaf of bread, what’s special about it?’ Whereas a pavlova is iconic. Bread and baking’s been around forever. Pavlova and lamingtons haven’t, but they are things that we’ve been born and bred with. If someone was to reinvent rēwena, it would probably be closer to a European bread because of the technologies involved in contemporary baking […] a little bit like an Italian Tuscan bread. Rēwena is recognised as being a Māori bread, but if you ask young people, ‘Do you know what Māori rēwena bread is?’ they would have no idea because I don’t know where they could buy it.

Contrasting that was Patrick’s view. He shared:

I think rēwena parāoa helps in creating a national identity. Rēwena bread in commercial operations would be fantastic. It only needs to be picked up by one of the franchises, and to do that throughout New Zealand would be fantastic. I wanted to make sure that, before I was calling my bread rēwena, they [the local Māori] recognised it as such. They were excellent, giving me very good, positive feedback, and quickly too.

That feedback gave him confidence.

I began experimenting, using other [Māori] potatoes like urenika and tūtaekuri. Those potatoes have [and give the bread] a quite different flavour and texture. I have also added other ingredients to create an enriched dough.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In discussing and concluding our topic this paper concentrates the findings within considerations of Hage (1998), Morris (2010), and Mavromatis (2017). These authors hold commonality in their application to this research because
they considered the invisibility of minority cultures within dominant socio-cultures, albeit in different ways. Using Hage’s (1998) work as a theoretical base this paper expands upon it with Morris’s (2010) insight of Māori food in Aotearoa New Zealand and then Mavromatis’s (2017) insight into the mindset of early colonists to Aotearoa New Zealand. Consequently, it is within the amalgam of Hage (1998) Morris (2010) and the more recent work of Mavromatis (2017), that this paper, after summarizing their positions, discusses the wider implications of the participants’ narratives.

Hage (1998) proposed that within the accumulation of cultural capital members of the dominant culture inflict symbolic violence on others. That violence renders others ‘invisible.’ Consequently, Hage (1998) observed that dominating white cultures controlled and normalised social concepts and constructs reflecting the mores of their own dominant white imaginary. Using Hage (1998) and applying those considerations to Aotearoa New Zealand, suggests that Pākehā, as the dominant white culture, have eroded the reality of the indigene and therefore diminished their socio-cultural potency. Consequent to that process, Hage (1998) suggested that members of the dominating culture gleaned a sense of belonging. In Aotearoa New Zealand, that sense of belonging has assuaged the insecurity of identity for many Pākehā (Bell 2006; Neill 2018).

Borrowing the notion of ‘scape’ from Appadurai (1990) Morris (2010, 6) explored, what she termed, Aotearoa New Zealand’s ‘culinascape’ (culinary landscape) within a framework of identity politics. Morris (2010) considered the rationales contributing to the lack of Māori restaurants in the nation. Morris’s (2010) work built upon the theoretical positions of Hage (1998), Harbottle (2000), and Heldke (2003). Like those authors, Morris (2010, 8) proposed that food and its edibility were a ‘social, not a physiological taste.’ Within her research, Morris (2010, 24) explored and positioned Māori food, as unacceptable to Pākehā because Māori held a ‘spoilt identity’. For Morris (2010, 24) that ‘spoilt identity’ reflected the decades of political activism engaged by Māori that ‘challenge[d] Pākehā cultural and political dominance’ (Morris 2010, 7). In that way, Morris’s (2010) research makes real Hage’s (1998) notion of symbolic violence and invisibility for Māori. Consequently, Morris (2010, 6) suggested that Pākehā aversion to Māori food was reflected in the absence of Māori food within Aotearoa New Zealand’s ‘culinascape’. In evoking the binary within Brillat-Savarin’s (1825/2009, 15) most famous quote, ‘[t]ell me what you eat, and I shall tell you what you are,’ Morris (2010, 6) revealed ‘what we do not eat may be equally revealing of who we are.’ In that way, like Hage (1998), Harbottle (2000), and Heldke (2003), Morris (2010) positioned food as a metaphor for indigenous acceptability within dominant cultures. Considering that, Morris
Neill & Sturny (2010) realised the political symbolism inherent to Māori food and its potential to render the indigene ‘invisible,’ via the view of Pākehā, within the continuation of culinary colonialism. Yet Heldke’s (2003) consideration of culinary colonialism, reflecting the consumption of exotic cultures with the aim to make yourself more ‘interesting,’ is not congruent to Morris’s (2010) position. That difference reflects the notion that Morris’s (2010) participants considered that Māori food and culture were not exotic because they are indigenous. Notwithstanding that difference Mehta (2009), Grey and Newman (2018) add illumination. Respectively, they proposed that culinary colonialism denoted the imposition of Western food values that undermined the ‘value’ of local food, and that culinary colonisation reflected a culinary multiculturalism within which ‘indigenous peoples’ gastronomies are commodified and alienated’ (Grey & Newman 2018, 717). As Mavromatis (2017) noted, the positions of Mehta (2009), Grey and Newman’s (2018) hold history.

Reflecting that history, Mavromatis (2017, 18) noted that because Aotearoa New Zealand’s early settlers mostly came from the United Kingdom, early-settler culture ‘was not open to new cultures of culinary ingredients.’ Overtime, this meant that many ethnic restaurants owned by non-Anglo-Saxon migrants to Aotearoa New Zealand – including those from China, Greece and Spain – had to ‘hid[e] [their ethnic food] out the back while they served steak, eggs and chips in the main café for the customers’ (Mavromatis 2017, 15). Additionally, Mavromatis (2017, 16) observed that ethnic restaurants had to ‘adapt many of [their] recipes to suit the tastes of [their] patrons’. In that way, Mavromatis (2017) highlights the positions of Hage (1998), Harbottle (2000), Heldke (2003), Mehta (2009), Morris (2010), and Grey and Newman’s (2018) because each author recognised that food’s acceptability within dominant cultures mirrored the acceptability nexus of that group within dominant culture. Consequently, Māori as indigenous people, are simultaneously inassimilable and their cuisine unpalatable to dominating Pākehā tastes (Morris 2010). That, as Morris (2010) suggested, has come to reflect the subordinate position of Māori, and defines the state of race-relations in Aotearoa New Zealand between Māori and Pākehā at the time of her writing in 2010.

Considering those positions cognisant of this research, excepting one Pākehā baker who held views similar to those of the Māori bakers, the participants revealed two distinct worldviews. The Māori participant views about parāoa rēwena denoted their wider considerations of te ao Māori and matauranga Māori. The self-identifying Pākehā bakers, by contrast, held little, and sometimes no knowledge of parāoa rēwena, and had a limited knowledge of its place and importance in te ao Māori. Notwithstanding that, and given the positions
of Hage (1998), Morris (2010), and Mavromatis (2017), this research on parāoa rēwena reveals more than a mere difference in world-view.

This research suggests that particularly from the Pākehā bakers’ perspectives, that many of their views were expressed not only within the language of objectification but also from a Eurocentric perspective. Reflecting that were their references to scones, lamingtons and the iconic kiwiana dish, pavlova (Neill 2018), presented within a hierarchy of Kiwi food, that did not include parāoa rēwena. Compounding that, were other comments including ‘[that parāoa rēwena] isn’t my cultural roots.’ Additionally, these participants came to realise parāoa rēwena by its association with the production and taste of San Francisco sourdough bread. In that way, the consideration of the ‘other’ was made palatable by its reference to an established, non-indigenous and well marketed contemporary bread style.

These observations add weight to Hage’s (1998) proposition that within the accumulation of cultural capital members of the dominant culture inflict symbolic violence on others, in this case the negation of Māori via parāoa rēwena. Thus we propose that many of the participant Pākehā bakers assuaged their identity insecurity (Bell 2006; Neill 2018) via a food hierarchy that reflected their Anglo-centric worldview.

The indigenous bakers realised parāoa rēwena as a tribal point of distinction. That distinction reinforced notions of te ao Māori, particularly with constructs of whakapapa within the responsibilities that the handing down of a parāoa rēwena dough ‘bug’ evoked. Within that process, the parāoa rēwena bread required constant nurture. That nurture and time promoted, recreated, and evoked feelings of nostalgia, religious belief, and wider notions of whakapapa for the Māori bakers with whom we spoke. In that holistic way, parāoa rēwena reinforced rituals and ways of being and becoming for this group of participants. That was evidenced not only within the considerations that some bugs were 80 or 100 years old, but also within participant narratives of aunts and other whanau making bread on the marae and the rituals associated with its production and commensality that reinforced ways of being and becoming Māori.

While parāoa rēwena bread is popular on marae and for Māori social occasions, and, as we note within an emergent commercial restaurant environment, the production of parāoa rēwena needs to be incorporated within Aotearoa New Zealand’s culinary curriculum. Māori and the providers of bakery training in Aotearoa New Zealand hold the key to position parāoa rēwena as an artisan
bread of Aotearoa New Zealand. That positioning would not only make more people aware of this bread, but also open up more possibilities for its realisation as Aotearoa New Zealand's equivalent of the French baguette. Within that realisation comes a new level of response. That response not only recognises Māori kai, but also the response and respect inherent to Te Tiriti o Waitangi’s key principles and the mutual respect between its parties. Consequently, a diminution in the need to define Aotearoa New Zealand’s sense of nation, back to Eurocentric understandings is averted, and redirected within consideration of te ao Māori. In that way, the unique lactobacillus yeasts constituting the terroir of Aotearoa New Zealand’s geography, hold the potential, like its San Franciscan counterpart, to constitute what Billig (1995) might reference as the ‘bread of nation’.

NOTES
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