

‘HOSTILITY WON’T DETER ME, SAYS PM’:  
THE PRINT MEDIA, THE PRODUCTION OF AFFECT AND WAITANGI DAY

Alex McConville, Margaret Wetherell, Tim McCreanor,  
& Helen Moewaka Barnes

ABSTRACT

*This paper explores affect, discourse and emotion in national life. We focus on the print media’s use of Waitangi Day as an affective-discursive distribution channel maintaining and reinforcing the hegemony of settler culture. Applying new thinking around affect, we consider how the cultural production of emotion in print media privileges settler identity, whilst simultaneously devaluing indigenous struggle. One hegemonic interpretive repertoire is discussed; that ‘Waitangi Day is a day of conflict.’ Two subordinate repertoires are juxtaposed against this: that it should be ‘a day of celebration’ and that it should be ‘a day of conversation.’ We argue that these repertoires and their associated affective-discursive positions encourage readers to move into episodes of pejorative affect directed towards Māori ‘ruining the day.’ Productive engagement with bi-culturalism requires a broader and deeper range of affective-discursive resources. Popular journalism fails its readers and limits debate through its narrow modelling of the emotional experiences Waitangi Day might evoke.*

*Keywords:* Waitangi Day; media representations; affect and emotion; positions and repertoires; emotional capital

Waitangi Day is a key moment in the national life of Aotearoa/New Zealand and a crucial focal point in (re)presenting ourselves to ourselves. Its commemoration performs the everyday ‘banal nationalism’ (Billig 1995) central to the formation and maintenance of national identity (Liu *et al.* 2005). In the context of New Zealand’s colonial history, Waitangi Day illuminates patterns of inclusion and exclusion, the nature of the relationships between Treaty partners, imaginings of community (Anderson 1983), and contemporary formations of identity and wellbeing. To date, researchers have investigated the politics and history of Waitangi (Kāwharu 1989; Orange 1987), modes of commemora-

tion and their functions and effects (McAllister 2007, 2012; Richards and Ryan 2004), and media representations of Waitangi events and histories (Abel 1997). This article builds on and extends this body of work focusing particularly on the emotion and affect of Waitangi Day. We explore the print media's narration of the emotional possibilities for citizens and the characteristic affective-discursive practices found in newspaper accounts of this particularly intensified moment in national life.

The mainstream media aim to inform the public of both local matters and cultural issues (Hodgetts *et al.* 2004). In doing so, they play a central role in the construction of intergroup relations (Livingstone 1998). As Abel and her colleagues have demonstrated (Abel 1997; Abel, McCreanor, and A. Moewaka Barnes 2012), the media have been especially important in the shaping of the agenda for Waitangi Day and people's understandings of the Treaty. Media practice has long been criticised as a site where settler ideology is privileged and Māori perspectives are marginalised (Borell *et al.* 2012; McCreanor 1993; A. Moewaka Barnes *et al.* 2012; Nairn *et al.* 2012). As we will demonstrate, these processes play out also in the affective orderings around Waitangi Day. We argue that Waitangi Day becomes an affective-discursive distribution channel shaped by the media in a way that maintains and reinforces the hegemony of settler culture. Our argument is based on the analysis of a corpus of newspaper articles collected around Waitangi Day in 2013. In discussing our findings we consider the limitations of the affective-discursive resources newspapers present to readers and in particular how these restrict the emotional capital required for citizens to engage in biculturalism.

#### WAITANGI AND NATIONAL LIFE

Te Tiriti o Waitangi commemorated on Waitangi Day recognises the agreement signed in 1840 providing British subjects with the right to settle in Aotearoa, as well as granting Māori the right to become British subjects (Orange 1987). The process of treaty making was complicated in this case by the relative importance of oral explanations of the text and the existence of contradictory versions of the document in Te Reo and English. Te Tiriti, written in Te Reo, which most Māori signed, stated that they would retain sovereignty over their rights to resources and land, while in the English version sovereignty was to be ceded to the British Crown (Kawharu 1989).

Contemporary New Zealand emerged through the process of colonisation opened up by Te Tiriti o Waitangi where settlers quickly became the main beneficiaries of possible interpretations of this agreement. The rapid influx of

British nationals and other Europeans after 1840 led to a population majority a decade later. With this, new sets of laws, beliefs, and practices, including settler self-government based on the English Acts Act (Durie 2005, 2), were laid down. The national culture came to be dominated by the normative power of settler culture (Bell 2009). Despite the expression of partnership and bi-cultural equity underpinned by Te Tiriti o Waitangi, power and privilege remain with the coloniser and extend into interpersonal relations, societal norms, and institutional practices reproducing a society developed by and for settlers (H. Moewaka Barnes *et al.* 2014). The hegemony of settler cultural and social practices continues to afford non-indigenous citizens a range of benefits such as greater economic advantages, better health prospects, and a higher social status (Bell 2006). And, citizens today find themselves continuing to negotiate ideological worldviews that have supported colonial domination and the notion that settlers are culturally superior. As Tuhiwai Smith (1999) argues, these work to afford Pākehā the privilege to pass over the racist and destructive origins of their settler society, and ignore the resultant comprehensive contemporary disparities between Treaty partners (H. Moewaka Barnes *et al.* 2014).

The ongoing tension between Māori and Pākehā over the meaning and status of Te Tiriti is often reflected in the nature of Waitangi Day itself. Observed on 6 February each year, it is formally described as the day in which our nation commemorates the signing of Te Tiriti o Waitangi by Māori chiefs and representatives of the British Crown (Orange 1987). However, like Te Tiriti itself, the meaning of the day is contested. While for some it has become a time for commemorating loss, others characterise it as a day of conflict and thus offering nothing to celebrate. Still others remain indifferent and see it quite simply as a day off work.<sup>1</sup>

The positions people currently take up reflect the range of reactions foregrounded at different periods in the last 174 years. The middle part of the 20th century, beginning in 1938, for instance, saw large annual commemorations, with the day portrayed as steadily increasing in popularity after the Queen of England's visit in 1953 (O'Malley *et al.* 2010). These events were celebratory in nature guided by a politics of cultural assimilation evident in the concept that 'we are one harmonious nation.' In contrast, the late 1970s and early 1980s saw Waitangi Day highlighted as a key site for protest and dissent. This helped to establish the day as a platform for critical discussions around Māori and Pākehā relations (Orange 1987). Certainly, woven through this history, and in people's hearts and minds, is the demand that Waitangi Day be *felt as something*. There are many embodied possibilities: quiet reminiscence, patriotism, empathy, release, guilt, indifference, apathy, pride, anger, resentment, anguish,

joy, pain, etc. Our questions are: which responses do the print media privilege and what emotions do they routinely attribute to which social actors?

#### THE MAINSTREAM MEDIA AS AN AFFECTIVE-DISCURSIVE DISTRIBUTION CHANNEL

For information around Tiriti issues, the media is cited as a main source (UMR Research 2004). This emphasises the pivotal role media plays and the ethical and political responsibilities involved. Previous research in New Zealand suggests that said responsibilities are often ignored. Māori, for instance, are regularly characterised in a wide range of disparaging ways such as being intrinsically violent and primitive, to being the cause of their own predicament (McCreanor 1993; A. Moewaka Barnes *et al.* 2012; Nairn *et al.* 2012). A commonly media constructed *figure* (Ahmed 2010), for instance, is of the unreasonable Māori stirrer, understood as immoderate, irrationally motivated by anger rather than legitimate grievance, and extremist for the sake of it. This figure is often contrasted with a normative standard set by an imagined ordinary 'Kiwi New Zealander' – a convenient masking label from which settler norms, practices, and perspectives are privileged and enacted (A. Moewaka Barnes *et al.* 2012; see also Dominy 1995; King 2004; Pearson and Sissons 1997 for discussions of settler identity, the range of nomenclature and its significations).

We begin to see the relevance of what Heaney (2011, 272) calls the 'hidden history of emotions' to understanding both the play of power in New Zealand society and the media's broad ideological role. As Heaney argues, given the centrality of the distinction between emotion and reason, or passion and objectivity in Western thought, less attention has been given to the connections between emotion and power. Heaney urges scholars to place increased emphasis on 'how emotions are implicated in the manufacture of consent in societies, and on the emotional bases of social order' (2011, 271).

Political scientist David Ost draws attention to the degree in which frustration and discontent are stitched into the fabric of social life as a consequence of economic inequality, the lack of perceived distributive justice and prejudiced meritocracy. As a result 'anger is built into politics through the everyday activities of political parties, which continually both stoke and mobilize anger in order to gain and maintain support' (Ost 2004, 230). Similarly, Pantti and Wahl-Jorgensen (2011) suggest that over time journalists have moved from being primarily neutral observers of events such as disasters to becoming more actively engaged in social and political processes through the increasingly apparent manufacture of morally charged stories evoking strong emotion.

Journalists now more readily offer personalised views, and increasingly speak for the public.

Richards and Rees (2011) invite us to imagine news gathering as a pump, distributing a flow of affect that begins with agents of the media and ends with consumers of their product. They note the many sites through which the emotions related to selected news items travel. As the process unfolds, emotions are felt, shared, worked through and distributed in various ways. Journalists deal with their direct experience of events, their own feelings towards the contexts and the histories of these events, and how audiences might respond to their views. They work within an economic paradigm in which competition for consumer attention is of utmost importance, and thus 'the most profitable stream is found in material with the strongest emotional content, especially if it points to danger or loss' (Richard and Rees 2011, 854).

#### AFFECTIVE-DISCURSIVE PRACTICE

It is clear that media deliver to their audiences not just a cognitive or intellectual experience but also an emotional one, and that the kinds of emotions on offer for national events such as Waitangi Day will be bound up with broader power relations, the politics of biculturalism, and the wider cultural projects of Pākehā settler society. But to study affect and emotion in the print media, some account is needed of affect itself and how it might be accessed and studied. This is no easy matter given that much recent scholarship in the social sciences follows Thrift's (2004) non-representational theory which conceives affect as a non-verbal, pre-personal, extra-discursive force.

Here, we follow Wetherell's (2012, 2013) argument that embodied responses to events and meaning-making occur in synchrony. Drawing on contemporary psychobiology and neuroscience, she suggests that there is no non-representational moment in affect. Rather, being affected by events and registering these affects as specific kinds of emotional experiences is a multi-layered process in which body/brain processes intertwine with personal histories, discourses and culturally available ways of making sense, and intertwine also with larger-scale social histories and the material organisation of spaces and contexts.

Wetherell argues that this entangled flow produces relatively ordered patterns and social practices, and she suggests that these can be studied directly in episodes of social action.<sup>2</sup> The implication is that examining the print media might disclose some regular ways of emoting and of narrating the process of being affected. It might disclose the emotion canon, or feeling norms, print

media present to the nation and the types of emoting actors who are privileged. The study of text and discourse can thus expand to include emotion registers and affective-discursive practices. This is not to say, of course, that the transmission of an ideologically inflected emotion canon is always successful and that all readers of a newspaper article will feel the same emotions. Readers and citizens are not emotionally unsophisticated and a variety of affective responses and practices will be relevant on any particular occasion. But, the sustained and repeated development of particular emotion canons and affective-discursive positions in newspapers will have an impact on what comes to be seen as the usual and expected emotions for national events like Waitangi Day, and is likely to influence the kinds of emotional reactions which become seen as accountable, in need of justification, , and as deviant. These dimensions of national emotional life, which have been neglected in existing research, are our focus.

To delve into the emotion canon around Waitangi, we apply a range of analytic concepts derived from discourse studies in social psychology (Edley 2001; Potter and Wetherell 1987; Wetherell and Potter 1992). We aim, for instance, to identify the main interpretative repertoires in a sample of the print media and their affective dimensions. Interpretative repertoires (Potter and Wetherell 1987; Wetherell and Potter 1988) are repeated characterisations and formulations of events and phenomena. Like steps in a dance they are made up of familiar argumentative sequences, metaphors, tropes and rhetoric. We also seek to identify the main subject positions on offer in media texts and their affective valence and character. Subject positions (Davies and Harre 1990) refer to the identity possibilities, voices and speaking positions a text constructs. An interpretative repertoire very frequently formulates, for instance, not just a way of understanding the world but also a position from which to speak which affords the speaker a particular kind of character. In this case we are interested in the emotional identities and forms of affect on offer.

The corpus developed for this analysis focuses on one year – 2013 – and includes 69 articles from a survey of national and regional newspapers. All articles were included that discussed issues around Waitangi Day, published over the three days in the lead up to 6 February 2013, along with those published on Waitangi Day itself. An analysis of the main topics covered in these articles found that, prior to Waitangi Day, six discussed the then Leader of the Labour Party David Shearer's vision for Waitangi Day, 16 discussed local events and commemorations around the country, two discussed flags, six revolved around a pub crawl in London, and five articles made predictions about what would happen on Waitangi Day. On 6 February itself, 11 articles discussed the politics

of the day, five discussed ‘granny gate’—an incident with prominent Māori activist Titewhai Harawira – four discussed Prime Minister John Key promising to return to Waitangi, ten discussed particular commemorative events, and four discussed Labour leader David Shearer’s vision for Waitangi Day.

To illustrate the repertoires and positions found in our analysis of this corpus and their affective-discursive patterning, we will focus on sequences in two specimen articles chosen because they are representative of the recurring regularities we found across the corpus. These are an article titled ‘Hostility won’t deter me, says PM’, published in the *Taranaki Daily News* on 6 February 2013, and an article titled ‘Day marred by rancour and ill feeling’, published on the same day in *The Timaru Herald*. These will be supplemented with extracts from a range of other articles. Our presentation of this material is organised around a central contrast deployed in the majority of news items that focus on Waitangi Day at the national level. Here, Waitangi Day is primarily presented as a day of conflict (91 percent). Of the stories revolving around conflict, 39 percent of articles suggest the day should be one of celebration, 10 percent of articles suggest it should be a day of conversation, and 35 percent discuss aspects of both. What affective-discursive trajectories does this motif set in motion?

#### WAITANGI DAY IS ‘A DAY OF CONFLICT’

The kind of conflict media focus on is protest action and dissent enacted by Māori people. Conflict, as mentioned earlier, is a staple in Western news reporting, and even more so in the contexts of contestation found in settler societies (Abel, McCreanor, and A. Moewaka Barnes 2012). We begin with the headline from the article in the *Taranaki Daily News* and its affective-discursive affordances.

#### *Hostility won’t deter me, says PM*<sup>3</sup>

This headline establishes an affective-discursive position of courage (self)-assigned to Prime Minister John Key. The overarching repertoire, ‘day of conflict’, is evoked through the use of the single word ‘hostility’ and sets the backdrop for the ensuing article. This categorisation effortlessly calls into focus the repeatedly reproduced, news gathering notion that Māori are particularly disruptive and menacing subjects on Waitangi Day (Abel 1997; Rankine *et al.* 2008). Readers who can identify with (feel into) the affective-discursive position constructed for and by Key are rewarded with an affective platform of stability, strength, and safety offered by the state through the media. From here, the reader is welcome to feel into other affects such as righteous indignation

directed at the figure of hostile and menacing Māori.

Of course, the particular regime of ‘truth’ (Foucault 1980) and the associated emotional thrust with which the article begins do not necessarily have to be picked up by the reader. Headlines are, however, powerful shortcuts summarising what is about to follow (Andrew 2007) and as such, the cascade of affect that is set in motion will be in relation to what is read, be it resistance, acceptance, or otherwise. Other headlines in our corpus evoke similar themes.

*‘I’ll keep turning up’, vows PM*<sup>4</sup>

*‘I will be back’ PM tells elders*<sup>5</sup>

*Waitangi Day tension*<sup>6</sup>

*Rivals in scrap to escort Key*<sup>7</sup>

Throughout the corpus it is evident that whatever paper of the day the reader comes into contact with they are likely to be swept into images of Māori attacking government officials, ‘quarrelling’ amongst themselves, and generally stirring up ‘rancour’ and ‘ill feeling’. Given that much of this material is actually published in advance of Waitangi Day itself and in advance of any actual events on the Day, the ‘prepared’ and routine nature of this affective-discursive script can be seen. In years that depart from this script, the story often becomes that: ‘This year there is no story.’

Our focal *Taranaki Daily News* article continues after its headline as follows:

1. *Despite Titewhai Harawira’s attempt to steal the show at Waitangi, Prime Minister John Key has vowed he will continue to attend celebrations there regardless of the reception he receives.*
2. *Threats of yet another disturbance, this time over whether Mrs Harawira would be allowed to escort him on to Te Tii Marae, descended into farce yesterday.*
3. *But Mr Key said no matter how hostile the reception was, he would always be there as long as he was prime minister.*
4. *“I’ll keep turning up, you decide how you use it,” he told iwi leaders in his speech at Waitangi’s lower marae.*



The article begins by drawing on and reminding readers of the media focus that played out in the days leading up to Waitangi Day, 2013, a dispute between Ngapuhi elders and prominent Māori activist Titewhai Harawira, around who would lead distinguished guests on to the marae at Waitangi. In the excerpt above, Harawira is positioned as ‘stealing the show’. The use of this theatrical idiom suggests a lack of authenticity and sincerity in her actions. It takes its place within the collage of coverage around the time in which she is variously described as a ‘bully’ whose ‘culture is based around media coverage and radicalism’<sup>9</sup> and as a ‘threat to the undisturbed celebration of Waitangi Day’.<sup>10</sup> In contrast to the characterisation of Key as a courageous politician, Harawira is positioned as a menacing Māori – a carnivalesque figure. She has become what Ahmed (2004) would describe as a ‘sticky’ subject: a site for intensifying negative affect and emotion around issues that involve Māori and Pākehā relations. Particularly in 2013, these kinds of pejorative affects stuck to Harawira but are part of a larger media strategy built up over time – put quite simply, that news about Māori is bad news (Nairn *et al.* 2012). In contrast to Harawira’s link with ‘farce’, Key is positioned as not just courageous but also as steady, willing and consistent (‘I’ll keep turning up’). The article continues.

5. *Mr Key questioned the legacy that violent protests left for Waitangi Day and local iwi, Ngapuhi.*

6. *‘If they want to do what they did to me last year, shout me down and not give me a chance to speak, fair enough. But that just doesn’t take us anywhere’ he said.*

*‘If you want to let a bunch of thugs jump around with bull horns we are not going to go anywhere,’ he said referring to his assault by the Popata brothers in 2009.*

7. *‘How will history judge me? I think as courageous, because I will keep coming back’ he said.*

The positioning of Harawira as menacing is extended to wider Māori dissent in general (in extracts 5 and 6) which works to further justify hegemonic readings that Māori are the sole source of conflict. Across the corpus and in media representations of Waitangi more generally (see Abel 1997), formulations of Māori protest are overtly ahistorical and decontextualised. Again, the affective-discursive positions assigned to Māori protesters as violent, hostile, irrational, and lacking control and consideration contrast with Key’s self-positioning as courageous. Interestingly, these affective-discursive formulations tend to

individualise Key as a particular kind of person rather than positioning him as an agent for a collective, or through his role as the head of the state. Across the corpus, Key, in contrast to iwi leaders, is given the space to articulate feeling and define appropriate emotion through extensive quotation, deployed without question or critical reflection. This affective patterning legitimises, privileges, and reinforces a particular view, whilst denying the affective validity of both Māori and those dissatisfied with an unjust Tiriti relationship.

WAITANGI DAY SHOULD BE ‘A DAY OF CELEBRATION’ / SHOULD BE ‘A DAY OF CONVERSATION’

The overarching interpretive repertoires throughout the corpus juxtapose the notion that Waitangi Day is a day of conflict against the claim that Waitangi Day should be a day of celebration, and that it should be a day of conversation.

8. *It's Waitangi day, New Zealand's national day, a day where Kiwis get together to amicably celebrate our nationhood. Yeah right*<sup>8</sup>

The excerpt above, this time from our second focal article in *The Timaru Herald* also published on 6 February 2013, draws on the ironical trope, ‘Yeah right’, the advertising slogan of local brewery Tui. The distance between Waitangi Day and amicable national celebration is emphasised. Again, little context is given in the rest of the article as to why this might be the case. The use of the category ‘Kiwis’ here does subtle work to deny the heterogeneity of beliefs and values held by different cultural groups, while privileging settler perspectives. The sarcasm of ‘Yeah right,’ along with the term ‘Kiwi’ constructs a frustrated but stoical national collective. Kiwis are realists but they are missing out on what should occur – an ideal national day in which celebratory rituals, theatrical ceremonies, and widespread festivities carry on uninterrupted. It is this kind of affecting tension between what should be the case and what is the case that in part gives the media coverage its ideological clout. We, ‘Kiwis,’ are forever wishing to celebrate ‘our’ national day yet we are continually ‘denied’ such satisfaction. *The Timaru Herald* continues:

9. *Overseas visitors must be shocked to see the way Kiwis appear to ‘celebrate’ their national day. It's certainly in sharp contrast to other countries' national celebrations.*

This dissatisfaction that our national day is not a day of celebration is further reinforced. The journalist stresses the hit of ‘shock’ that foreign visitors may experience when they realise that Waitangi Day is not an example of unity,

celebration, and enjoyment—characteristics attributed to the national days of other countries. Subsequent thought might question this, including reflection on Australia’s national day which similarly features indigenous dissent alongside media dismissal of that dissent (Banerjee 2000), but in the affective moment conjured by the newspaper article it is the sense of ‘missing out’ compared to others which becomes most dominant.

In the newspaper corpus, conflict and its notional opposite, celebration, are triangulated with a third possibility: conversation. Our focal *Taranaki Daily News* article reports Key applying these three affective-discursive states making short rhetorical work of bicultural relations in Aotearoa/New Zealand.

10. *‘If we want this to be a day of celebration we have to demonstrate that we are big enough to talk about the issues, even if we can’t agree on them’.*

Key engages with the notion that Waitangi Day should be a celebration, suggesting that to reach this goal Waitangi Day needs to become a day of conversation. Dialogue here is set up as an obvious good thing and as emotionally demanding. Those who do engage in conversation are admirable because they are ‘big enough’. Key, by implication, is ‘big enough’. Māori might retort that their requests for cordial dialogue around important matters over the last 174 years have frequently gone unanswered by Pākehā.

What is also clear is the normative framing. Activism formulated as ‘violent protest’ is not a legitimate expression of dissatisfaction (see also Abel 1997). In describing both parties as needing to ‘demonstrate’ that they are ‘big enough’, Key can be read as infantilising Māori. The forms of affective privilege we have tried to illustrate here are generally reinforced throughout the corpus. In our focal *Taranaki Daily News* article, Māori are continually spoken for (‘If we want this to be a day of celebration’). Māori are continually spoken at (‘if you want to let a bunch of thugs jump around with bullhorns’). Māori are continually told what they are doing wrong (‘Shout me down and not give me a chance to speak, fair enough. But that just doesn’t take us anywhere’). And, Māori are continually told how to behave (‘we have to demonstrate that we are big enough to talk about the issues, even if we can’t agree on them’).

In contrast to PM John Key who suggests it is conversation that will move us from conflict to celebration, David Shearer (then Labour Party leader) suggests that the tension can be resolved by dropping politics, and thus conflict, from the agenda altogether.

11. *Too often discord has defined the day. I'm tired of it, and I think most New Zealanders are, too. While there are legitimate issues to debate for Māori and Pākehā alike, Waitangi Day should be the day when we focus on what we have to celebrate as a country.*<sup>11</sup>

In suggesting that the removal of politics from the agenda on Waitangi Day will make way for more straightforward celebration, Shearer takes on an affective-discursive position of the happy, uncomplicated, patriotic celebrator. He applies the conflict repertoire and noting its hegemonic status suggests that he himself and the majority of New Zealanders have had enough of 'it'. Here Shearer takes the affective formations of the media—their practice of finding discord—as if it were Truth. This kind of affective-discursive labour works to further marginalise the emotional possibilities Waitangi Day holds. Indeed, Waitangi Day is a mixed, heterogeneous affective-discursive experience with a range of affective practices running concurrently. We have tried to show, however, that the print media continually strip the depth and breadth of these practices out of the national account and 'feel' the day primarily through a limited set of affective-discursive positions which privilege particular standpoints.

#### BUILDING EMOTIONAL CAPITAL

The concept of 'emotional capital' has a complex history (Reay 2004). Originally developed to refer to the added value associated with particular consumer brands such as Coca-Cola, it can also be read, as Reay points out, as an extension of Bourdieu's analyses of social and cultural capital. These forms of capital posit that the resources people can mobilise, and which maintain and determine their social position and social class, include not just accumulated financial wealth but other kinds of 'goods' such as social networks, the 'distinction' afforded to particular leisure pursuits and habits, and familiarity with highly valued cultural practices. In contrast to social and cultural capital, however, the notion of 'emotional capital' is not so straightforward. It is often debatable what counts as emotional privilege or as 'emotion goods', for instance. Might it simply be capacities for emotional resilience? The seeming universality of emotional reactions complicates matters. Social and cultural capitals work through differential exclusion and inclusion. If all of us, however, have equivalent universal emotion potentials then how do these come to be unequally socially distributed? Finally, as Reay (2004) also notes, the emotional capital and surpluses generated by some groups (such as women and mothers) might be appropriated by other social actors (such as workplaces, male partners, and children) on a routine basis, without any benefit to the originator of the capital.

Despite these complexities, it is insightful to think about the distribution of emotional capital in Aotearoa/New Zealand in light of the affective practices we have identified in this sample of the print media. The classic ‘who benefits?’ question, characteristic of ideological critique, is relevant to both the affect constructed by newspapers and the cognitive content of the representations. We have tried to show what we interpret as systematic biases in the emotional ranges allowed different social actors and in the narration of the affect attributed to ‘Kiwis’ and Māori around Waitangi. The affective-discursive resources found in our sample of print media, and the forms of emotional work and labour evident in the articles, maintain the hegemony of settler society. They are a classic form of accumulated capital in this sense. The media’s reliance on particular interpretive repertoires and associated affective-discursive positions dilutes complex histories of Pākehā and Māori relations, and positions Māori in harmful affective terrain whilst Pākehā remain explicitly unmarked and largely invisible. This allows Pākehā the freedom to feel certain ways about Māori without needing to engage in any particular reflexivity around their emotional experiences given the ‘evidence’ for such feelings are clearly laid down in print.

But, it is also possible to think of national emotional capital in a more inclusive and critical sense. What kinds of emotional labour and new affective-discursive practices might foster bi-culturalism? And, while segments of settler society might in some sense benefit from the repetition of these affective-discursive positions, are there not major losses also as a consequence of this limited palette and the relentless attempts to demonise some and make others aggrieved? Arguably, this affective-discursive patterning might feel good in the moment but is deeply problematic for citizens who use the media as a primary source of information on issues relevant to Treaty-based relations. From a social justice standpoint and in terms of the democratic wellbeing of Aotearoa/New Zealand, the lack of reflexive emotional labour in Pākehā media practice is challenging. We recommend ‘affective combat’ as a form of resistance. It may seem as though emotions simply are an authentic and natural expression of how the world affects us, but, as we have tried to demonstrate, affect is a matter of practice. In this case combat should be directed to developing critical thought around the nature of these practices and to identifying and debating the collateral damage, developing further the possibilities for change.

#### NOTES

- 1 See Abel 1997 for a more extensive discussion.

- 2 For similar arguments see Burkitt 2014, Reckwitz 2012 and Reddy 2001.
- 3 ‘Hostility won’t deter me, says PM,’ *Taranaki Daily News*, February 6, 2013.
- 4 “‘I’ll keep turning up’ vows PM,’ *Dominion Post*, February 6, 2013.
- 5 “‘I will be back,’ PM tells elders,’ *New Zealand Herald*, February 6, 2013.
- 6 ‘Waitangi Day tension,’ *Southland Times*, February 6, 2013.
- 7 ‘Rivals in scrap to escort Key,’ *Northern Advocate*, February 6, 2013.
- 8 ‘Day marred by rancour and ill feeling,’ *The Timaru Herald*, February 6, 2013.
- 9 ‘Farce fear in activist escort,’ *Northern Advocate*, February 4, 2013.
- 10 ‘A gift for controversy,’ *The Press*, February 5, 2013.
- 11 ‘Let’s be proud of our legacies,’ *The Dominion Post*, February 6, 2013.

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The work described is part of a research project on *Affect, Wairua and National Days*, supported by The Marsden Fund Council from Government funding, administered by the Royal Society of New Zealand (contract MAU019). The research team consists of Tim McCreanor, Margaret Wetherell, Angela Moewaka Barnes, Alex McConville, Te Raina Gunn and Jade Le Grice led by Helen Moewaka Barnes as Principal Investigator.

#### REFERENCES

- Abel, Sue. 1997. *Shaping the News: Waitangi Day on Television*. Auckland: Auckland University Press.
- Abel, Sue, Tim McCreanor, and Angela Moewaka Barnes. 2012. ‘Reporting Te Tiriti: Producing and Performing Colonial Society.’ In *Scooped: the Politics and Power of Journalism in Aotearoa New Zealand*, edited by Martin Hirst, Sean Phelan, and Verica Rupa, 65–79. Auckland: AUT Media, Accessed October 20, 2014. <http://dro.deakin.edu.au/eserv/DU:30041263/hirst-scoopedthe-politics-2012.pdf/>.

- Ahmed, Sara. 2004. *The Cultural Politics of Emotion*. London: Routledge.
- . 2010. 'Feminist Killjoys (and Other Willful Subjects)'. *The Scholar and Feminist Online* 8:1–13.
- Anderson, Benedict. 1983. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origins and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.
- Andrew, Blake. 2007. 'Media-Generated Shortcuts: Do Newspaper Headlines Present Another Roadblock for Low-Information Rationality?' *The Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics* 12: 24–43.
- Banerjee, Subhabrata B. 2000. 'Whose Land Is It Anyway? National Interest, Indigenous Stakeholders, and Colonial Discourses: The Case of the Jabiluka Uranium Mine.' *Organization and Environment* 13:3–38.
- Bell, Avril. 2006. 'Bifurcation or Entanglement? Settler Identity and Biculturalism in Aotearoa New Zealand.' *Continuum: Journal of Media and Cultural Studies* 20: 253–268.
- . 2009. 'Dilemmas of Settler Belonging: Roots, Routes and Redemption in New Zealand National Identity Claims.' *The Sociological Review* 57:145–162.
- Billig, Michael. 1995. *Banal Nationalism*. London: Sage.
- Burkitt, Ian. 2014. *Emotions and Social Relations*. London: Sage.
- Davies, Bronwyn., and Rom Harré, R. 1990. 'Positioning: The Discursive Production of Selves.' *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour* 20: 43–63.
- Dominy, Michèle. 1995. 'White Settler Assertions of Native Status.' *American Ethnologist* 22: 358–374.
- Durie, Mason. 2005. 'Race and ethnicity in public policy: Does it work?' *Social Policy Journal of New Zealand* 24:1–11.
- Edley, Nigel. 2001. 'Analysing Masculinity: Interpretative Repertoires, Ideological Dilemmas and Subject Positions.' In *Discourse as Data: A Guide for Analysis*, edited by Margaret Wetherell, Stephanie Taylor and Simeon J. Yates, 189–228. London: Sage.

- Foucault, Michel. 1980. *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972–1977*. London: Random House LLC.
- Heaney, Jonathan. 2011. 'Emotions and Power: Reconciling Conceptual Twins.' *Journal of Political Power* 4: 259–277.
- Hodgetts, Darrin, Bridgette Masters, and Neville Robertson. 2004. 'Media Coverage of "Decades of Disparity" in Ethnic Mortality in Aotearoa.' *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology* 14: 455–472.
- Kawharu, Ian H. 1989. *Waitangi: Māori and Pākehā Perspectives of The Treaty of Waitangi*. Auckland: Oxford University Press.
- King, Michael. 2004. *Being Pakeha Now: Reflections and Recollections of a White Native*. Auckland, N.Z: Penguin Books.
- Liu, James H., Tim McCreanor, Tracey McIntosh, and Teresia Teaiwa, eds. 2005. *New Zealand Identities: Departures and Destinations*. Wellington, NZ: Victoria University Press.
- Livingstone, Sonia. 1999. 'New media, new audiences?' *New Media & Society* 1(1): 59–66.
- McAllister, Patrick. 2007. 'Waitangi Day—an annual enactment of the Treaty?' *SITES* 4(2): 1–26.
- . 2012. *National Days and the Politics of Indigenous Identities in Australia and New Zealand*. Durham NC: Carolina Academic Press.
- McCreanor, Tim. 1993. 'Mimiwhangata: Media Reliance on Pākehā Commonsense in Interpretations of Action.' *SITES* 26: 79–90.
- Moewaka Barnes, Angela, Belinda Borell, Ken Taiapa, Jenny Rankine, Ray Nairn, and Tim McCreanor. 2012. 'Anti-Māori Themes in New Zealand Journalism—Toward Alternative Practice.' *Pacific Journalism Review* 18: 195.
- Moewaka Barnes, Helen, Belinda Borell, and Tim McCreanor, 2014. 'Theorising the Structural Dynamics of Ethnic Privilege in Aotearoa.' *International Journal of Critical Indigenous Studies* 7: 1–14
- Nairn, Ray, Tim McCreanor, Angela Moewaka Barnes, Belinda Borell, Jenny



- Rankine, and Amanda Gregory. 2012. "Māori News is Bad News": That's Certainly So on Television.' *MAI Journal* 1: 41–65.
- Ost, David. 2004. 'Politics as the Mobilization of Anger Emotions in Movements and in Power.' *European Journal of Social Theory* 7: 229–244.
- O'Malley, Vincent, Bruce Stirling, and Wally Penetito, eds. 2011. *The Treaty of Waitangi Companion: Māori and Pākehā from Tasman to Today*. Auckland: Auckland University Press.
- Orange, Claudia. 1987. *The Treaty of Waitangi*. Wellington: Bridget Williams Books.
- Pantti, Mervi K., and Karin Wahl-Jorgensen. 2011. "Not an Act of God": Anger and Citizenship in Press coverage of British Man-Made Disasters.' *Media, Culture and Society* 33:105–122.
- Pearson, David, and Jeffrey Sissons, J. 1997. 'Pākehā and Never Pākehā.' *SITES* 35: 64–80.
- Potter, Jonathan. and Margaret Wetherell. 1987. *Discourse and Social Psychology: Beyond Attitudes and Behaviour*. London: Sage.
- Rankine, Jenny, Raymond Nairn, Angela Moewaka Barnes, Mandi Gregory, Hector Kaiwai, Belinda Borell, and Tim McCreanor. 2008. *Media and Te Tiriti o Waitangi, 2007*. Auckland: Kupu Taea.
- Reay, Diane. 2004. 'Gendering Bourdieu's Concept of Capitals? Emotional Capital, Women and Social Class.' *The Sociological Review* 52(2): 57–74
- Reckwitz, Andreas. 2012. 'Affective Spaces: A Praxeological Outlook.' *Rethinking History* 16: 241–258.
- Reddy, William M. 2001. *The Navigation of Feeling: A Framework for the History of Emotions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richards, B. and Rees, G. 2011. 'The Management of Emotion in British Journalism.' *Media, Culture and Society* 33: 851–867.
- Richards, Parehau, and Chris Ryan. 2004. 'Waitangi Day: New Zealand's National Day.' In *National Days/National Ways*, edited by Linda K. Fuller, 145–15. Westport Connecticut: Praeger.

- Thrift, Nigel. 2004. 'Intensities of feeling: Towards a Spatial Politics of Affect.' *Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography* 86:57–78.
- Tuhiwai Smith, Linda. 1999. *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. London: Zed Books.
- UMR Research. 2004. Treaty of Waitangi Awareness Research – A Quantitative and Qualitative study. Accessed October 31, 2014. [http://www.ssc.govt.nz/upload/downloadable\\_files/TreatyofWaitangiAwarenessResearch.pdf](http://www.ssc.govt.nz/upload/downloadable_files/TreatyofWaitangiAwarenessResearch.pdf)
- Wetherell, Margaret. 2012. *Affect and Emotion: A New Social Science Understanding*. London: Sage.
- . 2013. 'Affect and Discourse—What's the Problem?: From Affect as Excess to Affective/Discursive Practice.' *Subjectivity* 6: 349–368.
- Wetherell, Margaret, and Jonathan Potter. 1988. 'Discourse Analysis and the Identification of Interpretative Repertoires.' In *Analysing Lay Explanations*, edited by Charles Antaki, 168–184. London: Sage.
- . 1992. *Mapping the Language of Racism: Discourse and the Legitimation of Exploitation*. New York: Columbia University Press.