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Abstract

A bicultural approach to the politics of settler-indigenous relations, rapidly increasing ethnocultural diversity and its status as an ex-British settler society, make Auckland a fascinating and complex context in which to examine contemporary British migrants. However, despite Britain remaining one of the largest source countries for migrants in Aotearoa New Zealand, and the country’s popularity as a destination among British emigrants, contemporary arrivals have attracted relatively little attention. This thesis draws on twelve-months of qualitative research, including in-depth interviews with forty-six participants, photo-elicitation with a smaller group, and participant observation, in order to develop a nuanced account of participants’ narratives, everyday experiences and personal geographies of Auckland.

This thesis adopts a lens attentive to the relationship between the past and the present in order to explore British migrants’ imaginaries of sameness and difference, national belonging, place and ‘the good life’ in Aotearoa New Zealand. First, through attention to the ‘colonial continuities’ of participants’ popular geographical and temporal imaginaries of Aotearoa New Zealand, and the lifestyles they associate with it, this thesis is part of growing attention to historical precedents of ‘the good life’ in international lifestyle migration literature. Secondly, by examining participants’ relations with Māori, other ethnicised groups, bi- and multiculturalism, I expand on whether these migrants’ invest, or not, in ‘the settler imaginary’ (Bell 2014). In doing so, I bring crucial nuance to understandings of ethnic and cultural difference, and settler-indigenous relations, in globalising white settler spaces. As neither fully ‘them’ nor ‘us’ (Wellings 2011), British migrants occupy an ambiguous position in ex-British settler societies. Finally, I examine participants’ notions of shared ancestry and of cultural familiarity with Pākehā, and, in doing so, problematise the notion of Britishness as a natural legacy or passive inheritance in this context.
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Glossary of Māori terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aotearoa</td>
<td>New Zealand, long white cloud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haka</td>
<td>a type of dance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karakia</td>
<td>a prayer or chant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāwanatanga</td>
<td>government, governorship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>usual, indigenous person of Aotearoa New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marae</td>
<td>meeting area for iwi, meeting house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mihi</td>
<td>a form of greeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pākehā</td>
<td>non-Māori, New Zealander of European descent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pōwhiri</td>
<td>welcome ceremony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taonga</td>
<td>treasure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tane Mahuta</td>
<td>the largest known living kauri tree in Aotearoa New Zealand, with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>significance in te ao Māori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te ao Māori</td>
<td>the Māori world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Kōhanga Reo</td>
<td>Māori language pre-school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te reo</td>
<td>the Māori language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tihei mauri ora</td>
<td>breath of life, call to claim the right to speak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tikanga</td>
<td>custom, protocol, correct procedure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tino rangatiratanga</td>
<td>self-determination, sovereignty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiata</td>
<td>song</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waka</td>
<td>vessel, canoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whare</td>
<td>house</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Writing conventions**

Te reo is an official, rather than a ‘foreign’ language, in Aotearoa New Zealand so I have not put those words in italics in the thesis. When words are used frequently, such as te reo, I have stopped translating them in the text after initial introductions.

I have used Aotearoa New Zealand to reference both the Māori and European name of the country, unless using a direct quote or referring to an institution which does not do so.

When directly quoting from the transcript of an interview, I have placed the quote in commas. In such quotes, when a word or phrase is in italics this conveys emphasis. Additional comments in square brackets describe body language and translations are included in footnotes. I have
indicated my deletion of part of the transcript with three ellipses. In order to differentiate transcripts from notes taken during observations, I have placed the entirety of the latter in commas and italics.
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Chapter one. Ambiguous migrants: contemporary British migrants living in Auckland, Aotearoa New Zealand

Introduction

Daniel was in his late fifties and had migrated to Auckland in the 1980s with his then-wife, who was Pākehā, whom he met while she was living in London, England. He missed his family in the UK and experimented twice with return. However, he found the pubs and sociability he had nostalgised while away had moved on, and he realised that his ‘heart’ was now in his other home. During one of our interviews, Daniel performed a song he had written to reflect on his place as an English migrant living in Aotearoa New Zealand,

‘... we all swim in the same rivers,
we all bathe in the same broad streams,
we are in this place together,
this is our New Zealand dream ...
In the land of the long white cloud.
We all walk in the same forest,
Taking shade from the same tall trees,
Standing tall Tane Mahuta¹,
Been watching us for a thousand years,
We can learn to walk together,
Everyone can do their share,
Our voices singing karakia²,
Everyone can join in prayer,
Tihei mauri ora³,
oh tihei mauri ora,
tihei mauri ora,
Aotearoa’.

¹ The largest known living kauri tree, and certainly the most famous, in Aotearoa New Zealand, with significance in te ao Māori, the Māori world.
² A prayer or chant
³ The breath of life, call to claim the right to speak
Daniel’s reflections on his migrancy, national belonging, dream of ‘the good life’ in a verdant landscape and encounters with different cultures speak to many of the themes addressed in this thesis. His desire to ‘learn to walk together’ has traces of a much-repeated quote from prominent Pākehā poet Curnow ([1943] 1997),

‘Not I, some child born in a marvellous year,
Will learn the trick of standing upright here’.

Inspired after gazing at the skeleton of the, now-extinct, giant Moa bird held up by wires, Curnow’s poem has echoed in discussions about the position of non-Māori in Aotearoa New Zealand, such as this thesis, ever since.

1.1 British migrants in the ex-British settler society of Aotearoa New Zealand: the relationship between the past and the present

According to the Institute for Public Policy Research (IPPR), nearly one in ten British nationals live abroad, and more than one hundred countries around the globe have more than one thousand British migrants living in them (Sriskandarajah and Drew 2006; Finch, Andrew and Latorre 2010, 7). In 2011, the World Bank identified the UK as the eighth largest emigrant-sending nation in the world, and it was the only high-income country to make it into the top ten (p. 3, 40). Despite the extraordinary extent of this phenomenon, Knowles and Harper (2009, 7) have suggested that ‘the habits of six million Britons who live in other countries have escaped detailed attention’. This thesis aims to contribute to the thriving body of work which engages with British emigration (see, for example: O’Reilly 2000; Walsh 2006; Knowles and Harper 2009; Leonard 2010a; Benson 2011; Cranston 2016).

Aotearoa New Zealand is the seventh most popular destination among British migrants (Finch et al. 2008, 29). In 2008, the IPPR claimed that around 248,000 Britons have migrated there long-term (ibid.; see also: Statistics New Zealand 2013a). Migrants from the UK dominated arrivals from the early nineteenth century until the early 1990s, and remain one of the largest source countries of migrants (Spoonley and Bedford 2012, 9). According to the 2013 Census, of the ‘overseas-born’ living in Aotearoa New Zealand, England is the largest source country followed by the People’s Republic of China and India; however, ‘Asia’ has overtaken the UK and Ireland to become the most common birthplace for overseas-born (Statistics New Zealand 2013b). Despite British and, in particular, English migrants’ ongoing prominence, the vast majority of research that exists is historical, addressing up until just after
the mid-twentieth century (Hutching 1999; Brooking and Coleman 2003; McCarthy 2007; Terry and Hearn 2008; Buelttmann, MacRaild and Gleeson 2012; Fraser and McCarthy 2012, 7). The lack of research with English migrants specifically, both historically and more recently, has been remarked upon (Buelttmann, MacRaild and Gleeson 2012, 1; Fraser and McCarthy 2012, 7; Pearson 2013, 82). Lately this lacuna has begun to be addressed by Pearson (2012; 2013; 2014; with Sedgwick 2010) who has taken a comparative approach between post-war and more recent English migrants across Aotearoa New Zealand to explore their lifestyle pursuits, perception of class in both societies and national attachments. There has also been a policy-oriented study of British employees and employers in Auckland and Hamilton (Watson et al. 2011) and a qualitative project with later-life European migrants examining identity, home and ageing in Dunedin, which included British migrants (George and Fitzgerald 2011).

Through the adoption of a historically informed, critical analysis attentive to colonial dis/continuities in participants’ imaginaries and post-migration lives, this thesis makes a significant contribution to this body of research. In doing so, the thesis responds to Fechter and Walsh’s (2012, 9) call for attention to ‘postcolonial continuities in relation to people, practices and imaginations’ in research with mobile professionals and, more recently, Benson’s (2013, 327) appeal for more research attentive to ‘how historical precedents and processes shape lifestyle migration’ (see also: Benson and Osbaldiston 2014). With regards to research with British migrants in Aotearoa New Zealand, this thesis expands upon current research through a focus on ‘the British’, both more broadly and more narrowly defined than the studies outlined above. In this way, I am able to address the different experiences of Britain’s constituent nations, as well as tracing broader patterns across the group. Also, I focus predominantly on the least researched cohort, those who arrived after the 1980s immigration reforms. Pre- and post-1980s marks a distinction between cohorts, particularly in terms of socio-economic status, which I will expand upon in chapter four. Finally, I concentrate on the specificity of place for participants’ living in the region of Auckland, in contrast to the relatively a-spatial analysis of previous contemporary research.

In ‘ex-British settler societies’ (Anderson 2000, 382), such as Aotearoa New Zealand, ‘historically “Britishness”’ is seen by many local commentators as performing the groundwork for the construction of majority identity and the construct against which an emergent nativist nationalism was framed’ (Pearson 2008, 51). The diminishing of British legacies in Aotearoa New Zealand, and a more recent centring of bicultural and multicultural futures, has been associated with both a new assertion of post-empire identities, or, alternately, ‘a void in national imagining among the majority of settler ancestry that still requires to be filled’
(Pearson and Sedgwick 2010, 447). What does it mean for British migrants to construct narratives of dislocation and belonging in this context? Several scholars have argued that a more nuanced exploration of British migrants’ settlement processes offers an important route to question whether Britishness still operates as a dominant cultural myth in this context, and to complicate conventional notions of British migrants’ easy assimilation, which rely on simplistic accounts of identity formation (see, for example: Wills and Darian-Smith 2004, 4; Pearson 2008, 2014; Wills 2010, 96). In chapter six, I contextualise participants’ reflections on their migrancy, and that of their compatriots, against this history, and in chapter seven, I specifically interrogate participants’ awareness of their national antecedents as it emerged in relation to particular landscapes and notions of shared ancestry with Pākehā.

Auckland’s shifting ethnic contours have led Friesen (2008) to name it ‘the face of New Zealand in the twenty-first century’. If the city is the very ‘place of our meeting with the other’ (Jacobs 1996, 4, cited by Yeoh 2001, 461), Auckland, as the most populous, the largest and by far the most ethno-culturally diverse area in Aotearoa New Zealand, marks a crucial and fascinating site from which to consider everyday encounters and experiences of difference, and sameness, for British migrants. I frame such encounters through Pratt’s (1992) ‘contact zones’, a concept she developed to describe ‘the spatial and temporal copresence of subjects previously separated by geographic and historic disjunctures, and whose trajectories now intersect’ (p. 7). Rather than diffusionist accounts of colonial conquest and domination, or relations of separateness, this concept, initially developed to describe colonial frontiers, emphasises ‘copresence, interaction, interlocking understandings and practices, often within radically asymmetrical relations of power’ (ibid.; see also: Yeoh and Willis 2005). This concept, adapted to the complexity of a settler society, implicitly frames chapters seven and eight, which consider participants’ relations with indigenous and other migrant and ethnicised peoples, and forms part of the concluding discussion in chapter nine.

In settler societies, postcolonialism is a contentious concept. In her iconic response, poet and activist Sykes (1996) evoked some of the ambiguity of the ‘post’ in a settler colonial context when she asked ‘what have I missed something? ... Have they gone?’ Instead of ‘postcolonial’, Australian indigenous scholar Moreton-Robinson (2009, 11) refers to ‘the postcolonising world we inhabit... where colonisation has not ceased to exist; it has only changed in form from that which our ancestors encountered’. The temporal ongoingness of her challenge to the implied chronology of postcolonialism is further complicated by Curthoys (2000, 32) who suggests that settler societies are both colonising and decolonising at the same time. In doing so, she points to the messy, ongoing and spatially differentiated nature of
colonising and decolonising processes. Ahmed (2000, 11) provides useful conceptual clarification,

‘For me, post-colonialism is about ... the complexity of the relationship between the past and the present, between the histories of European colonisation and contemporary forms of globalisation. That complexity cannot be reduced by either a notion that the present has broken from the past (a narrative that assumes that decolonisation meant the end of colonialism) or that the present is simply continuous with the past (a narrative that assumes colonialism is a trans-historical phenomenon that is not affected by local contexts or other forms of social change).’

Following this more abstract discussion of colonial (dis)continuities, I next examine how scholars have tied this conceptualisation to the everyday ways in which bodies inhabit spaces.

In an argument which stresses the iterative and processual basis of the relation between the past, present and future, Lester (2012, 1) emphasises that ‘...the postcolonial is not simply a matter of passive inheritance; not simply a legacy or continuity of the colonial past’ but rather,

‘Aspects of the colonial past are actively brought into the present by knowing and often unknowing agents following ... well-trodden routes, existing according to rhythms and routines worked out through colonial encounters. ... Where the impression of linear continuity from the past is created, it is the active performance of routine, rhythm and repetition, the active reconstruction of the categories of the West and the rest’.

In a complementary argument, developed in relation to British migrants in the postcolonial landscape of Hong Kong, Knowles (2005, 107) has argued,

‘Empire survives as a feeling of choice and opportunity, (divergent) forms of entitlement, facilitated by a (racialised) geography of routes already carved out and traversed by others ... [such colonial legacies] are actively sustained and reformulated by present activities: by the movement of bodies in space’.

In their understanding of the inheritance and reworking of the past, Knowles and Harper (2009, 19) see ‘past, present and future less as chronologically arranged than as intertwined around crucial practices which act as vectors’. An understanding of the everyday, emplaced ways in which colonising and decolonising processes are actively maintained and reworked shape the following analysis of participants’ understanding of Aotearoa New Zealand as ‘young’ and ‘isolated’, ‘the good life’ available there, notions of shared ancestry with Pākehā and encounters with indigenous and, what Veracini (2012) has called, ‘exogenous “Others”’ in settler societies.

When researching with British migrants in Auckland, Aotearoa New Zealand, the following questions emerged: what do the narratives and everyday lives of British migrants
tell us about privileged postcolonial migration? What do British migrants’ encounters tell us about the cultural and ethnic politics of sameness and difference in ex-British settler societies? What are the popular spatial and temporal imaginaries of Aotearoa New Zealand, and of the lifestyles available there for British migrants? How do British migrants understand their own migrancy, their compatriots, and that of others? I will address these questions in conversation with the concept of ‘the British World’ (Bridge and Fedorowich 2003), through an examination of the social status attached to integration and particular performances of Britishness and migrancy (O’Reilly 2000; Benson 2011), the colonial continuities of participants’ lifestyle pursuits (Fechter and Walsh 2012; Benson 2013) and ‘cultures of relatedness’ (Fenton 2010) with Pākehā. I also develop the concept of ‘the settler imaginary’ (Bell 2014) though an analysis of dominant modes of national belonging (Hage 1998) and attention to the heterogeneity and complexity of being together in difference in Auckland.

1.2 Outline of the thesis

Chapter two contextualises the cultural and ethnic dynamics of Aotearoa New Zealand and Auckland. First, I explore the colonial expansion of ‘the British World’ through emigration, and to Aotearoa New Zealand in particular, reflecting on the consequences and subsequent myths associated with settlers’ efforts to create a ‘better’ version of what they had left behind. Secondly, the chapter introduces the identities of Māori and Pākehā, both of which are a product of colonial encounter, although both, also, exceed that relationship (Bell 2014, 10). Thirdly, I address the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi between the British Crown and many Māori leaders, which is often framed as the nation’s founding document, and critically discuss efforts at redress for colonial injustices in the late twentieth and twenty-first century. Finally, I engage with the increasingly multi-ethnic and multi-cultural character of Auckland.

Chapter three engages with three intersecting imaginaries which emerged as significant to participants’ experiences. First, I examine the complexity of ‘British’ identities, before arguing for the significance of the expansive, colonial legacies of this in contemporary research with Britons. This discussion leads into a focused review of literature on British emigration. Next, the chapter addresses debates which have emerged in research with Britons in Australasia, which, I suggest, can be partly attributed to the ambiguity of settler societies which complicate the dichotomy between Europe and the rest of the world (Stasiulis and
Yuval-Davis 1995, 3). Secondly, I engage with the prominence of Arcadian myths attached to Aotearoa New Zealand for British settlers in the nineteenth and twentieth century and the way in which these are still recognisable in popular geocultural imaginaries of isolation, insignificance and an idealised rural notion of the ‘good life’. Finally, I critically engage with the concept of ‘the settler imaginary’ (Bell 2014) and the growing literature and debate to have emerged from ‘the settler colonial turn’ (Veracini 2015), in order to better explore the persistence of colonialism, tensions and complexity of research, in ex-British settler societies.

In chapter four I reflect upon the twelve-month qualitative research I undertook for this project and the process of writing up. First, I reflexively engage with my embodied positionality as a researcher in ‘the field’ and the dynamism of insider/outsider status. Secondly, I outline the characteristics of the participants involved and the process of recruitment, reflecting on potential limitations attendant to these. In the third section of the chapter, I outline the three main methods drawn upon and describe their development in situ. This includes a discussion of the process of conducting over eighty in-depth interviews and the ethical ambiguity of being overt/covert when listening to prejudicial opinions. I discuss the process of developing instructions for the photo-elicitation aspect of the project, the way I have incorporated images into the thesis and the greater appreciation of the everyday spatiality of participants’ lives that this method enabled. I also reflect on participant observation as a research method, the social landscape of ‘the British’ in Auckland and developing relationships with participants. Finally, I turn my attention to the process of analysis and writing, outlining an argument that the individual lives explored in this thesis are a window onto larger processes.

Chapter five is the first of the substantive chapters. It engages with participants’ popular temporal and spatial imaginaries of Auckland and Aotearoa New Zealand, and the lifestyles available there. First, the chapter outlines common tropes which emerged about ‘the good life’ among participants. The second section engages with a geographical imaginary related to many of these lifestyle attributes, which centred on being ‘isolated’ and distant from other places. I argue that this geographical imaginary reflects colonial continuities. Thirdly, the chapter engages with the suburban aspect of many participants’ residency patterns, and a popular dynamic which emerged between an idealised natural landscape and a notion of a ‘lack’ of culture and history. Fourthly, the chapter expands on the common understanding among participants of Aotearoa New Zealand as history-less, or ‘young’, and the erasure of a longer Māori presence associated with such understandings.
Chapter six engages with participants’ reflections on their migrancy, and that of their compatriots. The first section explores participants’ distancing of themselves from ‘the whingeing Pom’, a local term used to describe particular stereotypical characteristics associated with British migrants. Secondly, the chapter examines participants frequent professed reluctance to recreate British social and cultural environments, and introduces the figure of ‘the bad migrant’ who does not integrate. I suggest that the poor performances of migrancy and Britishness associated with this figure functioned to delimit an internal boundary among the British. In the third section, I explore the classed aspect of participants distancing of themselves from ‘the bad migrant’. Finally, I engage with the differences in meaning of signs of nationness between Britain’s constituent nations and when practiced ironically.

Chapter seven examines participants’ awareness of their national antecedents, and their relations with Pākehā and peoples with East Asian heritage, in order to critically examine hierarchies of belonging and otherness. First, I address the frequent travel between the countries, the significance of romantic connections formed with New Zealanders travelling in the UK and a common imagining of Aotearoa New Zealand as familiar and ‘exotic’. Secondly, I engage with participants’ experiences of familiar landscapes and the popular notion of shared ancestry with Pākehā. Thirdly, I consider the frequent reflection among participants that they were an ‘ordinary’ presence, both as a consequence of the significant number of British migrants and the racialised experience of being able to ‘blend in’. I contrast this sense of ordinariness with the concern, among a minority of participants, that there were ‘too many’ migrants from Asia, and the dominant mode of national belonging this revealed.

Chapter eight examines participants’ investment, or not, in what Bell (2014) has called ‘the settler imaginary’ through five key tropes. First, I examine the idea that biculturalism and colonial reparations unfairly privileged Māori and the desire for a singular national identity. Secondly, I analyse the way in which the adoption of a post-racial perspective and a preference for multiculturalism among participants, as an alternative to biculturalism, led to the inclusive erasure of indigenous peoples. Associated with the perspectives explored thus far, thirdly, I examine the popular notion of a historical break with settler colonialism, and the spatial dynamics of the undesirability of indigenous difference. In the fourth section I address the different experiences of the significant number of participants who were positive about biculturalism. Finally, I focus on the story of two participants whose perspectives are tentatively explored as alternative settler imaginaries.
Finally, chapter nine synthesises the key contributions from each chapter to address the questions raised above and makes recommendations for further research. In the first part of this chapter, I expand upon the usefulness of the concept of the ‘British World’ to illuminate participants’ experiences. In order to do so, I reflect on the classed figure of ‘the bad migrant’, the differences in the meaning of signs of nationness between Britain’s constituent nations and the potential for participants to hold a narrow understanding of their ‘host’ society. Next, I make a case for the importance of examining colonial traces in popular temporal and spatial imaginaries and notions of ‘the good life’ in settler societies for lifestyle migrants. Finally, I examine the process of making racial sameness with Pākehā through participants’ participation in ‘cultures of ancestry’. In the latter part of this chapter, I engage with the cultural and ethnic dynamics of ex-British settler societies. In this section, I argue that the idea among some participants that there are ‘too many’ of those ethnicised as ‘Asian’ and that biculturalism unfairly privileges Māori both reproduce the settler imaginary. In contrast, I next address participants’ enthusiasm for cultural and ethnic diversity and a bicultural mode of national belonging, but I warn that such positions can be related to a problematic reconciliatory understanding of difference. Lastly, I explore the possibility for alternative settler imaginaries.
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Chapter two. The ethno-cultural landscape of Auckland, Aotearoa New Zealand: contextualising British migrants

Introduction

In order to better situate the stories and everyday lives of British migrants explored in this thesis, this chapter provides a broad historical and contemporary overview of the cultural and ethnic landscape of Aotearoa New Zealand and, lastly, Auckland in particular. The chapter is divided into four parts. First, I trace colonial aspirations for Aotearoa New Zealand to be a ‘better Britain’. This focus leads to an exploration of racially motivated immigration policies, ecological imperialism and the circulation of a de-territorialised ‘Britishness’. Secondly, the chapter discusses identity formation of Māori, the indigenous peoples, and Pākehā, the dominant majority, their entanglement and some of the privileges of the latter group. Thirdly, I outline some of the consequences for Māori of British colonisation, officially initiated in the mid-nineteenth century with the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi. Followed by a discussion of efforts to redress colonial grievances and the implementation of biculturalism in the late twentieth century, in response to vigorous activism, as well as some criticisms of the bicultural process. Since immigration reforms in the 1980s Aotearoa New Zealand, but especially Auckland, has become an increasingly multi-ethnic and multi-cultural society. In the final section, I address some of the prominent cultural debates which have arisen recently in this context.

2.1 A ‘better Britain’: British colonialism and the ‘invention’ of (Aotearoa) New Zealand

It is estimated that 22.6 million left the British Isles between 1815 and 1914, in a period which saw ‘the expansion of Britain and the peopling and building of the trans-oceanic British world’ (Bridge and Fedorowich 2003, 4, 11). They were part of ‘a settler revolution’ (Belich 2009), mobilised by the opportunities opened up through Britain’s imperial expansion
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4 In this thesis, I use indigeneity ‘to refer to the particular status of peoples who occupied a territory at the time of colonisation and who retain historical, often tribally articulated, connections to place’ (Bell 2014, 8). This definition reflects the widely accepted international usage endorsed with the 2007 United Nations’ ratification of the Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples’ (ibid.).
and, for many, seeking to escape poverty, in an approach to emigration described by Johnson (1972) as ‘shovelling out paupers’. Of those who left Britain and Ireland between 1800 to 1950, only a tiny part, some 500,000, journeyed the 12,000 miles to what became Aotearoa New Zealand (Phillips and Hearn 2008, vi). In the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century explorers, missionaries and international traders in flax, timber, seals and whales arrived from across the globe, but from 1788 the relative proximity and vital role British Sydney played in trade meant a distinct British cultural presence developed (McClean 2012, 11).

Migrants from other places also arrived in Aotearoa New Zealand over the following years, with a few thousand people from Germany, Scandinavia, China and, from the turn of the century, Dalmatia (Phillips and Hearn 2008, 194). Although less overt than Australia’s infamous ‘White Australia Policy’, Aotearoa New Zealand introduced thirty-five acts between 1881 and 1920 to discourage migrants from countries in Asia making it, in practice, more strict (Spoonley and Meares 2011, 43). Such measures were enacted at the same time as the intentional recruitment, during times of prosperity in Aotearoa New Zealand, of white British migrants via assisted passage. This encouragement of, a particular kind of, British migration marked the beginning of an ‘imperial anachronism which shaped the foundation for immigration policy for the New Zealand government since colonisation up until the 1980s’ (Hutching 1999, 74). In fact, it was not until the 1987 Immigration Act that British immigrants, ‘became non New Zealanders in any ’real’ sense’ (Pearson 2000, 98), making the New Zealand government the last ex-British country in the Pacific Rim to remove national origin and kinship preference (Ward and Lin 2005, 156). Although, as Pearson (2013, 86) has noted, the language, education and skills requirements in recent immigration legislation still gives British migrants an advantage over many other nationalities.

Bell (2014) draws on Spivak’s (1985) concept of ‘worlding’ to describe ‘the joint processes of destruction and substitution by which colonists set out to transform the indigenous worlds they entered ... into their visions of a better version of the societies they had left’ (Bell 2014, 14). Through such processes, the frontier colony of Aotearoa New Zealand was recast as a ‘suitable, and suitably familiar, home for settlers’ (Barnes 2012, 5-6). Pound (2009) describes how,

‘In the seventeenth and eighteenth century, Europeans might be said quite literally to “discover” the country – if, that is, the previous Māori discovery be discounted. (It was.) By the nineteenth century, the Europeans were, in a sense, literally and physically “inventing” a New Zealand by replicating an England – making a landscape in their own
The ‘invention’ of Aotearoa New Zealand involved the transplantation of plants and animals (Crosby 1986; Dunlap 1999), the ecological consequences of which are still being felt, as well as, ‘an entire world of political, economic, legal and social institutions and practices’ (Bell 2014, 14).

In the nineteenth century, Britishness was constantly evoked and reiterated in Aotearoa New Zealand’s ambition to be ‘a better Britain of the Southern Seas’, ‘a Greater Britain’, and ‘a Britain under the Southern Cross’ (Barnes 2012, 5). ‘The construction of “Britishness” in New Zealand was a colonising act’, which, Barnes (2012, 5) goes on to argue, in different ways continued well into the twentieth century. Conradson and Latham (2007, 234), too, argue a strong connection with the UK was evident up until the mid-twentieth century. They note the significant trade between the two countries and the way in which the UK was still referred to, by the majority of New Zealanders with British ancestry, as ‘Home’. Belich (2001) has described Aotearoa New Zealand as the ‘most British’ outlier and has argued that until well into the twentieth century the majority of New Zealanders with cognate ancestry were at ease seeing themselves as ‘British’ as well as local. As a snapshot of public sentiment, the 1921 Census found that 99% of the 1.2 million population – excluding Māori – claimed British nationality (Census and Statistics Office 1921 cited by Grbic 2010, 126). Young’s (2008) deterritorialised understanding of British, or more specifically English, national identity complements Belich’s argument. Young argues that during the course of the nineteenth century Englishness, which he uses intentionally as a synonym for Britishness, was translated from the national identity of the territorially domestic English into a diasporic Anglo-Saxon identity which expanded beyond the nation’s geographical boundaries. For Young, Englishness was ‘less a set of cultural characteristics attached to a particular place’, than an export of a sensibility and set of values. In this way, Aotearoa New Zealand necessitates a postcolonial understanding of space which fundamentally challenges the ‘here’ and ‘there’ of different places, because ‘here’ has been formed and performed only through long interactions with ‘there’ (Mains et al. 2005). The way in which contemporary British migrants negotiate notions of shared ancestry and cultural affinities with Pākehā New Zealanders is explored and problematised in chapter seven.
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5 House.
6 See the New Zealand High Commissioner to the UK, Leask’s (2012), speech on ‘What counts in New Zealand’s links with Britain’ for a recent diplomatic articulation of lingering connections.
Following from the context outlined above, Thomson and Trlin (1970, 11 cited by Hutching 1999, 9) suggested that there was a common assumption that the British would ‘settle easily and almost imperceptibly into the host society’ as ‘[f]or them migration is more akin to a transfer from one to another branch of essentially the same culture’. However, research with post-war and more recent British migrants, a body of literature I expand upon in the literature review in chapter three, has resolutely troubled this assumption (Hutching 1999, 175; Pearson and Sedgwick 2010, 459; George and Fitzgerald 2011, 8). ‘The Listener’, a popular national magazine in Aotearoa New Zealand, ran a feature titled ‘A Nation of Pommy Knockers’ in 1973 which also challenged the idea of a smooth transition to Aotearoa New Zealand for British migrants. One quote from a British respondent said, ‘You feel that you’re a foreigner. There are supposed to be ties between New Zealand and the UK, but it feels more like an overseas posting’. Another pointed to the sometimes prickly reception for those arriving from ‘Home’, complaining that, ‘When they ask “What do you think of our country?” They’re really saying “Tell us how much you like our country”’ (Cape 1973, 9). This social friction was further revealed by a campaign in the 1970s called ‘bash a Pom a day’ run by a ‘shock jock’ DJ. The potential for resentment can be traced back to the earliest arrivals. Phillips and Hearn (2008, 159) suggest that colonial culture was not very sympathetic to newcomers who showed their ‘Old World’ roots too strongly, evidenced in a distinction drawn between an ‘old chum’ and a ‘new chum’ who was yet to have ‘the lime juice squeezed out’. Although usually less vividly realised, the delicacy of expressions of Britishness for contemporary British migrants is explored in chapter six, which unpacks participants’ reflections on their migrancy, and that of their compatriots, and a trope which emerged of ‘the bad migrant’ who does not integrate.

Although migration was clearly not without difficulty for British arrivals, part of Aotearoa New Zealand’s attraction in the nineteenth and early twentieth century was a prevalent myth of classlessness (King 2003). While regionally and temporally uneven, there is historical evidence that Aotearoa New Zealand compared favourably to Britain in terms of social mobility, residential and occupational segregation, and distributions of material wealth and income, for white, British men at least (Pearson and Thorns 1983; Bell 1996, 5). Granting that there were differences in wealth, occupation, property ownership and culture in colonial Aotearoa New Zealand, for the historian Phillips (2012a, 3), ‘it is difficult to argue for the existence of tightly demarcated classes’. In the mid twentieth century, Aotearoa New Zealand was one of the more equal societies among ‘developed’, non-Soviet countries with one of the lowest, or indeed the lowest, concentrations of incomes (Rashbrooke 2013). This context of relative equality contextualises prominent historian Sinclair’s suggestion in 1959 that, while
Aotearoa New Zealand was not classless, ‘[i]t must be more nearly classless, however, than any other society in the world. Some people are richer than others, but wealth carries no great prestige and no prerogative of leadership’ (p. 276).

However, labour historian Nolan (2007, 127) has complicated this history of equality in Aotearoa New Zealand as a ‘rich amalgam of truth and myth’. Social class is only one part of the way society is divided. The persistent social and economic marginalisation of Māori (Hokowhitu 2004, 267), who besides which have their own social systems, women (James and Saville-Smith, 1994) and some migrant and minority ethnic groups, has been argued to have obscured the primacy of class divisions in everyday lives (Phillips 2012b, 1; Pearson 2013, 83). Since the 1970s, there has been a marked rise in socio-economic inequality in Aotearoa New Zealand (Rashbrooke 2013), such that visible distinctions in income, employment, housing, and health, for example, are more evident. Pearson (2013, 84) questions whether such trends have marked a substantive rise in class consciousness for New Zealanders. The complexity of class distinction in contemporary Pākehā society appears in subtle ways. For example, schools, which are sorted into a hierarchy of ‘deciles’ according to broad socioeconomic factors, are viewed as one prominent influence and mark of social position (Phillips 2012c, 7). A changed socio-economic landscape was commented on by participants in relation to social mobility and flattened social hierarchies, as I will discuss in chapter five. However, in terms of local social divisions, ethnicised experiences of sameness and difference take on a more prominent role in my analysis, as these emerged as more significant during the research process.

2.2 Becoming Māori and Pākehā

The first arrivals to what is now Aotearoa New Zealand probably came from Eastern Polynesia sometime between 800 and 900 AD (Walker 1990, 28), where they found ‘a prolific, archaic environment, until then completely undisturbed by human beings’ (Salmond 1992, 31). European explorers were not to ‘discover’ the islands until Abel Tasman passed by in 1642, and it was another 120 years until Captain James Cook arrived in 1769 and circumnavigated them in The Endeavour.

Māori roughly translates as ordinary, and its origins as an identity can be traced back to the early nineteenth century as a way to distinguish between new arrivals and the indigenous population (Poata-Smith 2013). Salmond (2012, 132) outlines some of the dynamism of self-identification for contemporary Māori,
‘Many Māori now live in other countries, and relatively few now speak te reo, the Māori language, they play rugby and netball, have Play Stations and cell phones, practice various professions, run successful businesses, write novels and make films enjoyed around the world, and sing opera on the world stage. Some have abandoned tikanga7 or never knew these ways of being, while others adopt some tikanga later in life’.

There are long histories of relationships between Māori, Pākehā and other ethnic groups, and consequently many possible affiliations along ethnic, cultural and tribal lines. As Brandt (2013, 79) says, ‘[i]t is not uncommon for a person to state that he or she is of, for instance, Ngāti Porou and Tainui, or Ngāti Hine and Scottish descent’ (see also: Callister 2004; Bell 2006, 258). Smith (2013) has described the history of Pākehā and Māori relationships as entangled and messy such that they defy the drawing of a clean line down the middle8. In an earlier publication, she expanded on some of the complexity of this entanglement,

‘People now live in a world which is fragmented with multiple and shifting identities, the oppressed and the colonised are so deeply implicated in their own oppressions that they are no more or less authentic than anyone else’. (Smith 1999, 97)

In chapter three, I expand on some of the debates to have arisen with regards to settler-indigenous relations, and the binary attendant to this conceptualisation. I turn now to Pākehā identification.

Another product of first encounters of Māori with Europeans, Pākehā is a Māori term which probably came from the word pakepakeha which denoted mythical light-skinned beings (King 2003, 169). Pākehā tends to refer to New Zealanders of British or European descent (Smits 2010, 71), although more recently it has been used to refer to white people or sometimes non-Māori people in Aotearoa New Zealand (Chung 2015). Rather than an ethnic group, Pearson (1989) has argued that Pākehā conveys a more abstract and nebulous ethnic category. In the 1990s, Pākehā identities became a popular topic of interest in response to what has been called the Māori Renaissance, examined in the next section, and as a way of drawing a distinction from Britain in a context of attenuating links (see, for example: King 1985; Spoonley 1991). The political connotations of claiming this identity are much disputed. Spoonley (1995) has argued self-identification as Pākehā could reflect a desire to claim a firmer Pacific identity and support for the decolonising process. Pearson (2000) notes that some refuse the label Pākehā because of an (unfounded) belief it is an insulting term, or in resistance to an identity which posits greater distance from Europe or Britain, and/or proximity to Māori (p. 104). In Brandt’s (2013) contribution to this debate, she notes that some Pākehā choose to
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7 Māori customs or traditions.
8 For personal academic reflections on such family histories by Māori scholars, in relation to British ancestry in particular, see Mutu and Husband (2015) and Tapsell (2015).
refer to their respective European ancestry (for example, Irish or German) or just call themselves New Zealanders, a category which is equally controversial (p. 79). Alternatively, Matthewman and Hoey (2007) have questioned whether the adoption of the label Pākehā may reflect a wish to distance oneself from the misdeeds of British colonial powers and to assert a right to be ‘in place’ in the nation.

Although the meaning and act of identifying as Pākehā, or not, remains contested, the connection of privilege to whiteness is more clear. Following Ahmed’s (2007, 154) suggestion that whiteness is ‘an orientation that puts certain things within reach’, Gray et al. (2013) have argued that British colonisation in Aotearoa New Zealand produced a society in which white people have the capacity to attain certain advantages more easily than those who are not white. As examples of such privilege they list: a tendency for a higher educational status (Ministry of Education 2011); a longer life expectancy (Statistics New Zealand 2009); a greater likelihood of owning your own home (DTZ NZ 2007); a lower likelihood of being arrested or convicted of a crime and, if you are convicted, a considerably smaller likelihood of receiving a custodial sentence (Department of Corrections 2007). Racialised privileges shape the ability of many participants to achieve ‘the good life’ outlined in chapter five, and can be related to the tendency to feel ‘ordinary’ and able to ‘blend in’ which is addressed in chapter seven, where I critically examine the unequal distribution of national belonging in Aotearoa New Zealand.

2.3 The Treaty of Waitangi and biculturalism

British colonisation of Aotearoa New Zealand was officially initiated with the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi between the representative of the British Crown, Captain William Hobson, and many, but not all, Māori leaders in 1840 (Orange 2011). There were several versions of this Treaty, Hobson signed a version in English; whereas most Māori signed the versions in te reo, the Māori language. A popular understanding of the Treaty among Māori at the time is reflected in the oft-quoted speech by chief Pana-karaeo, in which he said ‘The shadow of the land goes to Queen Victoria, but the substance remains with us’ (Schwimmer 1966, 107). However, there were crucial differences in translation between the different versions of the Treaty. The most significant relates to the ceding of sovereignty to the British Crown, which is made clear in the English version, but in te reo versions was translated as kāwanatanga, a term that conveys the less significant meaning of governorship (King 2003, 160). The varied meanings and interpretations of the Treaty are the source of ongoing public
debate. For a recent example, the Waitangi Tribunal recently confirmed in the Ngāpuhi claim that they did not cede sovereignty in the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi (Kenny 2014).

Fleras and Spoonley (1999) describe the period between 1860 to 1960 as ‘a century of assimilation’. From the signing of the Treaty, Māori had *de jure* if not always *de facto* status of first British and then New Zealand citizenship, and acquired political rights including four set-aside seats in parliament and the enfranchisement of Māori men in 1867 (King 2003, 241). However, such representation has been criticized as tokenism, as at the time the Māori population meant they were entitled to twenty seats (Walker 1990, 144). The arrival of alcohol, new infectious diseases and muskets led to dramatic population decline among Māori, so that by 1840 their population had already decreased by approximately forty per cent (Walker 1990, 80). But Walker (1990, 136), a prominent Māori scholar, has argued that the Native Land Courts, established in 1862, had ‘the most destructive and alienating effect on Māori people’ (p. 136). The Court had the purpose of transforming communally held land under customary title into individual title recognizable in British law and was instrumental in transferring large swathes of land out of Māori hands. By the end of the nineteenth century, Māori were reduced to a minority at only ten per cent of the country’s population and their remaining land reduced to only seventeen per cent (King 2003, 258).

Through the 1960s to the 1980s Aotearoa New Zealand saw a renewed assertion of indigenous politics where Māori and some Pākehā activists challenged the long-standing understanding first expressed by Captain William Hobson at the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi, ‘we are all one people now’ (Harris 2004; Hill 2010). Their struggle was echoed in a more widespread ‘crisis of legitimacy’ for paternalistic liberal governance (Povinelli 2011), but in Aotearoa New Zealand found focus around the Treaty. In response to extended protest, a commitment to biculturalism has shaped government practice since the late 1980s (Fleras and Spoonley 1999, 236). This model casts Māori and Pākehā as the two founding peoples and equal partners. However, Bell (2008, 852) has argued ‘the reality lags behind the rhetoric’ and a Pākehā backlash against ‘special rights’ for Māori has gained political traction more recently.

Brandt (2013, 84, drawing on Schwimmer 1968) defines biculturalism, in opposition to assimilation, as the full economic and political inclusion of Māori into society while simultaneously maintaining different forms of Māori organisations. Biculturalism mostly takes the form of accommodation through, ‘reforming state institutions, policies and regulations so
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9 I have not used the term ‘native’ unless naming an institution or quoting someone directly, instead using the terms indigenous peoples or Māori, because in the context of Aotearoa New Zealand the former term has been criticised as offensive (Pihama 1997).
that they include greater participation by Māori people, as well as Māori concerns, forms of expression and cultural practices’ (Smits 2010, 68). The call for ongoing attention to the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi in the State Owned Enterprises Act of 1986 has been interpreted as a \textit{de facto} upgrading of the Treaty into something constitutionally binding (Veracini 2001, 13). However, biculturalism’s association with the much disputed Treaty principles also points to the difficulty of defining it (Fleras and Spoonley 1999, 6). Partly because of its success and prevalence in political and public life, biculturalism has been described as ‘a rather diffuse and ambiguous term referring to a variety of meanings and discussions that also change over time’ (Brandt 2013, 84). Bicultural goals range from the inclusion of Māori values and perspectives into institutions, their more active involvement within existing institutions, to the development of parallel Māori institutions, and from the celebration of differences to improve ‘race’ relations, the reduction of socioeconomic inequalities, to the creation of relatively autonomous patterns of Māori self-determination (Fleras and Spoonley 1999, 238). Fleras and Spoonley (1999) have positioned such approaches along a continuum: from ‘soft’ biculturalism which merely celebrates Māori culture, through ‘moderate’, ‘inclusive’ and ‘strong’ with increasing efforts at the redistribution of resources and power, to ‘hard’ biculturalism, which aims for tino rangitiratanga, or Māori sovereignty (p. 238).

A central development of the bicultural process was the establishment of the Waitangi Tribunal in 1975. Made retrospective to 1840 from 1985, the Tribunal was tasked to investigate Crown actions which violate the spirit of the Treaty and to make recommendations to the government for appropriate settlement of Māori grievances. Belgrave (2005, 1) has argued that the Waitangi Tribunal is by far the most comprehensive and extensive review of a country’s colonial legacy in existence. It has been described by the UN Special Rapporteur on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples as one of the most important examples in the world of an effort to address historical and ongoing grievances of indigenous people, and has committed over one billion dollars through settlements (Anaya 2011). However, the Tribunal process has its critics, for instance, Smith (2007, 350) has criticised the way in which the market place has become the site where, ‘indigenous peoples, communities, knowledges and identities are contested as if they are simply commodities of culture and legacies of the past’. In addition, Kelsey (1990, 234-45) has argued that the Tribunal process channelled the energy of claims for recognition of the right to full political self-determination into a cumbersome, expensive and largely ineffectual apparatus that legitimised the government’s supreme authority without placing any obligation on it to act. As ambivalent as some of the consequences of the Tribunal
are, the process has raised awareness of settler colonial histories among non-indigenous peoples in Aotearoa New Zealand in what Veracini (2001) has called ‘a historiographical revolution’ (p. 29). For instance, at the end of the 1980s, copies of Claudia Orange’s revisionist and intellectually demanding book on the Treaty of Waitangi were sold at a popularity previously only reached by rugby memoirs (Phillips 1990, 128).

Biculturalism has been connected with efforts at cultural recognition for Māori. For instance, in 1987 te reo was acknowledged as an official language, Māori Television has been on air since 2004 and Māori ceremonial occasions are recognised when considering requests for leave from state employees. As well as greater inclusion of Māori values and cultural practices in existing state institutions, there has been a move to devolve service provision to Māori organisations (Smits 2011, 97). In education, for example, as well as the inclusion of Māori history and culture in the national curriculum, Māori groups have set up state-funded pre-schools and primary schools, run by local communities which deliver education in te reo and from a Māori perspective (Smits 2010, 97, 69). However, as with the Waitangi Tribunal, such processes have attracted criticism. In terms of the devolution of services, Fleras and Spoonley (1999, 239) have condemned the way in which this was done ‘on the cheap’ so that service providers were sometimes given administrative responsibility, but without corresponding power or resources.

More broadly, Fleras and Spoonley (1999, 239) criticise the way in which, rather than ‘power-sharing through structural adjustments, biculturalism tends to lead to institutional accommodation by incorporating a Māori dimension into state practice and national symbols’. What Fleras (2009, 140) has called the ‘multiculturalisation of biculturalism’ marks a shift towards a depoliticised form of institutional accommodation and cultural recognition, and away from a redistribution of resources. As Johnson (2010) has argued,

‘Without a strong commitment to Māori self-determination and an honest reworking of colonial institutions, biculturalism ends up as little more than a revamped multiculturalism with a particularly “Polynesian twang”’. (p. 281)

Such trends can be connected with what Yúdice (2003, 23) has suggested is a global trend in which culture, ‘is invoked to solve problems that previously were the province of economics and politics’. This cultural turn has popular appeal in Aotearoa New Zealand. Sibley and Liu (2004), for instance, found a stark discrepancy between Pākehā support for ‘symbolic’ and opposition to ‘resource-based biculturalism’. Yet the latter is of particular importance as, despite improvement in many areas, society is still stratified along colonial lines (McIntosh 2011). For instance, Māori life expectancy is considerably shorter than that of Pākehā (Kukutai
2011) and Māori children are twice as likely as Pākehā children to live in poverty (Cram 2011). As Cram (2011) put it, ‘The legacy of colonisation is the differential distribution of social, political, environmental and economic resources and wellbeing within this country’ (p. 250).

In many ways, the institutional mainstreaming of biculturalism makes Aotearoa New Zealand a unique context in which to consider the way the past relates to the present for contemporary British migrants as it means colonial legacies are debated in the public sphere. This section contextualises, in particular, chapter eight, which addresses participants’ responses to biculturalism, Māori and indigenous politics. However, ethnic and cultural differences in Aotearoa New Zealand extend beyond Pākehā and Māori, the predominant focus of this chapter so far, as I will discuss next.

2.4 Auckland and its shifting ethnic and cultural landscapes

Brooking and Rabel (1995, 36) have claimed that Aotearoa New Zealand was one of the most ethnically homogenous white settler societies up till the end of World War Two. From the 1950s, migrants began to arrive from the Pacific, especially to Auckland, to fill labour shortages in expanding, low-wage manufacturing sectors (Macpherson 2004). Their migration to Auckland was paralleled by mass rural to urban migration by Māori. In the decade before World War Two, most Māori lived in rural communities, but the following decades saw a rural exodus which means that today the vast majority, eighty-five per cent, live in urban areas (Kukutai 2011, 42). During the same period as Aotearoa New Zealand ushered in a bicultural era, changes to immigration policy in the 1970s and 1980s radically diversified migration streams. As a consequence of this shift, between the Censuses of 1991 and 2013, the population of those who identified with at least one Asian ethnicity grew by four times (Simon-Kumar 2014, 10). The introduction in 2006 of the new Census category ‘Middle Eastern, Latin American and African’ further illustrates an increasing ethnic diversification. In Aotearoa New Zealand’s 2013 Census, seventy-four per cent of people identified with at least one European ethnicity, fifteen per cent with Māori, twelve per cent with Asian and seven per cent with Pasifika (Statistics New Zealand 2013b). However, Auckland, as the gateway city, has seen a
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10 Although Phillips and Hearn (2008, 14-15) have criticised the notion of ethnic ‘homogeneity’ among British arrivals.

11 The label ‘Asian’ is problematic as it masks broad internal diversity and expands over a huge geographical spread (Bedford and Ho 2008; Butcher 2008); as does the label Pasifika (Macpherson 2004, 135), a term which refers to Pacific Islanders living in Aotearoa New Zealand.
more marked demographic shift over the last few decades, in the 2013 Census just fifty-nine per cent identified with at least one European ethnicity, eleven per cent with Māori, twenty-three per cent with Asian and fifteen per cent with Pasifika (Statistics New Zealand 2013c).

The immigration reforms introduced in 1987 favoured ‘skills’ and wealth, in what has been described by Simon-Kumar (2014) as a shift from ‘race’ to class as the basis for desirable migrants. In a discussion of migration policy in Aotearoa New Zealand in the new century, Simon-Kumar (2014, 14) has outlined a contemporary ‘desirable high-income migrant’ who is ‘globally mobile, flexible and cosmopolitan’ and for whom racial difference is ‘less significant than the growing shared “global” culture of consumption’. Since the late twentieth century, Aotearoa New Zealand has been among the top migrant-receiving countries in the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, and the highest in terms of per capita population (Bedford and Ho 2006). This trend is particularly evident in Auckland, where overseas-born now make up forty per cent of the city’s population (Spoonley and Bedford 2012, 13). In chapter seven, I examine the perspective of the minority of participants who were concerned about ‘too many’ migrants from countries in Asia and, more broadly, what relations with those who appeared to have East Asian heritage revealed about participants’ assumptions with regards to dominant modes of national belonging. In chapter eight I explore, and partly problematise, the more prevalent perspectives of those who were enthusiastic about the city’s increasingly multicultural identity.

Despite an increasingly ethnically and culturally diverse population, Aotearoa New Zealand has not established a coherent multicultural policy (Spoonley and Meares 2011, 55). Spoonley and Meares (2001) argue that investment has been focused on recruiting ‘human capital’ globally, but the settlement of immigrants is left to their own agency, in a sort of ‘laissez-faire multiculturalism’. At a national level, the Office of Ethnic Communities was introduced in 2001, which works ‘to promote the benefits of ethnic diversity to develop prosperity for every New Zealander’ (Office of Ethnic Communities, 2016), and the Human Rights Commission’s Diversity Action Programme was established in 2004 after the desecration of two Jewish cemeteries in Wellington (Human Rights Commission, 2016). In Auckland, support is left to particular agencies, for instance, the Auckland Regional Migrant Service and those responsible for its implementation, such as the Auckland Chamber of Commerce and Omega (Spoonley and Meares 2011, 59). The current rather ad hoc approach has led Hiebert, Collins and Spoonley (2003, 17) to describe multiculturalism in Aotearoa New Zealand as ‘ambiguous and ill-formed’. Fleras (2009, 134) has argued compellingly that ‘much of what passes for New Zealand multiculturalism does not involve major public resources, does little to
make Pākehā uncomfortable, and puts the onus on minority communities to preserve their identity and culture’.

In contrast to the apparently linear structure of this chapter, I want to distance myself from a common narrative which assumes that multiculturalism will eventually succeed biculturalism, with the latter understood as finite rather than an ongoing process (Goldsmith 2003, 285). For an example of this chronology, Grbic (2010, 143) has described a ‘transition from a nostalgic Anglo-colonial identity, to a post-colonial biculturalism in the 1980s then to an emergent, but weak, multicultural identity’. Biculturalism, at the time it emerged, as mentioned earlier, was a way of resolving the crisis of paternalistic liberal governance in the face of demands for indigenous political inclusion. However, the fixed terms it operates through are unable to cope with the fluidity of identities in contemporary Aotearoa New Zealand (Smith 2007). Moreover, the exclusion of Pasifika and Asian groups, who are some of the most socioeconomically marginalised and racially excluded groups respectively, within the bicultural framework has come under criticism (Kobayashi and de Leeuw 2010; Chung 2015). However, in turn, scholars and activists have expressed concern that while multiculturalism as a policy might pay homage to ethnic and cultural diversity and tolerance, it is not often associated with a substantive redistribution of resources and an effective anti-racist, anti-colonialist politics; whereas biculturalism has been (Larner and Spoonley 1995, 52). But the Treaty of Waitangi and its associated politics are not static. Reeves (2004) has described it as ‘an embryo rather than a fully developed set of ideas’ meaning that ‘the significance of the Treaty unfolds as each generation faces its issues’ (cited by Ip and Pang 2005, 186). Following from this argument, Ip and Pang (2005) argue that to expand the notion of what a New Zealander is does not necessarily mean the weakening of a Treaty-based nation. Through attention to the nuance of British migrants’ belonging and dislocation, and their experiences of sameness and difference in Auckland, this thesis aims to contribute to a broader conversation about living together in difference in settler societies.

Conclusion

For migrants, ‘[a]rriving in a new place means joining up with, somehow linking into, the collection of interwoven stories of which that place is made’ (Massey 2005, 119). This chapter has addressed the socio-historical processes which have shaped contemporary ethnic and cultural politics in Aotearoa New Zealand. First, it engaged with the British colonisation of
Aotearoa New Zealand and the desire to create a ‘better Britain’ through the transformation of ecological, political, social and cultural ways of life. These changes were accompanied by demographic state-building, via the racist exclusion of ‘Asian’ migrants and the encouragement of white British arrivals through assisted passage. I outlined the mobility of ‘Anglo-Saxonness’, ‘Britishness’ or ‘Englishness’, as a diasporic cultural identity in nineteenth and early twentieth century Aotearoa New Zealand. However, rather than a smooth transition between similar national cultures, I discussed the possibility of a difficult reception among Pākehā locals for British arrivals. British migrants have played a significant and problematic role in the ‘stories-so-far’ (Massey 2005) which make up Aotearoa New Zealand. This section contextualises chapters six and seven, in particular, in which I explore some of the ambiguities attendant to this history of involvement. In the next chapter, I will expand on the blurred boundaries of Britishness further through attention to the difference between Britain’s constituent nations, and unpack in greater detail Arcadian aspirations associated with migrating to Aotearoa New Zealand.

In the second section, I expanded on the identities of Māori and Pākehā, their entanglements and some of the debates in contemporary research about the meanings of the refusal or adoption of the latter label. Through attention to some of the privileges attendant to whiteness relative to Māori in contemporary Aotearoa New Zealand, this section situates the achievement of ‘the good life’ and national belonging reflected on by participants in chapters five and seven respectively. In the third section, I documented some of the consequences of colonisation for Māori, officially initiated with the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi. The Treaty provided a focal point for activism and is central to contemporary decolonial politics. I introduced some of the forms which bicultural policies take and the Waitangi Tribunal, as well as some criticisms of these processes. In particular, this discussion provides an important context for chapter eight, which addresses participants’ reflections on biculturalism directly.

The cultures and ethnicities which make up Aotearoa New Zealand have historically, and now increasingly, expand beyond Pākehā and Māori, as the fourth and final section makes clear. Following the 1980s immigration reforms, while still significant, British arrivals are now ‘one stream among several’ (Constantine 2003, 27), and the particular ethno-cultural landscape of Auckland provided the context for a concluding discussion of the place of the Treaty in contemporary Aotearoa New Zealand. This final section provided a broader context to chapters seven and eight, which examine participants’ perceptions of multiculturalism and their relations with those who appear to have East Asian heritage. In the following chapter, I will expand on the complexities of conceptualising ethnic difference in settler societies.
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Chapter three. Collective imaginaries: Britishness, the Arcadian ‘good life’ and settler societies

Introduction

Three sets of co-existing imaginaries emerged as significant when researching with British migrants in Aotearoa New Zealand, which shape the content of the following chapter. First, ‘Britishness’ as an ‘imagined community’ (Anderson 1983) and identity which is generated through mundane, everyday practices (Edensor 2002), secondly, the imaginations of other places and the lifestyles available there (Benson and O’Reilly 2009; O’Reilly and Benson 2009) and, finally, what Bell (2014) has called ‘the settler imaginary’. Before I introduce the chapter further, I want to more clearly articulate how I draw on the concept of imaginaries.

‘The imaginary’ is a term increasingly used as a way to talk about ‘shared mental life’ and ‘compelling, widely shared, historically durable meanings’ which is less ‘redolent of Otherness, fixity and homogeneity’ than terms such as culture and cultural beliefs (Strauss 2006, 322, 326). However, Strauss (2006, 323) has called for a focus on people’s imaginaries rather than ‘reifying societies as entities that can imagine’ and, in doing so, as well as the mapping of repetitive, shared patterns, to leave space for contestation. Moreover, Strauss (2006) stresses that cultures are not necessarily held in common by a geographically bounded or self-identified groups. By centralising the imaginaries of real people, she argues, research may counter the tendency to see imaginaries as more homogeneous or fixed than they are. In a complementary argument, O’Reilly (2014a, 211) has argued that the concept of ‘the social imaginary’ has the tendency to become what Billig (2013) has termed a ‘noun phrase’, which describes the way in which imprecise jargon reifies complexes of things while discounting people and actions. When drawing on the concept of the social imaginary/imaginaries in relation to lifestyle migrants, O’Reilly (2014a, 211, 213) separates out the level of ‘grand ideas, distant structures, sweeping changes, discourses and significations, that pre-exist given agents’ from ‘the daily practices of different agents’ who are situated in specific cultural communities. She understands,

‘...social imaginaries as something people do (a verb, people acting based on how they have been shaped by their class background, for example) as well as something that exists externally (a class based social imaginary, for example)’. (O’Reilly 2014a, 230)

This approach allows research to be more specific and more closely aligned with this social actor in this time and place, but to allow also for the durability and collectivity of
established social imaginaries (see also: Benson 2012). In the substantive chapters, I plot shared imaginaries which recurred among participants, with regards to Britishness and migrancy, ‘the good life’ available in Aotearoa New Zealand and sameness and difference, but strive to remain sensitive to the specificity and heterogeneity of participants’ investments in such imaginaries.

With regards to Britishness, this review of literature engages, first, with the differences in national identities between its constituent nations, which is an aspect of participants’ experience which runs throughout many of the substantive chapters in the thesis. I emphasise the significance of imperial histories when considering Britishness and, as Ware (2007, 4) put it, its ‘heavy global baggage’. I then follow Britons out into the wider world through the now burgeoning literature on their emigration. This focused review looks, first, at research with Britons who pursue ‘the good life’ in European destinations, where privilege tends to fall along the axes of class (see, for example: O’Reilly 2000; Bott 2004; Oliver 2007; Oliver and O’Reilly 2010; Benson 2011), and, secondly, at research with British migrants in formerly colonised or ‘developing’ countries, which often frames such experiences through a lens informed by postcolonialism and critical ‘race’ theory (see, for example: Yeoh and Willis 2005; Fechter 2007; Harper and Knowles 2009; Leonard 2010a; Walsh 2010).

Although these sets of literature bleed into one another, this artificial arrangement is one way to helpfully organise the discussion, and usefully highlights the ambiguity of ex-British settler societies as both formerly colonising and colonised spaces. The specificity of this context frames a debate I outline which has emerged in Australia and Aotearoa New Zealand about the position of British migrants. One side of the debate, in brief, stresses the potential of dislocation and alienation for British migrants migrating to Australasia and, more recently, understands their migration as one of individualistic lifestyle consumption. The other position stresses the context of indigenous dispossession and the privileges of whiteness for British arrivals and, from a different theoretical angle, the relative ease of integration of British migrants. I try to include the nuance demanded by the first approach as well as the critical insight offered by the latter. Attention to the ambiguity of British migrants’ position in an ex-British settler society is a consistent theme throughout the thesis.

Section 3.2 examines the historical development of imaginaries of an Arcadian ‘good life’ in Aotearoa New Zealand, which has been associated with the rejection of the supposed corruption of the city, an ongoing idealisation of rurality and the development of ‘profoundly suburban cities’ (Latham 2000, 285). I argue that the wide-spread geo-cultural imagining of
Aotearoa New Zealand as ‘isolated’ and ‘peripheral’ can be traced to colonial understandings of space, an urban-hinterland dynamic which developed between London, England in the twentieth-century and contemporary place-marketing by tourist industries. Through attention to these broader historical and social processes which have shaped contemporary visions of ‘the good life’ and place in this context, I strengthen an argument developed in chapter five that British migrants’ lifestyle aspirations and their spatial and temporal imaginaries of Aotearoa New Zealand reflect colonial continuities.

Thirdly, the chapter engages with the notion of ‘the settler imaginary’, which I engage with through situating this concept within the expanding, interdisciplinary literature to emerge from the ‘settler colonial turn’ (Veracini 2015). This scholarly field has made important conceptual and political contributions, but has also attracted vigorous criticism, for instance, for positing totalising explanations, reinforcing settler over indigenous voices and its reliance on a binary understanding of settler-indigenous relations. I navigate a position which retains the dynamism and situated aspect of identities, but stresses the ongoing implications of non-indigenous peoples in settler processes. Through addressing the debates to have emerged from these concerns, I deepen my theoretical engagement with the landscape of ethnic and cultural difference in Aotearoa New Zealand. This section develops the theoretical premise of chapters seven and eight, which examine the relations of British migrants with indigenous and, following Veracini (2012), ‘exogenous “Others”’.

3.1 The ‘fuzzy frontier’ of Britishness and its constituent nations

‘The shape and edges of British identity are ... historically changing, often vague and to a degree, malleable – an aspect of the British identity I have called a “fuzzy frontier”’. (Cohen 1995, 35)

Anderson (1983, 15) famously argued that, with the possible exception of what he calls ‘primordial villages’, human communities are imagined entities in which people ‘will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion’. ‘Communities are distinguished’, he suggests, ‘not by their falsity/genuineness, but by the style in which they are imagined’ (ibid.). In terms of how one might imagine ‘Britishness’, Ward (2004, 3) has defined it as ‘what people mean when they identify themselves individually and collectively as “being British”’. His is a radically open
and inclusive approach, if somewhat tautological, which usefully allows for the ‘inconsistencies, contradictions and flexibility of daily identity formation’ (*ibid.*). In chapter two, I have already discussed some of the ‘fuzziness’ of this expansive identity as it expanded through empire. In this section, I want to unpack the ‘fuzzy frontier’ between Britain’s constituent nations, before returning to a discussion of the importance of considering Britain’s imperial legacies.

As ‘four nations and one’ (Kearney 1991, 4) there are heterogeneous meanings attached to national identity and patriotism within Britain’s constituent nations. For instance, Williams (2005, 14) speaks of an ‘affective borderland’ for some Welsh nationals between England, and a persistent, if minority, adoption of a position of victimhood in relation to an English oppressor (see also: Jones 1992; Williams 1995). Condor and Abell (2006) also address a distinction from English national identities in their study, but this time for the Scottish. They found a romanticised patriotism was easier to distance from negative associations to do with the British Empire for Scottish nationals, than it was for the English (see also: Kiely, McCrone and Bechoffer 2005). Once an imperial nationalism with a global civilising mission, post-empire Englishness has been cast as a national identity that has lost its way (Kumar 2000, 577). In post-devolution Britain, celebrations of Welshness, Scottishness and Irishness were viewed enviously by the English participants in Clark, Garner and Gilmour’s (2009, 129) study. Many felt that the St. George Cross and Union Jack have become symbols linked to the political right, and were concerned that celebrating Britain and England’s past, with its imperial associations, may cause offence. Condor (2000) also found a significant group of English respondents were uneasy and embarrassed about expressing what was perceived to be a potentially prejudiced interest in their nationality. In fact, for these respondents, patriotism was equated as tantamount to racism. Finally, Fenton (2007), in his project on young English adults’ national sentiment, highlights the importance of including casual indifference, anti-nationalist disregard or even a cosmopolitan ‘citizen of the world’ approach when researching national identity (see also: Fenton 2008; Fenton and Mann 2011).

In this thesis, I have focused on ‘the British’, rather than one of its constituent nations, and in doing so allowed space to focus on both commonalities and differences across experiences within this broader parameter. Langlands (1999, 63) has conceptualised Britishness as an ‘added value’ and a secondary form of national consciousness, varying in felt intensity according to context (Langlands 1999, 63). While she concedes that British institutions and public life were largely constructed in English terms, Langlands suggests that participation in them by other nationals does not necessarily conflict with their other
identifications (p. 63). Moreover, although many English nationals tend to conflate the two, Langlands challenges the idea ‘that Britishness is just Englishness writ large’. Instead, she argues, ‘a considerable measure of accommodation, cultural fusion and social intermingling’ means the English have been ‘Britonised’ such that the distinction of England from Britain is ‘fuzzier’ than it might be for Scottish and Welsh nationals (p. 63). For many Britons, as Colley (1992, 6) put it, ‘[i]dentities are not like hats. Human beings can put on several at a time’. I am aware that a focus on ‘the British’ conceals former colonial relationships, but I adopt this approach in recognition that national identity and its ‘Others’ in Britain were, to a significant extent, shaped through imperial expansion, and thus contemporary Britishness merits critical attention (Colley 1992; Knowles 2012, 166).

As indicated in the various studies of national identity for English, Scottish and Welsh nationals discussed above, part of the complexity of Britishness is to do with its imperial legacies. Gilroy (2004) has argued contemporary Britain has been characterised by a collective amnesia about the empire and its history of violent colonial conquest (see also: Schwarz 2011). ‘The theme of empire’ remains a rich seam to be explored in future research with Britons (Clarke and Garner 2011, 59), in particular with regards to ‘how the colonial past provides material for contemporary actors’ understanding of difference’ (Garner 2006, 259 cited by Rogaly and Taylor 2010, 1337). ‘In our own times’, as Schwarz (2011, 205) has put it, ‘the compulsion still remains to live out, in new ways … old ethnic forms’. A point clearly articulated by Hall (2001, 39) who outlines the importance of ongoing reflection on Britain’s imperial past,

‘Imperial identities, made over centuries, are not easy to unravel. They live on in renewed forms in the postcolonial moment. The long history of representations of Irish, African-Caribbean, and South Asian peoples, or Māori and of white settlers, inflect the ways in which race is lived in twenty-first century Britain. This history demands our attention. If cultural identities are to be reconstructed and we are to learn to live with difference, some memory work on empire is essential’.

There have been several recent examples of research which centres Britain’s imperial history in the UK. For instance, Rogaly and Taylor’s (2010) analysis of retired British servicemen and their wives’ narratives in an English provincial city examines the colonial legacies and discursive connections evident in their constructions of an amorphous ‘Other’. In another example of such research, this time premised on a multi-sited ethnography of an English suburban village, a post-industrial town and an inner-city locale, Tyler (2012) highlights the presence of imperial legacies in ready-to-hand understandings of otherness and perceptions of what was local and what was ‘exotic’ (see also: Wemyss 2009; Knowles 2012). In chapters
seven and eight, I examine Britons’ everyday encounters and experiences of both sameness and difference, focusing on their relations with Pākehā, Māori and ‘Asian’ peoples.

3.1.1 The postcolonial and classed privileges of British emigrants

As mentioned in the introduction, the following discussion is organised around British migrants seeking ‘the good life’ in European destinations, for whom privilege tends to fall along the axes of class, and British migration to formerly colonised or ‘developing’ countries, which tend to adopt a postcolonial lens attentive to racialised privilege. I make this division with the disclaimer that there is overlap between the groups. However, this separation helps organise the material, and emphasises the ambiguity of ex-British settler societies such as Aotearoa New Zealand and Australia, which fit neither of these categories. I briefly want to address my omission of the broad scholarship exploring the corporate lives and decision-making of British migrants as part of a ‘transnational capitalist class’ (Sklar 2000) in global hubs such as New York, Singapore, Boston and Vancouver (Beaverstock 2002; 2005; 2011; Harvey 2011; 2012). I have omitted this work because such experience is somewhat removed from most, if not all, British migrants in Auckland where, according to Rowe (2006, 585), relative geographic isolation, limited financial resources and a small domestic market mean the city struggles to compete for international inward investment. Auckland tends to be overlooked by larger corporations for its more significant neighbours on the Pacific Rim, such as: Sydney, Hong Kong, Tokyo and Los Angeles. Instead, participants in this project can be usefully understood as lifestyle migrants, that is, as ‘relatively affluent individuals, moving either part-time or full-time, permanently or temporarily, to places which, for various reasons, signify for the migrants something loosely defined as quality of life’ (Benson and O’Reilly 2009, 621). In chapter five, I will expand on the use of this concept in relation to the participants in this study.

The first part of this review of literature on British emigration concentrates on intra-European migration flows and two scholars in particular, O’Reilly and Benson. O’Reilly (2000) became part of ‘the holiday space’ during her ethnographic research with the British community in Fuengirola, Spain and has extended this project across Malaga in subsequent visits (see also: 2002; 2007; 2012). She argues that the centring of traditional past-times and community spirit and the frequent denigration of Britain as in decline by her participants can be understood as efforts to recreate a nostalgised version of the UK, but with flavours of
holiday and escape (2002, 189). Economic and material inequalities circumscribed the lifestyles available to her participants, O’Reilly was sensitive to the multiple ways that class was rearticulated under new conditions for her participants, for instance, plotting the way in which social status was gained through integration into Spanish society (Oliver and O’Reilly 2010; see also: O’Reilly 2009a). The significance of class is also evident in Benson’s (2009; 2011; 2012; 2016) ethnographic research with British migrants in the Lot, France. Although initially her participants’ pursuit of a better life appeared as highly individualised, Benson argues that it was, in fact, a thoroughly comparative endeavour. As with O’Reilly, she suggests that integration into an idealised bucolic, French village community was highly valued, in a pursuit of social status for a now transnational British middle class (Benson 2011, 23, 151).

O’Reilly and Benson’s attention to migrants’ imaginings of place and ‘the good life’ available in particular destinations, which they have developed in their joint publications on lifestyle migration (Benson and O’Reilly 2009; O’Reilly and Benson 2009) shapes the analysis of this thesis, in particular, in chapter five which addresses temporal and spatial imaginaries of Aotearoa New Zealand and the lifestyles available there among participants. In addition, their attention to the way in which the desirability of integration into an imagined ‘host’ society relates to the accrual and loss of social status among British migrants centrally informs the analysis of participants’ reflections on their migrancy and that of their compatriots in chapters six, seven and eight.

Postcolonial connections and disconnections appear closer to the surface for ‘Euro-Americans’ moving to ‘developing’ countries or former colonies (Fechter and Walsh 2012, 11). The second part of this review focuses on three scholars researching in such contexts, namely, Knowles, Leonard and Walsh. First, Knowles’ (2006; 2012; 2014; 2015; with Harper 2009) eye for details animates her research into the biographies, journeys and quotidian lives of British migrants in Hong Kong and Beijing and retiree return migrants to the south of England. In her research, Knowles is attentive to the significance of racial privileges and the concrete way in which the past animates the present in postcolonial contexts. Second, Leonard (2008; 2010a; 2010b; 2012; 2013; with Conway 2014) adopts a feminist, postcolonial and poststructuralist lens to frame her research on British emigration, particularly as it relates to work, gender and whiteness in Hong Kong, and more recently South Africa. Leonard focuses on the nuance of ‘a mobile mosaic of white subject positions’ (2008, 58) to convey the way in which whiteness acts as a shifting, contextually-defined, but persistent, resource for mobile Britons. Finally, Walsh (2006; 2010; 2011; 2014) has conducted reflexive, ethnographic research with British expatriates in Dubai, and across the region, which pays attention to the significance of
intimacy, domesticity and responses to ‘foreignness’, in their everyday lives. She has mapped the complexity of racialised transnational encounters in this space and has called for more attention to the postcolonial continuities and discontinuities of privileged migrants’ lives (Coles and Walsh 2010; Fechter and Walsh 2012, 9).

The attention of Leonard to the local inflections of white Britishness shaped my aim to centralise the specificity of the context of an ex-British settler society for understanding participants’ relations with sameness and difference in chapters seven and eight. Knowles’ persistent call for research to illustrate the practical, mundane ways in which the past is brought into the present and racialised privilege is realised, and the connections between everyday, micro details and broader, macro processes shaped my suggestion, developed in chapter four, that broader patterns can be traced in the quotidian aspects of participants’ lives. Finally, Walsh’s call for research with privileged migrants to formerly colonised and ‘developing’ sites to centre a postcolonial analysis has shaped my attention to the historical precedents and post/colonial discontinuities of contemporary migration from Britain to Aotearoa New Zealand throughout this thesis.

3.1.2 Unsettling ‘the West and the rest’: British migration to Australia and Aotearoa New Zealand

‘Australia, in its current time-space positioning, belongs to neither its Anglo-centred past nor to an assuredly post-colonial or Asian future. Positioned somehow “down-under”, it is thought to sit tenuously on both sides of the North/South divide, as a “Western” country under “Southern skies” making a “push into Asia” while occupying a “Third World environment”’! (Anderson 2000, 381)

Anderson’s (2000, 381) situating of Australia illustrates an argument made by Stasiulis and Yuval-Davis (1995, 3) that settler colonial societies, in particular, complicate the dichotomy between Europe and the rest of the world. A dichotomy recreated in the organisation of the literature above, but which I now seek to problematise. Aotearoa New Zealand does not fit into either a European, nor a formerly colonised or ‘developing’ context, comfortably. I want to suggest that the ambiguity of ex-British settler societies, as neither quite ‘West’ nor ‘the rest’ (Hall 1996a, 249), has shaped a debate which has emerged about contemporary British migration to Australia and, with a relative sparsity of literature, Aotearoa New Zealand.
The debate tends to fall between, first, those who frame British migrants as historically more alienated from their host society than assumptions of smooth transition between similar majority cultures allow (Hutching 1999; Hammerton and Coleborne 2001; Hammerton and Thomson 2005; Wills 2010, 234). In terms of more recent cohorts, British migration is conceptualised as a form of lifestyle consumption, for a now middle class, urban and cosmopolitan group (Hammerton 2011, 242; Pearson 2012, 159). Secondly, there are those who centralise the significance of a ‘postcolonising’ context and the privileges of whiteness (Schech and Haggis 2000; 2004; Moreton-Robinson 2005). Schech and Haggis (2004, 191) illustrate the ease of post-war British migrants’ access to national belonging through quotes which describe their migration as ‘like moving next door’ (p. 183). Although differently theoretically located from the previous examples, Stratton (2000, 40), in Australia, and Watson et al. (2011, 21), in Aotearoa New Zealand, have both also stressed the relative ease of settlement of recent British migrants.

On the one hand, Hammerton (2011, 235) has accused Schech and Haggis of ‘gross over-simplifications’ in their portrayal of British migrants since 1945, while he contends their argument is of diminishing relevance to more recent arrivals in Australia. Wills and Darian-Smith (2003, 4) are also suspicious of a notion of shared ethnic identity when considering the situation of British migrants in Australia, quoting Appiah (1994, 156) to argue that such an approach ‘presupposes conceptions of collective identity that are remarkably unsubtle in their understandings of the processes by which identities, both individual and collective, develop’ (p. 71). Similarly, in Aotearoa New Zealand, Pearson (2014) warns that, unless carefully delineated, such research can assume, ‘a priori reified conceptions of social and cultural homogeneity and boundedness that over simplify the diverse ways that English migrants orient themselves to a range of contextual possibilities’, whether in their new country, the UK or elsewhere (p. 518-519). On the other hand, Moreton-Robinson (2005) has robustly criticised the individualistic ‘battler tale’ told by some British migrants to Australia which stresses their ‘pioneering’ spirit in the face of adversity, arguing that this tale is reliant on the support of a cast of thousands. The more celebratory accounts outlined above could also be included in her criticism of research with British migrants which forgets the centrality of whiteness and the dispossession of indigenous peoples in Australia (Moreton-Robinson 2005).

To borrow Wills’ (2010, 213) argument developed for Australia, although unevenly experienced, British migrants’ presence in Aotearoa New Zealand should be understood in relation to the privileges consequent from a history of settler colonialism, racially restrictive immigration policies and a sense of white national identity, aspects of which continue in subtle
and not so subtle manifestations today. Benson (2012, 1689) has warned that one of the primary challenges of the study of lifestyle migrants is to see beyond the discursive construction of the phenomenon as an individualised event, while also allowing for the individual experience of the broader social and historical production of their lives. In a context where British migrants tend to be subsumed within national narratives which frame them ‘in terms of a promise, threat or difficulty’, Wills and Darian-Smith (2003, 79) have called for research ‘to think of these people on their own terms’ in order ‘to chart their narratives of inclusion and dislocation’ (see also: Pearson 2008). As Wills (2005, 107) later clarified,

‘Comprehension of this experience will depend ... on the ability of listeners to hear the new stories: not to produce uncritical celebration, but to acknowledge British migrants as passengers of their own memories, and thus to seek appropriate structures of historical (and political) thought that can recognise such post-imperial journeys’.

Research with British migrants requires a nuanced approach sensitive to the heterogeneity of individual stories. However, in a context where settler colonial dynamics still shape life chances, critical attention to the broader contexts of their experience is also crucial. I adopt an approach to their migration informed by a postcolonial lens which ‘stretches beyond economic imperatives, narrow time-frames and individualised experiences’ (Mains et al. 2013, 140), which I develop in relation to the specific context of Aotearoa New Zealand as a settler society in section 3.3 of this chapter.

3.2 The Arcadian ‘good life’ in Aotearoa New Zealand

‘...the material and social construction of particular places offering an alternative way of living is crucial ... revealing the role of imagination, myth and landscape within the decision to migrate’. (O’Reilly and Benson 2009, 3)

As O’Reilly and Benson indicate above, imaginaries of other places and the lifestyles available there are a central part of what makes migration ‘thinkable, practicable and desirable’ (Ong 1999, 5). These imaginaries ‘are not just drawn out of the air; they rely on long histories of prior engagements and reflect wider cultural imaginings about particular places’ (O’Reilly and Benson 2009, 7). Accordingly, Benson and Osbaldiston (2014, 6) have called for greater attention to ‘the historical dimension of the quest for a better way of life’. In Aotearoa New Zealand, collective imaginings of an Arcadian ‘good life’ in a ‘better Britain’, as seen in chapter two, prompted extensive migration from the UK to Aotearoa New Zealand from the nineteenth century. Initially an imaginary location set in ‘the Greek Antiquities’, Arcadia was
associated with a belief in the fertility and wealth of nature, as well as a conservative longing for the settled and hierarchical social relationships of a nostalgised past (Swaffield and Fairweather 1998, 113; Dürr 2007, 64). Arcadian imagery was strongly present in nineteenth century literature, painting and depictions of Aotearoa New Zealand (Pound 1983), such as photographer George Valentine’s iconic images of spectacular, empty landscapes in the late nineteenth century (Dürr 2007, 65). This imagery was also present in the New Zealand Company’s plan for a transplanted and ‘purified’ British society in the South Seas during colonial expansion (Swaffield and Fairweather 1998, 114), and was actively spread in the UK through recruitment campaigns designed to attract settlers and investors (Fairburn 1989, 20). Bell (1996) has suggested that such Arcadian ideals are still visible in notions of ‘the good life’ in contemporary Aotearoa New Zealand.

One prominent example of this lingering presence is that, despite Aotearoa New Zealand being over eighty per cent urbanized, making it one of the more urbanized populations in the world (Statistics New Zealand 2001), several scholars have argued a rural myth continues to influence the self-identity of many New Zealanders (Fairburn 1975; Bell 1996; Swaffield and Fairweather 1998, 122). Fairburn (1975) has speculated that nineteenth and early mid-twentieth century British migrants’ experiences of the slums in places such as the East End of London and inner-city Manchester prompted a deeply ingrained suspicion of the city once they reached Aotearoa New Zealand. The city was viewed as parasitic and predatory, trapping degenerates in its midst, corrupting the nuclear family, and representing a hub for disease, criminality and immorality (Fairburn 1975, 4, 5). Moreover, a popular view of the city as an ‘artificial excrecence’ with no productive base meant that it clashed with a powerful myth at the time that through hard and honest toil one could ‘become one’s own boss or a self-made man’ (ibid., 5). It was mainly in the country that such opportunities were seen to exist. Although, as Fairburn’s quote makes clear, the dream of ‘getting on’ in Aotearoa New Zealand tended to be a masculine one. Even as Aotearoa New Zealand became undeniably and increasingly urban, the rural myth continued and, Fairburn (1975) suggests, the city was adapted to this vision through mass suburbanisation. From the late nineteenth century, the suburban ‘quarter acre dream’ emerged as a compromise through which the commuting city worker could create a family-centred Garden of Eden. Fairburn concludes that the small family farm and later the middle class housing ‘of shrubs, lawns and do-it-yourself’ can be traced back to a highly durable and conservative structure of beliefs imported from Britain, which he captures in the felicitous phrase of a ‘suburban arcadia’ (p. 16). In chapter
five, I examine how participants’ patterns of residency and aspirations for ‘the good life’ available in Auckland can still be partly understood through this frame.

In a related argument, Barnes (2012) has examined the way in which the marketing of Aotearoa New Zealand, from the early until the middle of the twentieth century, as an empty, rural hinterland, in distinction to the cultural hub of metropolitan London, benefited both places. For the latter this urban-hinterland dynamic provided economic and cultural capital for a largely agricultural economy, and for the former much-needed primary materials and a strengthening of the notion of the UK as the seat of ‘civilisation’. However, Britain’s shift towards the European Economic Community in 1973 was a major turning point and resulted in the ‘distancing of once intimately linked worlds’ (Pearson 2008, 52; see also: Belich 2001). The urban-hinterland dynamic between the UK and Aotearoa New Zealand has now gone, but understandings of Aotearoa New Zealand as distant and peripheral still proliferate (Dürr 2007). In addition to the desire for a suburban arcadia, I next situate several other popular imaginaries of Aotearoa New Zealand and the lifestyle available there among participants, which centred on ‘isolation’, ‘insignificance’ and being ‘marginal’.

Humanities scholar Calder (2011) draws on the distorted image of a brain homunculus to frame his affective cartography of Aotearoa New Zealand, suggesting that we can imagine this warped map insofar as poems, novels and stories are the nation’s nerve-ends. Although not part of the physical environment, an important part of this map, for Calder, is ‘overseas’. Its presence does not mark a destination, but ‘the gap distance opens out between here and there’ (p. 190). ‘Against the sounding face of the seas’, Pound (2009, 42) has suggested, in a development of this point, local poets such as Curnow (1960, 17) could claim, ‘[t]he best of our verse is marked or moulded elsewhere by peculiar pressures – pressures arising from the isolation of the country’. Pound (2009, 31) argues a prevalent national theme in mid-twentieth-century art was that of ‘islands’ and ‘landfalls’: in a topos of distance and isolation from Europe which emphasised the ‘new discovery’ of Aotearoa New Zealand. A year after Curnow’s comments, the writer C. K. Stead noted that, ‘[a] tension exists in the mind of every New Zealander between here and there’ which he related to a ‘combination of physical remoteness and insignificance’ (1961, 81, emphasis in original). The existence of a whole book devoted to the proclaimed remoteness of New Zealand in ‘Distance Looks Our Way’ (Sinclair 1961) demonstrates the mythopoetic power the island motif and a topos of distance and

---

12 Although, as Barnes (2012, 277) put it, ‘[h]interland habits are hard to break’. In 2011 seventy per cent of Aotearoa New Zealand’s exports still came from the primary sector, and only fifty-three per cent of those were processed (Statistics New Zealand 2011, 2).
isolation from Europe had attained in Aotearoa New Zealand’s intellectual culture in the mid-twentieth century (Pound 2009, 49). Calder (2011) argues that, ‘despite a thousand countervailing influences’, the tension between ‘here’ and ‘there’ still exists (p. 190). In a networked world, New Zealanders have come to share their condition of isolation and insignificance with more people in more places, but this perception characterises their geo-cultural location as profoundly as ever (Calder 2011, 189-190). However, Calder adds ‘there’ is less predominantly the ‘Home’ of British settlers but more broadly infers ‘anywhere in the big wide world that makes “here” seem outlying or negligible in comparison’ (Calder 2011, 190).

Brabazon (2000, 1, 41) has critically engaged with ‘the Antipodes’, a term used since the mid-nineteenth century to refer to Australia and Aotearoa New Zealand which reflects another significant spatial imaginary. Antipodean refers to points or people residing on diametrically opposite sides of the earth. However, rather than a way of marking distance from one place to another, as Brabazon (2000) points out, antipodean was never a straightforwardly oppositional space applied to Europe in turn. The term ‘antipodes’ can be traced etymologically to the Greek anti or opposite and pous, podos or foot and Brabazon suggests the symbolism around the imagery of a foot, and implicitly a head, is significant. She argues ‘the Antipodes’ acts as ‘a representational matrix’ and way of seeing the world which can block new understandings of space (p. 9), an argument which I develop in chapter five in relation to a popular understanding of Aotearoa New Zealand as ‘isolated’ among participants.

More recently, Dürr (2007, 65) has suggested that there is a continuity between contemporary tourist fantasies which view Aotearoa New Zealand as ‘untouched by the outside world’ and earlier Arcadian myth-making used to attract settlers. While such imagery may indicate marginality and unimportance, she argues it also implies a secluded, pristine and unspoiled environment. Notions of island purity and stasis in Aotearoa New Zealand were contrasted positively with those of over-crowding, urbanisation and rapid change for the tourists she researched with, and the idea of being ‘far away’ granted an air of exclusivity to their travel (Dürr 2007, 74). British tourists to Aotearoa New Zealand first arrived in the nineteenth century, when a few elite visitors made their way to the luxury spas in Rotorua (Dürr 2007, 59). In fact, the Department of Tourist and Health Reports, inaugurated in 1901, was one of the first Tourist Departments in the world. More recently, the long-running ‘100% Pure New Zealand’ tourism campaign, designed by the international advertising agency M&C Saatchi, has given the former pastoral paradise ‘a touch of wilderness and a burst of adrenaline,’ but, as Barnes argues (2012, 266), ‘it continues to imagine New Zealand as a haven from industry and urbanisation’. In this way, remoteness, scenic beauty and a low
population density have been marketed as a unique destination hook. Now over a century old, the essentialising of rural Aotearoa New Zealand is these days marketed highly successfully across the globe\textsuperscript{13}. The Tourism Industry Association, drawing on data from Statistics New Zealand, claimed tourism was Aotearoa New Zealand’s highest export earner in 2015, surpassing the dairy industry (Johnson 2015). The tropes outlined above situate the popular imaginaries of ‘the good life’ and of Aotearoa New Zealand among participants in this study outlined in chapter five.

3.3 The ethnic and cultural politics of settler societies

Bell (2014, 11) has argued that a shared ‘settler imaginary’ can be traced in the US, Canada, Australia and Aotearoa New Zealand, which describes a ‘set of ideas and values that underpin a peculiarly settler discourse of nationhood, identity and indigenous-settler relations’. She attributes this commonality to the originary influence of ‘British legal and cultural traditions’ and ‘European philosophical traditions’ (ibid.). For this concept, Bell draws on Taylor’s (2002, 106) notion of ‘social imaginaries’, which refers to, as he puts it,

‘the ways people imagine their social existence, how they fit together with others, how things go on between them and their fellows, the expectations that are normally met, and the deeper normative notions and images that underlie these expectations’.

For Taylor (2004, 24), the social imaginary constitutes an implicit ‘background’ that provides ‘the kind of common understanding that enables us to carry out the collective practices that make up our collective life’. In this final section, through engagement with several debates which have emerged from the ‘settler colonial turn’ (Veracini 2015), I develop a theoretical lens sensitive to the specific dynamics and multiple imaginaries of a settler context.

The starting point for the interdisciplinary, expanding field of settler colonial studies can be traced to Wolfe’s (1999, 163) much-cited claim that settler colonialism is ‘a structure not an event’\textsuperscript{14}. Work in this field often centres on the continuities of a ‘logic of elimination’ for

\textsuperscript{13} Between November 2014 and October 2015 British visitors made up the fourth biggest group in international visitor arrivals for holidays, at nearly 200,000, coming in after the US, China and Australia (Tourism New Zealand 2015).

\textsuperscript{14} It is important to note that this field is distinct from the already existing site of struggle and extended indigenous critique in settler societies. Indigenous scholars and activists have been addressing the ongoing effects of colonisation since its inception (for examples of published work in Aotearoa New Zealand, see: Awatere 1984; Walker 1990; Smith 1999), and one of the problems with ‘the settler
indigenous peoples in settler societies, whether physical, social or cultural, for instance (Wolfe 2006; 2013, 259). Settler colonialism is framed as a perpetuating process rather than a singular event which can be relegated to the past, because settlers ‘come to stay’ (Wolfe 2006, 388). Through a critical attunement to assimilatory logic, such work is able to delineate the overlaps between conservative and progressive approaches in settler societies (Strakosch and Macoun 2012). However, a central criticism of settler colonial studies has been precisely its radical premise, the continuity of settler societies, which Wolfe has (2006, 402) described as ‘relatively impervious to regime change’ (see also: Veracini 2015, 1). As Strakosch and Macoun (2013) argue, this understanding attributes a ‘peculiar suspended temporality to the settler project’ which can result in a kind of ‘colonial fatalism’ (p. 436). In a complementary argument, the historian Rowse (2014, 30) has troubled the ‘epistemological and political certainty’ attendant to some analyses in which ‘we know what’s going to happen because it always does’.

A sense of inevitability is not the only hazard associated with settler colonial studies. Macoun and Strakosch (2013, 76) warn that such analyses risk a totalising scholarly authority that works to contain everything including ‘the entire field of [settlers’] relationship with Indigenous people’ within its own reductive frame; a conceit which they argue ‘can serve to re-enact the central settler fantasy that we constitute and have authority over this space’. This criticism is especially pertinent as settler colonial studies is primarily drawn on by non-indigenous scholars. Macoun and Strakosch (2013) warn scholars in this field to be mindful of re-empowering non-indigenous academic voices, while marginalising indigenous contributions (p. 436). More broadly, it has been suggested that white scholars and activists tend to monopolise debates on settler colonialism (Patel, Moussa and Upadhyay 2015). In a criticism which is analogous to hooks (1990, 54-55) criticism of research on whiteness, when she noted ‘that few non-white scholars are being awarded grants to investigate and study all aspects of white culture from a standpoint of “difference”’. Accordingly, my positionality as a white, non-indigenous scholar needs to be situated against broader processes which enables some voices over others.

In order to address some of these concerns, Macoun and Strakosch (2013) suggest that those drawing on settler colonial studies should emphasise the limited nature of their analysis, the partial, iterative process of settler colonialism and the agency of subjects who resist. For them, this scholarly field is best understood as providing non-Indigenous peoples in
settler spaces with a better account of themselves, ‘rather than as an account of the entire settler-indigenous relationship’ (p. 38). Settler colonialism is not a totalising explanation, nor a meta-structure which determines all other relations (Dhamoon 2015); however, settler normativity shapes contemporary realities for all inhabitants of settler spaces, albeit in different ways (Smith 2010a, 42-44; Morgensen 2011, 1). In light of this argument, there is a growing body of research on settler colonialism as it is expressed in everyday life (Rifkin 2013). For instance, in Vancouver, Canada, Baloy (2015) described her research on the lived experiences of settlers as part of a shift from an anthropology of the Other to an anthropology of Othering. Through a focus on her participants’ ‘complicity, complacency, ignorance, and privilege’, as well as a range of practices to challenge these, she aimed to centre and denaturalise the settler subject (p. 2). In chapters seven and eight, I examine the way participants invest, or not, in a ‘settler imaginary’ through exploring their relations with those who appear to have East Asian heritage, Māori, indigenous politics and bi- and multiculturalism.

Gunaratnam (2003, 22) has suggested that poststructural and postcolonial approaches seek to challenge any notion of fixed meanings and break down binary thinking ‘by uncovering and working through the tense entanglements, interdependencies and junctions between categories and social relations’. From this perspective, Wolfe’s understanding of settler colonialism as an enduring structure organised around the binary of indigenous-settler relations has earned him the description of ‘very much a structuralist stuck in a poststructuralist world’ (Cavanagh 2012, 19; see also Svirsky 2014, 327). The emphasis placed on this binary has been criticised for recreating colonial dichotomies, for eliding entanglement between groups, for abstracting these categories from intersecting identifications and for essentialising identities (see, for example: Bell 2006; Smith 2007). In a special Issue of Settler Colonial Studies titled ‘Recuperating Binarism’, Wolfe (2013) responded to such claims by arguing that the poststructural indictment of binarism, to the extent that it endorses efforts to overcome Indigenous peoples’ difference from settlers, endorses colonial policy-making (p. 259). Wolfe acknowledges that this binary has become more complex since its violent assertion during the colonial frontier, but he maintains that the high degree of internal heterogeneity within settler and indigenous societies does not alter the binary nature of what he terms ‘the Native/settler divide’, as, for him,

‘The opposition between Native and settler is a structural relationship rather than an effect of the will. The fact that I, for example, am an Australian settler is not a product of my individual consciousness. Rather, it is a historical condition that preceded me. Neither I nor other settlers can will our way out of it, whether we want to or not. No
doubt our respective individual consciousness’s affect how each of us responds to this shared historical positionality but they did not create it and they cannot undo it’. (Wolfe 2013, 263)

Wolfe argues that the categories ‘Native’ and ‘settler’ are supra-individual rather than inherent qualities that individuals carry with them. He highlights the example of ‘Native American soldiers stationed in Hawai’i’ to illustrate the possibility, circumstances permitting, of ‘colonised Natives’ becoming settlers in another region (p. 263). Rather than an essentialised quality of ‘Nativeness’, Wolfe argues that his model focuses on structural dimensions which are site specific.

Pihama (1997, 11) has criticised the way in which anti-essentialist arguments associated with various ‘post’ theories emerged around the same time that indigenous political movements were undergoing a resurgence (see also: Bell 2014, 56). As Smith (1996, 64-5) has argued, ‘[c]olonisation involved the systematic fragmentation of indigenous world views, values, lands, resources and social order’ (cited by Pihama 1997, 11). In such a context, Bell (2014) has problematised whether a deconstructive analysis and the associated fragmentation of identities is an emancipatory course of action. Rather than being universally applicable, following her argument, poststructuralist analyses have to be applied in a way which is sensitive to different historical and social landscapes. What is emancipatory in one context, may compound a fractured and threatened identity in another. Moreover, she also criticises the notion that the deconstruction of identities is universally correct, as this approach can assume a singular, ‘Western’ epistemological terrain, such that the potential for autonomous, ‘non-Western’ epistemologies is ignored (Bell 2014, 126). In other words, if applied without differentiation, deconstructive approaches to identity can, ironically, recreate the hubris of a universalising approach in the very act of contesting monolithic, essentialist epistemologies.

On the other hand, seeing indigenous peoples as locked in a binary of difference denies their agency to pick and choose aspects of settler culture to appropriate. In a paper about ‘ontological quarrels’ between Māori and European, or Pākehā, perspectives with regards to the Treaty and its ongoing negotiation in Aotearoa New Zealand, Salmond (2012, 119) develops a non-essentialist notion of both perspectives. She first makes the argument, drawing on de Castro (2007), that ‘these are “different “worlds”, not one world viewed differently’. However, she then goes on to suggest that it is an oversimplification to characterize these ontological differences as differences between European and Māori ontologies. To do so is,
‘to assume, “an ontology” must be a bounded object, similar to or perhaps isomorphic with a “culture” or “ethnicity”, exclusively aligned with a particular bounded group each with its own fixed characteristic essence’. (Salmond 2012, 125)

Rather than ‘an ontology’ she prefers ‘ontological styles’, and more particularly refers to ‘Māori’ and ‘modernist’, or, alternately, ‘relational’ and ‘objective’ styles. She argues that such styles are not the exclusive preserve of a particular group and may not be consistently practiced, even though the different styles may be incommensurable, for the self is dynamic and contextually defined (p. 125).

In her research, which extends across several ex-British settler societies, Bell (2014, 16) reflects a common scholarly approach to understanding settler-indigenous relations when she acknowledges that,

‘[a]ctional indigenous and settler individuals are distributed more widely, identifying with, deploying, crossing and resisting these categories from day to day and context to context, and are further divided and joined by gender, class, age, sexuality and so on – no one is ‘purely’ an indigenous or settler subject’.

However, in an argument which echoes others (see, for example: Morgensen 2011, 22; Baloy 2015, 21; Dahmoon 2015, 32), Bell maintains that,

‘...as a result of historic and contemporary assimilatory pressures, the maintenance of a clear demarcation between indigene and settler (wherever drawn) is crucial for the survival of distinct indigenous peoplehood’. (Bell 2014, 76)

This thesis adopts her approach, and explores some of the complexities of settler – indigenous relations in greater detail in chapter eight.

However, ‘settlers’ are differently positioned, or, as Snelgrove put it, ‘...while all non-Indigenous peoples residing in settler states may be complicit in settlement, making us all settlers, not all settlers are created equal’ (in Snelgrove et al. 2014, 6; see also: Moreton-Robinson 2003, 29; Morgensen 2011, 18; Wolfe 2013, 265; Bell 2014, 7). In order to address ethnic dynamics in settler societies, in the mid-1990s Hage (1995) called for the study of triangular ‘Anglo-Ethnic-Aboriginal relations’, and, more recently, Veracini (2012) has similarly suggested a model of ‘natives-settlers-migrants’ (see also: Pearson 2001). Both of these models were posited in an attempt to overcome the frequently siloed approaches of research in ‘whiteness studies’, ‘indigenous studies’ and ‘ethnic and racial studies’ (Anderson 2000, 381). In an illuminating instance of research attentive to this complexity, Saranillio has evocatively written about his position as both ‘ethnic’ and ‘settler’ in Hawai’i. In the following brief extract, which echoes but expands upon Wolfe’s earlier reflection on his position, Saranillio stresses overlapping, but crucially distinct, experiences of oppression,
'I identify myself as a settler, placing me in direct engagement with an ongoing history of settler colonialism in the United States one that is often deliberately obscured, while simultaneously critical of the logics of White supremacy that have impacted my family and communities'. (Saranillio 2013, 290, emphasis in original)

Saranillio (2013) draws on Smith (2010b) to shape his analysis, who, in the context of the US, has outlined the following three intersecting aspects of white supremacy: the racist exploitation of slavery, the dispossession of colonialism and the othering of orientalism. In chapters seven and eight, I examine participants’ relations with peoples with East Asian heritage in order to develop an argument about hierarchies of otherness and belonging in Aotearoa New Zealand.

However, Curthoys (2000, 31) has troubled the triangular models of ethnic relations outlined by Hage and Veracini above. With regards to Hage’s (1995) ‘Anglo-Ethnic-Aboriginal’ model in particular, she stressed,

‘the significant differences in situation between European and non-European immigrants which the category “ethnic” suppresses, and the high levels of intermixture between people in all these ethnic groups, so that they blend into one another to an important degree, making such categories diffuse and unstable’.

Of particular relevance to this thesis, she argues that such models obscure ‘the important presence of the British migrant, who fits none of these categories’. Veracini (2012, 195) goes some way towards addressing this latter critique in his proposed model, which focuses on ‘native-settler-migrant’ relations. In his case, he defines ‘migrant’ loosely as a category encompassing all forms of nonsovereign displacement, with the intent not to deny variety but to emphasise shared subjection (p. 189). Veracini (2012) references Rana’s (2010) research in the US to suggest that ‘co-ethnics’ who join an already established settler colonial project are immediately endowed with the entitlements of a settler citizenship, meaning that they are not ‘migrants’ at all. On top of the criticisms of this position already outline above in section 3.1.2, others have criticised the way such an argument ignores Britons who may inhabit ‘co-ethnicity’ ambivalently as persons of colour, or the position of many Irish migrants historically, for instance (Hammerton 2011, 242; Wolfe 2013, 258). In chapter eight, I examine the experiences of participants who complicate the identitarian discourses of biculturalism and multiculturalism (Smith 2007, 83).

Bell’s (2014, 6) reflection on the position of non-indigenous peoples in settler societies closes this section, and illustrates the ethical urgency of a focus on settler imaginaries as they are lived by British migrants,
‘We are structurally if not biologically “settler descendants”. We have inherited the political, material and symbolic privileges secured by their practices of colonisation. And we continue them or address them in our own lives’.

Bell’s statement emphasises the continuity of the past in the present through both broader inheritances and individuals’ efforts, the latter reminiscent of the analytic lens I developed in chapter one. Berlant (in Helms, Vishmidt and Berlant 2012) has suggested a crucial political task lies in developing alternative compelling forms of sociality to enable a more capacious ordinary flourishing. She suggests what is needed is ‘a projection that reorients us to a different, better mode of the reproduction of life, a different sensus communis, a different structure of feeling associated with the good life’ (ibid., emphasis in original). For Bell (2014, 196), in Aotearoa New Zealand such a project requires an open and uncertain ethics which decentres a universalising ‘settler/Western subject’ to enable the existence of plural worlds when ‘relating to the difference of indigenous ways of being and living’. This thesis is invested in this ethos, but expands upon it in order to include the presence of more ethnically and culturally diverse ‘ways of being and living’ beyond Pākehā and Māori in Aotearoa New Zealand.

Conclusion

Through attention to the ‘fuzzy boundaries’ of Britishness and its global mobility, the pursuit of an Arcadian ‘good life’ in Aotearoa New Zealand and the complex dynamics of difference in settler societies, this chapter engaged with three co-existing imaginaries which emerged as significant to British migrants’ lives in Auckland.

Britishness is not stable or fixed, but always in a process of formation. First, this chapter engaged with research which explored the differences in national identification for Britain’s constituent nations and the significance of imperial legacies when considering Britishness. In doing so, this section contextualises attention in most of the substantive chapters to the differences in meaning attached to national identities and expressions of nationness for participants. The chapter then conducted a focused review of the flourishing body of literature on British emigration, organising this material around research on migration within-Europe and to formerly colonised or ‘developing’ countries. I then examined the specific ambiguity of ex-British settler societies which, as Stasiulis and Yuval-Davies (1995, 3) argue, ‘complicat[e] the neat dichotomy between Europe and the rest of the world’. Contemporary British migrants in Aotearoa New Zealand can usefully be conceptualised as a
comparatively new ‘service class’ generation of lifestyle migrants pursuing alternative environs made more accessible by the availability and freedom of travel (Pearson 2012, 159). However, at the same time, the broader historical and social context of their lifestyle pursuits requires critical attention. Through a nuanced analysis of contemporary British migrants’ experiences attentive to colonial continuities, this thesis expands research on this significant group in the otherwise relatively underexplored destination of Aotearoa New Zealand.

Through an exploration of the history of Arcadian imagery attached to Aotearoa New Zealand in section 3.2, I situated contemporary ideals of a bucolic ‘good life’ in this context, evident from the ongoing popularity of the suburban ‘quarter-acre dream’ to the imagery used in tourist pamphlets. The concept of ‘the Antipodes’ as ‘Down Under’ and ‘peripheral’ only makes sense in relation to a presumed centre. Next, I critically addressed the geocultural imaginary which positions Aotearoa New Zealand as ‘isolated’. This understanding can be historicised to the acute awareness among early more established settlers of the distance from their home-land, which is traceable as a dominant topos in local art and literature. It can also be related, more prosaically, to an urban-hinterland dynamic which developed between Aotearoa New Zealand and London in the twentieth century. This section engaged with some of the historical precedents of popular geographical imaginaries and associated notions of ‘the good life’ in Aotearoa New Zealand. In doing so, it supports an argument made in chapter five that participants’ imaginaries often reflected colonial continuities.

Finally, this chapter addressed the notion of ‘the settler imaginary’, which I situated among the expanding body of literature to have emerged from the ‘settler colonial turn’. Settler colonial studies has been criticised for an inevitable, verging on totalising, tone, as well as a tendency to centralise settler voices. Instead, I made a case for a partial analysis attentive to continuities, and discontinuities, when exploring the way in which settler colonialism shapes everyday lived experiences. A second central tension emerged around the binary posited between indigenous and non-indigenous peoples and the fragmentation of identities attendant to some deconstructive analyses. An argument was made for analysis which respects the importance of a clear demarcation between indigenous and non-indigenous peoples in an assimilatory settler context but which still understands the self as dynamic and contextually defined. Finally, I discussed the complexity of hierarchies of belonging and otherness in settler societies, and the necessity of an analysis which is attentive to distinct, but overlapping, forms of oppression in this context. Schech and Haggis’ (2004) research with post-war British migrants in Australia is the only other to centralise the specificity of settler spaces and encounters with indigenous and exogenous (or exogenised) peoples. They argued that
their participants adopted an ‘imperial imaginary’ which placed them as normative, but positioned other migrants as ‘perpetual foreigners’ and indigenous peoples as ‘strangers who do not, or cannot fit’ (p. 176). I build on their research in chapters seven and eight through greater attention to heterogeneity across participants’ experiences, the development of an analysis which incorporates contemporary forms of racialised stigma (Lentin and Titley 2011) and research which attends to British migrants’ experiences in the particular ‘contact zone’ of Auckland.
Figure 4.1 Lorna, watching a brass band
Chapter four. Researching with ambiguous migrants

Introduction

This thesis draws on fieldwork of twelve months, which included interviews, photo-elicitation and participant observation with British migrants living in Auckland in order to better understand their lives. I was inspired by international qualitative research with British migrants in which researchers spent around a year getting to know a community (see, for example: O’Reilly 2000; Walsh 2006; Harper and Knowles 2009; Leonard 2010; Benson 2011). In the following chapter, I organise the discussion around four areas. First, I address my positionality as a researcher and how I draw on reflexivity. I develop a more fluid notion of insider/outsider status, attentive to what was revealed in the way participants positioned me. Secondly, I reflect on the process of recruiting participants in the sprawling, residentially segregated city of Auckland. I introduce the characteristics of those who took part and address some of the potential limitations attendant to that. Thirdly, I introduce the methods used and how these developed in situ. My initial research encounter with participants was often in the form of an interview. I outline the process of interviewing, the way I conceptualise the knowledge this method evokes and the ethical ambivalence of being overt when researching critically, particularly with regards to listening to participants’ prejudicial opinions. The photographs taken for the photo-elicitation aspect of the project triggered conversations about the quotidian, spatial aspects of participants’ lives. I discuss the process of this method, the development of instructions and how I have incorporated visual material into the thesis. Finally, participant observation was a central part of the research method. I discuss the shape of the social landscape of British migrants in Auckland and explain why I chose to spend time with individuals, following them in their everyday lives. Fourthly, I reflect upon the process of analysis and writing, and the partial, fleeting claim to knowledge of this thesis.

4.1 Embodying the field

‘[I] see the world from specific locations, embodied and particular, and never innocent’.
(Rose 1997, 308)
British migration is wrapped up in my biography. My dad is from Glasgow, Scotland, and my mum is from Nottingham, England, and both migrated from working class backgrounds into something more approximating middle class lifestyles. When I was a child, in-between growing up in Nottingham, England, we lived in Virginia, USA for one year and Suva, Fiji for two, where my brother and I would attend local schools. When I was an adult, my mum migrated to Palmerston North, Aotearoa New Zealand and I was able to gain a permanent residency visa through her. Although it is difficult to access its precise impact on my trajectories, that history of movement was part of a constellation of interests which shaped the consequent reading, writing and research which led to this PhD.

My embodiment shaped the research process. At the risk of providing a list of characteristics which elide the way these are relationally constructed, and the plethora of researcher identities (Kobayashi 1994; Browne with Bakshi and Law 2010), I am in my late twenties, white, English, British and middle class with an accent that shifts from Midlands to Southern, and which I adapt, along with my dress and behaviour, according to who I am with. Bondi (2009, 336) suggests reflexivity, rather than an individual articulation of the self, is better used to explore the interpersonal, co-construction of social encounters. In this way, research is an account of the ‘betweenness’ of ‘the world between ourselves and the researched’ (England 1994, 251); even as these remain necessarily opaque (Rose 1997) and, if not handled with humility, can entail no less of an authoritative performance than ‘objectivity’ (Avis 2002). Although reflexive acknowledgement of my positionality is a necessary part of responsible research, Kobayashi (2003, 349) warns against a ‘self-indulgent focus on the self thus distancing the researcher from the research focus itself’.

I argue, tentatively, that my not being a New Zealander invited confidences and criticisms which participants may have been more careful to manage with a local researcher. Our shared nationality could invite a sense of proximity, for instance, when participants brought up the importance of a shared sense of humour with compatriots. In addition, my being positioned as white meant that some participants assumed complicity between ‘us’ about ‘them’ (Leonard 2010, 37), the ethical ambiguity of which I will further explore later. However, ethno-national identity was just one aspect of my identity in research encounters (Carling, Erdal and Ezzati 2014, 38). Nowicka and Cieslik (2014) challenge the latent understanding that common origin produces ‘common individuals’. For one, Ganga and Scott
(2008) have highlighted how supposed social proximity, paradoxically, increases awareness of the social divisions that structure the interactions between them. As Back (2004) suggests,

‘Otherness doesn’t begin at the boundaries between class or ‘racial’ groupings or differences of gender and sexuality but at the limit of our touch. There can be no simple appeal to the inside that does not also acknowledge the variegations within social groups’. (p. 210)

The ‘lived practices in which identification is practiced/performe’ (Anthias 2008, 16) exceed our dominant representational frames.

As such, insider-ness and outsider-ness is better thought of as an ongoing, unfolding of proximity and distance composed of ‘momentary spaces’ (Mullings 1999, 340). One moment of connection, or what Matejskova (2014) calls a ‘time-space of proximity’, occurred when I seemingly effortlessly caught a rugby ball holder thrown by the coach of a Welsh rugby team to the side of the pitch while I was mid-conversation with some spectators. What had been a slightly awkward situation - it being my first introduction to many of them as a researcher, which had prompted some nervous jokes – broke into laughter and an invitation to join the team. Such ‘moments’ of proximity, and I will explore moments of distance later, are more reflective of research encounters than static, identitarian categories. However, clearly in certain spaces and at certain times such blunt categories of identity do have more significance; as became clear during my efforts to form connections with older men in pubs. Moreover, such identities may ossify if someone is interviewed in a specific role, or in a politicised circumstance (Matejskova 2014).

Attention to the ways in which participants’ responded to and positioned me as an outsider provided useful information about how they make sense of who they are and how they represent themselves as part of a community (Young 2004, 200). For instance, Merrick, who I will introduce in chapter six (see figure 4.10 for a list of participants’ characteristics), regularly, later playfully, but initially less so, positioned me as an English, middle class outsider when we spent time together. In an example I will return to in chapter eight, at our second meeting he told me,

‘... well immediately you talk to Māori there’s an unsaid thing, you know where they’re coming from, they know where you’re coming from, and that doesn’t actually apply to most New Zealanders and especially doesn’t apply to most [he points at me] well, I don’t know, I shouldn’t be so- too specific’.

Although, later as our relationship developed - and after what he jokingly called ’my socialist indoctrination’ in which he asked me for around an hour about my life and my politics - this dynamic became more playful.
'After the game some of the Irish team dressed in their green kit came to our table in the crowded bar looking for spare seats. Merrick got chatting to them and congratulated them for beating the English, who were consistent panto baddies throughout the afternoon. He then pointed across to me, “she’s English”. As I laughed the man he was speaking to replied “I won’t hold that against her” and Merrick added “it’s alright she’s from Nottinghamshire”.

These negotiations offered insight into how Merrick positioned himself, as from a working class background, Welsh and in contradistinction from what he saw as the English and Pākehā New Zealanders, which were central to his claiming a place to speak from. My own attempt in our encounters to position myself as being from the Midlands rather than the south of England and my being explicit about having been awarded a scholarship rather than paying for my study independently, voices some of my own attempts to claim a place to speak with him, too. In the next section, I will address how I approached recruitment in order to include a heterogeneous range of experiences.

4.2 Finding British migrants

The Auckland region has the largest number of British migrants in Aotearoa New Zealand (Watson et al. 2011, 9), with 83,370 people identifying the UK as their birthplace (Statistics New Zealand 2013a). This group accounts for around seven per cent of the city’s population of 1.4 million, which matches the average across the nation (analysis author’s own, Statistics New Zealand 2013a). Although British migrants are scattered throughout the city, they tend to be concentrated in relatively affluent coastal suburbs, such as Devonport, Brown’s Bay, Orewa and Whangaparoa in the north of the city, Titirangi in the west and Beachlands in the east (Gilbertson and Meares 2013, 8). Figure 4.2 shows the distribution of those who identified with the ethnicity (rather than the birth-place) ‘UK and Ireland’ as a percentage of the area in Auckland according to the 2013 Census. A small, but significant, percentage of these respondents were born in Aotearoa New Zealand, pointing to the complexity of ethnicity in this context for British migrants, which I examine in greater detail in chapter seven.
I arrived in Auckland with no connections and took a varied approach to the recruitment of participants. I initially put posters in British-oriented commercial establishments, posted details about the project on the ‘New Zealand’ thread of a British expat blog, and purposefully attended various events, such as migrant socialising groups I thought might be productive for recruitment. Although the former may seemingly encourage a bias to nationally-oriented participants, this recruitment strategy only resulted in a small number of participants. The most successful method of recruitment was to draw on Census data in order to find suburbs with a high concentration of British migrants and to then advertise in those areas; for instance, I placed a call in a local community newsletter and put posters up in transport hubs, cafes and community centres. I opted to recruit participants through methods such as posters, rather than just spending time in public spaces and meeting people that way, because it was difficult to find public spaces frequently used and broadly reflective of British migrants. Many of my participants claimed to avoid spending time in British-oriented spaces, or did so only infrequently, as I will explore in chapter six. Generally, their lives instead reflected a diverse array of interests, including but not limited to, a yacht club, a bible reading group, boules, a French speaking group, a sci-fi club, a vegetarian cooking society, the Rotary Club, golf, Toastmasters, wild running and so on, none of which had a predominant British membership. Later, as I made friends, I drew on their connections, as well as meeting British migrants in everyday life. I snowballed from each recruitment method in order to meet yet more people. This approach to recruitment meant I got a mixture of self-selecting participants and those I encouraged to take part.
This research recruited first-generation British migrants living in Auckland. The use of the term ‘British’ in recruitment material for the project, see figure 4.3, was in some ways problematic, if difficult to avoid. First, this wording of recruitment material positioned those researched via their nationality, and thus shaped how they would experience the research encounter. For instance, the responses and engagement of participants with the project would have been different if they had been recruited as ‘a retired teacher’ or as ‘a pregnant woman’, for instance, rather than ‘a British migrant’ (Carling et al. 2014, 43). Secondly, the use of ‘British’ could be exclusionary. When I contacted the Auckland Irish Society, the manager explained that when she had told members about the project they were reticent to take part in something with British in the title, and when I visited and chatted with Northern Irish members one evening they repeated the same message. I was concerned to include the experience of those who felt ambivalent about being ‘British’, for instance, I actively encouraged Merrick, who I met at the Welsh Club, to take part even though he rejected that
identity. As mentioned earlier, I found people outside of British-oriented spaces and events, through snowballing and a varied approach to recruitment.

At the end of this chapter I have included a table which illustrates some of the characteristics of participants, and here I want to engage with that in greater depth. As around half of participants lived in affluent coastal suburbs in the north of the city, the sample could be criticised for overly reflecting a specific experience of living in Auckland. However, this focus reflects a concentration of British nationals living in these neighbourhoods. While British migrants make up seven per cent of Auckland population on average, they are unequally distributed across the region. For instance, the Otara-Papatoetoe local board area in the south of the city, measured UK-born residents at just one per cent. Whereas in the Hibiscus and Bays Local Board area, which includes Brown’s Bay, Orewa and Whangaparoa, this percentage increases to fourteen per cent (Statistics New Zealand 2013a). Attention to this suburban residential trend forms the focus of part of chapter five, which attends to participants’ relationship with the city and their notions of ‘the good life’, and chapter seven, which addresses their reflections on migrant enclaves. The predominant nationality for those born in the UK in Aotearoa New Zealand is English (Statistics New Zealand 2013a), and that was also the most prevalent nationality among participants, although Welsh, Scottish and Northern Irish nationals also took part. Three participants could be categorised as people of colour, although the majority could be categorised as white. The participants in the study ranged in age from those in their early twenties to their late eighties with a median age of fifty-five, and an average age of fifty-one. This distribution of ages is similar to the average age of this migrant group in Aotearoa New Zealand more broadly. According to the 2013 Census (2013b), which sorts data according to Britain’s constituent nations, people born in England and Scotland, for instance, have a median age of fifty-one and fifty-eight years respectively, making them the oldest migrant groups in the country. There was an unintentional gender bias in this study for women, with twenty-seven women and nineteen men. The participants had varying relationship statuses – travelling alone, as part of couples and in families.

Participants had a range of migration biographies. For several, Aotearoa New Zealand was their first major international trip, while for others it was the next instalment of a lifetime of globe-trotting. All participants had a New Zealand permanent residency visa or citizenship, the difference between which is minimal in terms of rights (Spoonley and Bedford 2012, 51), as opposed to a working-holiday or tourist visa. Their length of residence ranged from six months to fifty-six years. One year is the threshold for the statistical recording of migration (King 2012), but in Aotearoa New Zealand British passport holders can access two-year working
holiday visas between the ages of eighteen and thirty. I decided to include migrants who had arrived recently with the intention of staying long term, conveyed through their visa or citizenship status, as they may have more vivid reflections than earlier arrivals on the differences they have experienced and on their migration aspirations. I did not speak to any peripatetic migrants. Although a few aspired to that status, the distance and expense made it out of reach for most, ‘I’ve just got to win the lottery’, Aileen explained, who we will meet in chapter six. However, Douglas, who we will meet in chapter eight, had plans in place to make this aspiration his reality upon retirement. I spoke to three people who had arrived around six months previously and the rest had arrived at least one year previously, but the average length of stay among the group was sixteen years. A study on migrant retention found that skilled migrants from the UK and Ireland stayed for significantly longer in Aotearoa New Zealand, in comparison with migrants from the rest of Europe, North America, Asia and South Africa (McLeod, Henderson and Bryant 2010). Several participants, when I asked about their future plans, left their future travel open. As Amy said, who we will meet in chapter five, in an illustrative statement, ‘part of me’s thinking am I gonna move again at some point?’ Unlike many Britons who migrated to Aotearoa New Zealand previous to the last few decades, if things did not go well return migration, or perhaps moving on somewhere else, was more accessible. Responses such as Amy’s problematise the notion of permanent migration. However, the average longevity of participants’ stay appears to support a picture of long-term migration among this group.

In the mid-twentieth century many of the British migrants who benefitted from assisted passage schemes to Aotearoa New Zealand were skilled tradesman and clerical workers (Hutching 1999). Their stories are part of the moving histories of the working classes in the UK (Rogaly and Taylor 2011). Participants who travelled prior to the 1980s reforms were more likely to have come from working class backgrounds, although they had all experienced social mobility since then (Pearson 2013). Since the introduction of an occupational priority list in 1987 and a points-based immigration system in 1991, British arrivals, though possibly assisted by the private companies or state employers recruiting them, have often been more qualified, professional persons, business migrants or retirees who came through independent efforts (Pearson 2014, 505). Most of my participants had arrived after the 1980s immigration reforms and could be categorised as ‘skilled’ and part of the ‘middling’ migrants previously relatively neglected in research on migration (Conradson and Latham 2005a; King 2012). The focus on migrants who occupy such positions is also of particular import in the increasingly skill-based migration regimes of countries like Aotearoa New Zealand (Collins 2009, 6).
Although class is dynamic, relational and contingently experienced, if also linked to durable inequalities in access to material cultural and social resources (Rogaly and Taylor 2011, 11), most of the participants could be described as living middle class lifestyles, even as a minority drew on their working class backgrounds to narrate their identification.

4.3 Research Methods

In the following, I give an account of the twelve months I spent in Auckland from May 2013 to April 2014. Denzin and Lincoln (2011, 4) understand research methods as a bricolage, or a ‘poetic making do’, in which the researcher pieces together a set of representations in response to the specifics of a situation (citing de Certeau 1984, xv). This section outlines the intellectual reasoning, research process as it developed in situ and ethical implications, of the biographic, creative and ethnographic methods I drew on.

4.3.1 ‘Conversation with a purpose’

Due to the sparsity of public spaces where British migrants regularly congregated, I found it helpful to conduct interviews and thus build rapport with participants this way (see also: Benson 2011, 17). As Valentine and Sadgrove (2012) have argued, this method enables the folding in of participants’ pasts and future ambitions to engage with the broader duration of their experiences, and emphasises participants’ ability to reflect on their lives and normative orientations. I drew on interviews with the understanding that how the self is narrated may vary with time, with spatial context and according to the specific performative encounter between a given interviewee and interviewer (Atkinson and Silverman 1997, 305; Valentine and Sadgrove 2012, 2058). With just over half of those who took part in interviews, our relationship continued beyond the initial research encounter and they could thus be described as ‘ethnographic interviews’ (Heyl 2001). The other half, I met just for the initial in-depth interview because they did not have the time or inclination to take part in extended aspects of the project. The inclusion of this latter group of interviewees enabled a broader mapping of patterns and idiosyncrasies among British migrants, and for a group who often worked full-time, led busy, socially dispersed lives and who might otherwise have been difficult to access, I am glad of the wider range of experiences their perspectives brought.
I carried out thematically-oriented, in-depth interviews with forty-six participants, which tended to last between one and two hours. I addressed certain themes consistently, attending to their migration story, their process of settling into Aotearoa New Zealand, their relationships with the UK, with their national identity and with Auckland, and their experiences of ethnic and cultural difference. However, we would follow their threads of conversation rather than any strict itinerary with each interview, consequently, quite different from each other. As soon as possible following the interview, I would write notes about the atmosphere, body language, intonation, smiles and tears, the surrounding environment and my first impressions of what was significant. These recorded interviews were supplemented by innumerable informal conversations. I also carried out interviews with ‘key figures’, including members of various societies, estate agents, business owners and a playwright who has reflected upon British migrants living in Aotearoa New Zealand at length.

I tried to make research encounters with first-generation British migrants informal and relaxed ‘conversation[s] with a purpose’ (Eyles 1988 referenced by Valentine 2005, 111). For each initial interview, I would explain how long, on average, the interview would take, introduce the project and leave participants with an information sheet, before discussing the consent form with them (see: Appendix A and B). I encouraged questions while I explained the other aspects of the project they could be involved in, what would happen to the material, assured them that they could change their mind about taking part and that their identity would be anonymised. To this end, I have provided all the participants with pseudonyms and excluded some identifying details. Most of our sit-down interviews were recorded and transcribed, which I would explain was to aid my memory and allow me to concentrate on our conversation without having to take notes. People responded to the recording device variously. Most were acquainted with the idea and understood it would be helpful. Aileen checked to see the recorder was on before she started speaking. ‘Do I feel like a New Zealander? I suppose I do [she pauses before she continues with her answer glancing at the recorder] is it recording?’ Whereas with Merrick we chatted easily for an hour when we met to look at photographs together, but when I switched on the recorder his body language became tense and he adopted a formal voice. His distant demeanour dropped away again as I swiftly wrapped the questions up and turned the recorder off again to continue our conversation unrecorded.

The tenor of our conversations varied, some appeared to think of them as therapeutic relishing the chance to reflect on their experiences. As Penny, who we will meet in chapter six, explained in our correspondence before we met, ‘I’m not altruistic I just thought it would be a
good chance to process my migration’ (email) and Martin, who we will meet in chapter five, joked after our third interview, ‘is that it? I thought we’d get twelve sessions!’ For a minority the interview dynamic appeared to make them nervous. I would try to allay nerves by sharing some of my own experiences and making sure to convey the sincerity of my interest in their lives. However, Jane, for instance, who at the time was planning an imminent move back to the UK with her family which she felt worried about, nervously clasped her hands during our interview and expressed concern about saying the ‘right’ thing or sounding too negative, the latter marking a theme I return to in chapter six with regards to the stereotypical figure of ‘the whingeing Pom’.

Figure 4.4 Public transport

I asked participants where they would like to meet, and interviews mostly took place in their homes, as well as cafes, bars, offices and parks. When participants lived in outer suburbs, which they often did, travel to and from their homes could take hours. I cannot drive so I was at the whims of public transport or, failing that, taxis, which in some ways could limit where I was able to access for research. When such participants found out I had not driven to meet them, they would often be eager to help: offering me lifts and chastising me for not asking them before I had arrived. They tended to be older than me and their concern and help could set up a parental dynamic to our relationship. However, these lifts gave me a chance to drive around their local neighbourhood with them. Aileen, after finding out I had taken two buses and a long walk on a rainy night to get to her house, offered to drop me off at the train station, and told me a rich story about her travels as a young woman on the way. Most interviews were between the two of us, but some participants preferred to meet as a couple, or to bring along friends and family. I found these conversations were particularly lively with them bouncing off, encouraging and challenging one another (O’Reilly 2005, 130).
I made consistent efforts to be overt about my identity as a researcher. When I attended the St. David’s Day celebrations with the Welsh Club, this approach was rewarded.

‘Merrick would drift past and join in conversations to introduce me as a researcher, “did you know Katie was studying migrants - she could interview you!” It was done in a friendly, informative way, but it also felt like a warning. Fortunately, each time I’d already introduced myself and the project so I didn’t feel I’d been disingenuous’.

However, there was a tension between being overt and being critical (O’Reilly 2005, 75). One of the themes I addressed consistently was participants’ experiences of biculturalism and encounters with ethnic and cultural difference in Auckland. While watching the news with Veronica, talking about who lives in which suburbs with Ivan and in conversations about bicultural policies at work with participants’ in public sector jobs, they would readily offer opinions, often unprompted, and if I disagreed I would usually keep mine private.

O’Reilly (2000, 15) described staying quiet during certain conversations with British migrants in Spain, even if she felt an opinion strongly, in order not to influence the conversation or its outcome too much. As she explained, she felt she ‘would learn more about what people think and feel by appearing ignorant or innocent and by listening well, than if I was loud and opinionated’ (ibid.). I have often been troubled by the ethics of my apparent neutrality in conversations which I disagreed with, at most expressing a slight air of discomfort, as well as the deception of then writing something critical later. There are contrasting views on the best approach in this situation. Griffiths (1991), for instance, argues that researchers should challenge offensive comments because to remain silent is to legitimise such prejudice and is tantamount to collusion (cited in Valentine 2005). Wetherell and Potter (1992, 99) have suggested a more active and interventionist form of interviewing in which the interviewer may participate as an ‘animated conversationalist’ or even argue with the interviewee, by offering counter examples and questioning their assumptions. On the other hand, Skeggs (1994) argues that challenging an interviewee in this way is unlikely to change their views and will merely destroy any rapport developed, and in the process make some types of research impossible (cited in Valentine 2005). In a later publication Wetherell (2003) described how, in her interviews with white, middle class New Zealanders, she tried to facilitate the emergence of everyday common sense for participants, and consequently felt her role as interviewer should be self-effacing.

The following two vignettes are examples which made me reflect upon the ethics of my position or how ‘authentic’ I was in research encounters. Veronica was an elderly participant, which shaped my sense of care for her. She was kind to me, lending me money
when I left my purse on the bus, with her partner, offering to drive me the three-hour round trip home from her house and making scotch pancakes especially for my visit. She was aware some of her opinions were frowned upon. She would whisper conspiratorially behind her hand and laughingly told me that her grandchildren had warned her not to talk about Asians or Māori with me. But Veronica would often, unprompted, express concern about ‘the Chinese … taking over’ and, despite some positive relationships historically with individuals, expressed opinions about Māori which cast them as bad parents, criminal and violent. In response, I tended to adopt a face of mild surprise, feign that I was not sure what she meant and reflect back what she had said as a question. In another example, when I visited Douglas’ house one evening his lodger interrupted our conversation about biculturalism to claim ‘in New Zealand you can’t trust the black people, like any country!’ He then started laughing when Douglas grew agitated, stood up from the sofa we were sat on and raised his voice to denounce ‘the Treaty gravy-train’. I felt a strong sense of my isolation at his secluded house which had taken two buses and a taxi ride to reach. Again, I did not challenge their views, but instead listened quietly while trying to hold an impassive face. In both situations, I felt uncomfortable about my responses.

For Knowles (2006), even if participants’ opinions are distasteful to explore, researchers should listen carefully and search for complexity and ambiguity. Back (2004) made a similar argument when he called for researchers to avoid the temptation to write society as if it were populated by Manichean camps of good and bad people of absolute moral categories, and thus ‘…to allow the people about whom we write to be complex, frail, ethically ambiguous, contradictory and damaged’ (p. 209). Hage (1998) summed up this position when he reflected that, ‘even when the political person in me is crying “racist”, I have attempted to maintain a stance aimed at understanding people from the point of view of their own attempts at making their life viable’ (p. 21). Following their arguments, I have attempted to understand participants’ responses even when they were opposed to my own, by listening carefully and aiming to include some of the complexity of their positions in the analysis.
4.3.2 Photo-elicitation

Figure 4.5 The differing aesthetic quality of photographs

Through photo-elicitation I encouraged participants ‘to visually document their social landscapes through photography and reflect on their photos to produce personal narratives’ (Allen 2012, 443). In this way, the photographs acted as ‘triggers’ to stimulate participants to reflect on their everyday lives and personal geographies of the city. This method was not motivated by realist intentions to more accurately capture their lives, nor a search for greater depth ‘in the sense of a single unified truth’ (Latham 2003, 2007; Pink 2007). Instead, I hoped to elicit greater detail ‘in the sense of a fuller and more variegated picture of the interviewee’ (Latham 2003, 2007).

Twenty-three participants took part in the photo-elicitation aspect of the project and twenty-two had subsequent conversations with me about them. In all, two-hundred and ninety-seven photographs, of varying aesthetic quality, were taken (see figure 4.5). For two participants, I took the photographs on a mobile interview. In such travelling conversations the environment became a prompt and enabled explorations of their experience of space and place (Jones et al. 2008). I asked participants to photograph: ‘your everyday lives and places of Auckland’ over a week. A minority took photographs outside of Auckland or drew on photographs already taken outside of the time that we knew one another. Although not consistent with the aim of reflecting on their current, everyday lives, these still prompted fruitful reflections. I offered to provide a disposable camera for those who did not have, or want to use, their own camera. Most were dismissive of this option, Paul, for instance, calling it ‘a camera for kids’. For the minority who did opt for the disposable option, I collected the camera and developed the photographs, which they kept after I had scanned copies. They had
the option of withdrawing from the project any photographs they did not wish to include, although none did. For the digital photographs, we looked at them together on my laptop.

Figure 4.6 The Titirangi round-about near Lorna’s house and Martin’s cat

I went through two stages of instructions while developing this method. In the first case, I asked participants to photograph ‘people, places, objects and aspects of your everyday life important to you as a British migrant’, but I realised after the third associated interview these instructions presumed and, perhaps more problematically, encouraged a national orientation (Brubaker 1994, 4). For the second instructions, I asked participants,

‘Please take photographs over a week of meaningful aspects of your everyday life and places of Auckland’

I left the instructions purposefully open, apart from these temporal and spatial parameters, and asked those who had already taken part if they would mind repeating the process with the new instructions. Within the constraints of the instructions I had given, and allowing for the influence of their knowledge of the research project focus, participants’ chose what to photograph: from books, to pets, to skype, to having an international food section in the supermarket. I did not prepare questions before we met, but instead these arose in an open-ended fashion in response to the photographs taken.

One problem, perhaps related to my researching a group I was familiar with (O’Reilly 2009b, 113), and a sense of normalcy around British migrants’ presence in Aotearoa New Zealand, was the frequent comment by participants that their pictures were boring. I had to constantly reassure people of my interest and slow them down when we were looking through their photographs in order to draw out their meaning-making. Several participants found the novelty of this method strange, and I became aware of how much more recognisable, comparatively, the interview is in popular culture (Atkinson and Silverman 1997). Although, as
unusual as the method might have been to some, taking photographs was often ordinary for participants and could easily be incorporated into their daily routines.

Figure 4.7. Theo’s desk at work and the view from Sandra’s office

Photo-elicitation was a useful method to engage with the relatively socially dispersed lives of the participants as they negotiated Auckland. Latham (2004) contends that although participant observation works well when one is dealing with either a single, reasonably contained group, or activities that take place within tightly defined spatial and temporal boundaries, it is less appropriate for research participants navigating a city. He argues, in this case, if one were to focus participant observation on one site the participant, if they did pass through, would leave us with little context; and if one were to follow them around while they went about their day-to-day business, it would be unacceptably invasive (p. 122). Although I did draw on participant-observation, photo-elicitation allowed me ‘to bring in those “absent” spaces and places in migrants’ everyday journeys which are often hard for an ethnographer to access’ (Brickell and Datta 2011, 7), such as: meetings at work, bedrooms, spontaneous post-work drinks, romantic meals, working over the weekend, morning jogs, tinkering with a motorbike on a Sunday afternoon and so on. Moreover, while sight is privileged in visual methods it is informed by touch, smell, feel and embodiment (Tolia-Kelly 2010, 35). Interviews with photographs often prompted talk in embodied, affective and ineffable registers producing rich pictorial and oral material (Pink 2007, 28; Rose 2014). This creative and multi-stage method was also helpful to explore the taken-for-granted in participants’ lives, encouraging them to reflect on what they are usually immersed in and to articulate what typically remains implicit (Latham 2003; Knowles and Sweetman 2004; Rose 2014). As Penny reflected, ‘it’s quite fun in some ways just taking photos of things I wouldn’t normally and to think, well, what do I think is interesting about this day? What do I want to tell somebody about this?’
Rose (2014) has argued the treatment of images in much photo-elicitation research, as, ‘[b]anal, performative, designed, created by anyone, affective, saturated with reflexive talk and not always paid much attention’ (p. 40), is reflective of broader contemporary trends in visual culture. In its focus on participants’ verbal explanations of their photographs, this research could be included in Halford and Knowles’ (2005) criticism of the frequent reduction of photographs to an illustration of what is produced textually (p. 1.2; see also: Chaplin 2005, 1.21). In respect of the idea that there is an ambiguity and expressivity to photography which communicates some of what is outside language (Back 2007, 18; Pink 2007, 5; Leonard 2010a, 50), and to avoid the use of the photographs merely as illustration of the text, I have interspersed photographs from participants with minimal accompanying textual explanation in-between the chapters of this thesis, as well as in this section of this chapter. These images may be read as a supplement or as a challenge to the textual material. Although as the curator and with the images being immersed in a larger text, I have not entirely released authorial power or accompanying textual explanations. However, the ambiguous meaning of figure 4.8, with only the caption ‘Englishness’, conveys the significance of accompanying textual explanations. With three young children and a full-time job, Serena, who we will meet in the next chapter, led a busy life and in addition was wary of the researched-researcher relationship. We went through the consent form very carefully with her crossing out the part about my shadowing her in her everyday life. She agreed to take photographs, but rather than meet to discuss them she attached brief captions to each one via email.
Figure 4.9 Tom’s beer and the ferry to Devonport taken by Helen

The use of photographs raised difficult decisions about maintaining anonymity. To alter an image of a face is clearly problematic (O’Reilly 2009b, 222). While questions of consent also arose when participants produced photographs of other people (Clarke 2012, 20). Visual methods are often justified on the grounds that they can reveal information that text-based methods cannot and have a broad appeal as aesthetic cultural artefacts. Accordingly, Clarke (2012, 21) has argued that disguising participants to preserve their anonymity may destroy the very purpose of such methods. Nevertheless, I chose to ensure anonymity before conducting the project, as I was researching with a relatively privileged group and have adopted a critically informed lens. This research necessitates a different ethical practice from that adopted when pursuing a collaborative ethos centred around ‘empowering’ or ‘giving voice’ to a marginalised group, for instance (see, for example: Clarke 2012, 22). Moreover, once images have been disseminated publicly I would have little control over the ways these were interpreted and given meaning by their future audiences (Pink 2007, 56). I felt uncomfortable about jeopardising anonymity in such circumstances. As the photographs were mostly taken by participants themselves often they were not in them, which mitigated this ethical problem. Otherwise I have minimised the inclusion of photographs in which the participants are recognisable, in some cases cropping the image in order to do so. I have also avoided including identifiable images of their families and friends, but I have included images of people who appeared in shot engaging in ordinary practices. In the next section, I reflect on the method of participant observation with British migrants in Auckland.
4.3.3 Participant observation

The social landscape of British migrants in Auckland, as alluded to earlier, was somewhat dispersed. I found no official groups for the British or English while I was in Auckland. Frustratingly, a British group was set up on meet-up.com by an English migrant the day before I departed with the purpose of socialising with young adults. However, in many ways this group confirms this trend, as it subsequently closed from lack of interest after only one meeting with minimal attendance. I visited several groups which I thought might have had a predominantly British membership. The Welsh society had shrunk since the 1980s and 1990s. They had an older membership of Welsh migrants that met monthly but struggled to attract new members. The Welsh Club, a group formed after a schism with the Welsh Society, were also shrinking and struggling to attract new members despite opening up membership to include those who were just interested in Wales. They met more infrequently and were increasingly made up of supportive friends and family and an associated amateur sports teams funded by money gifted to the club. In the Welsh choir, now independent from both of these groups, I was told only one fifth of the members were Welsh migrants, although the choir made an effort to sing some Welsh songs during their performances. The City of Auckland Morris Dancers had around twenty members in attendance at the handful of practice sessions I went to. However, most attendees appeared to be Pākehā New Zealanders, in a trend which came to define many of my efforts to find events that would attract first-generation British migrants. Nevertheless, there was a sizeable number of British migrants, and one man who claimed to be the only Austro-German Morris dancer in the world. The Combined Council of Scottish Societies was set up in 1965 to support Scottish immigrants. At that time, Scottish migrants immigration status was strengthened if they were associated with an organisation in Aotearoa New Zealand. Since they changed the immigration requirements in the 1980s, the Council is now quite low key. When I spoke to a Scottish dance and Caledonian society in Auckland, they reported an ageing group, who struggled to replenish members. They told me that attendees would often be made up of New Zealanders who were interested in their Scottish ancestry, or who just liked to go and dance once a month with a group of friends.

Formal national groups or societies can be highly visible and accessible, but Scott (2007) warns that they only act as vistas onto particular social segments of a migrant community. In Auckland, the veracity of Scott’s argument was compounded by my impression that such organisations appeared to have a small and shrinking membership making them a particularly niche aspect of British migrant experience. Claudia, who was in her thirties and had
arrived three years previously from Scotland, provides an especially active, but still illustrative, example of a broader trend. She was part of the Lions Club International, I had met her at a vegetarian cooking society and I went with her to a sci-fi club and an event for the American society. However, she showed little interest when I asked her if she had attended any Scottish-oriented groups, saying they were ‘boring’ and for older people. Her experience reflects a broader documented trend, in which younger migrants draw on multiple transnational and local networks, rather than relying on nationally-oriented organisations (Scott 2007). Although there were a minority of participants who were actively involved in nationally-oriented groups, they tended to be older. For instance, David was in his seventies and had migrated nearly thirty years ago. He was heavily involved with various expressions of Welsh culture. Together, we ate Welsh cakes at a Welsh Society get-together, listened to the Welsh choir perform and attended the Multicultural Society’s Christmas party, where he led a prayer in Welsh. However, nationally-oriented activities did not tend to be the major focus of most participants’ social lives.

I attended several festivals I thought might be popular with British migrants. Under the shadow of Mount Manaia, I was woken up at seven every morning to the sounds of bagpipes at the week-long Gaidhealtachd Celtic Summer School (2016), which was ‘dedicated to the exploration of Celtic culture and traditions’, with David, and another participant, Maggie, in attendance. However, the festival turned out to be primarily attended by Pākehā New Zealanders enthusiastic about their Celtic ancestry. It was a similar story at a Tartan Day event and at the Auckland Highland Games, which I attended with Claudia who reflected, aptly, that ‘it was interesting to see New Zealand’s take on what it is to be Scottish’. At the two-day ‘Brits at the Beach’ festival in Whangarei Heads, I was told by the organisers only a fifth of attendees were first-generation British migrants. Most attendees were Pākehā New Zealanders who had a nostalgic attachment to British classic cars because trade embargoes up until the 1970s had made these a prominent part of the automobile landscape. Although my investigations of ‘British’ societies and events kept leading me to Pākehā interested in their ancestry, I chose not to focus on their experiences except tangentially, as that would have been an extensive project in itself (see, for example: Nash 2003, Basu 2005). However, I do examine participants’ notions of shared ancestry and cultural affinity with Pākehā New Zealanders in chapter seven.

I also visited various British-themed commercial establishments in Auckland. I spent time in several British-, Irish- and English-themed pubs, interviewed two owners, who were both English, and chatted with bar staff. The pub owners both downplayed the idea British migrants were their predominant customers and told me they actively targeted and attracted
a diverse clientele. However, both pubs did have a group of British regulars, and I will return to participants’ reflections on these pubs in chapter six. I also visited several British-themed stores. The UK grocery chain Bramptins had several stores. I spent a few days in the Orewa and Devonport branch, both of which have now closed, regularly visited the Browns Bay store, and travelled once to the Papakura store. I spoke with staff each time about my project and made observations of customers navigating the aisles. I was told by one member of staff that around half their customers were first-generation British migrants and the other half visited because they had previously travelled to the UK or liked the aesthetic. I also visited the English Corner Shop several times, which has since changed its name to Laines in order to attract a broader audience, and helped out for an afternoon near Christmas. For many participants, visiting these stores was a ‘special treat’, rather than an ordinary part of their everyday lives. In fact, in chapter six I introduce the stereotypical figure which emerged among participants of ‘the bad migrant’. This figure was cast as parochial, narrow-minded and overly focused on recreating Britain socially and culturally. In this context, focusing attention on British-themed commercial establishments only provided a limited perspective on these migrants’ lives.

In the face of a general lack of interest in nationally-oriented societies, events or commercial establishments among this migrant group, I decided to also focus on following individuals in their everyday lives (see also: Knowles and Harper 2009, 19; Conway and Leonard 2014, 25). For some introductory examples, I watched Richard Curtis films with Emma and supported her nervous first steps at singing at an open mike night, I joined Penny visiting an exhibition on Māori taonga (treasure), and had fish and chips on Mission Bay beach with Lucy at her leaving party before she returned to the UK. I took part in Maggie’s yoga class and sang with her at the local choir, Martin took me on a tour of his favourite spots in the city and I was driven around the city with Nathan and his friends singing the British national anthem in a self-parodying falsetto. Spending time with participants in their lives allowed me to watch and experience things as they happened, rather than asking about them afterwards, and meant I came across things people may otherwise forget to mention or may not normally want to discuss (O’Reilly 2005, 106; 2009b, 155). For example, when Martin raised the topic of migrants from countries in Asia he was restrained in our initial interview, ‘I’m not gonna say here, um [here he pauses and glances pointedly to the recorder], what it’s about but I know a lot of Kiwis get very- very upset about, um, the numbers and the way certain groups get into the country...’'. But later in the day, after we had visited an exhibition together, an encounter in the street prompted him to expand on his opinions. I explore participants’ perceptions of
those who appeared to have East Asian heritage, and of ethnic and cultural difference more generally, in chapters seven and eight.

There are some places it is difficult for a researcher to access because of their attributes whether their age, sex, colour or social class (O’Reilly 2005, 86). Walsh (2005) reflected that while she was able to enter and become part of feminised spaces and a scene of younger expatriates in her research with the British in Dubai, she had to manage the flattered perceptions of her attention from older men and sometimes being excluded or patronised by older women at other times. Her access was mitigated by her embodiment and the relations she could form with different expatriates who ‘hang around with those of similar backgrounds in terms of occupation or even class’ (Walsh 2005, 289). I found it easier to form lasting relationships with participants who were closer to my age, and to form relationships with new people in contexts where my presence and ability to approach new people was relatively inconspicuous, such as a shared interest group. Conversely, when I visited the pub alone during the day the majority of customers were men who were significantly older than me. My being a younger woman limited my access to the space, with several of them responding to my interest in their lives, or merely my presence, with innuendo. I felt more comfortable when I returned with friends and participants, and the line between the two blurred with time.

There were sometimes complications attendant to the blurring of lines between friends and participants. For instance, I met Charlotte after she responded to a poster calling for participants in her suburb. She was quite socially isolated and as we became closer she became uncomfortable about whether I was listening as a researcher or a friend. We decided that after that point she would stop being part of the project, and instead we would just spend time together as friends. In general, I had to make choices, premised on a relational and situational ethics, about what I could include in the thesis and what was shared with me in a personal capacity (Ellis 2007). Their significance as a migrant group meant that British migrants were present in various social circles and events I attended. The drawing of a boundary between my research and personal life was an ongoing process. When I introduced myself and my project to British migrants that I met in everyday life, this situation tended to prompt interested conversations, as well as the potential for their slight discomfort or jokes that I might be researching them at the time. At one party, an English woman, after hearing about my project, seemed keen to distance herself emphasising that she had left the UK, besides the weather, because she could not stand ‘the white, British, imperial sense of entitlement’ and ‘the entrenched class system’. Although her opinion was more critical than most, her
immediate effort to distance herself from association with undesirable British characteristics reflected a recurrent pattern among participants which I address in chapter six.

4.4 The process of writing and analysis

‘Qualitative research consists of a set of interpretive, material practices that make the world visible. These practices transform the world. They turn the world into a series of representations, including fieldnotes, interviews, conversations, photographs, recordings, and memos to the self’. (Denzin and Lincoln 2011, 3)

Writing and analysis was a messy, satisfying and sometimes unnerving process, which was continuous throughout the research process. I aimed to cultivate a dialectic of ‘surprise’ between my theoretical formulations and preconceptions and the empirical material during analysis, so that each could influence the other in an iterative-inductive approach (Wills and Trondman 2000, 394, 399; O’Reilly 2005). In pursuit of such a mode of analysis, rather than the use of ‘grand theory’ or an overly rigid ‘grammar’ which pre-exists the phenomena under study, Wills and Trondman (2000) advocate ‘sensitising concepts’ as a means of teasing out patterns from the texture of everyday life.

I sought to trace significant trends, noting recurrent patterns in the material, while also allowing space for less overt aspects of experience to rise to the surface too. In Wetherell’s (2003, 24) research with white, middle class New Zealanders, she found that over a large group of people repetition and clear patterns begin to emerge in their discourse, even as ‘the argumentative fabric of society’ remains dynamic and shifting (p. 14). Analysis proceeds, she suggests, through the identification of cultural resources and ‘the traffic jam of meanings ... which create that form of pollution known as common sense’ (Braidotti 1994, 16 cited in Wetherell 2003, 11). In an extension of this argument which relates such patterning more explicitly to power, Leonard (2010a) suggests that researchers should evaluate the extent to which the accounts and narratives offered ‘can be seen to be an expression of power or a resistance to dominant hegemonic ideologies’. She argues, this is a crucial step ‘if we are to argue that certain forms of discourse are implicated in the sustenance and maintenance of particular social patterns’ (p. 48).

The detail of participants’ everyday lives act as a window onto larger processes (Mills Wright 1959; Back 2007, 7). In other words, this thesis understood the everyday, quotidian,
banal and ordinary aspects of participants’ lives as illuminative and ‘co-constitutive of the wider complexities, structures and processes of ... social worlds’ (Neal and Murji 2015, 812).

Hall provided a powerful argument for the importance of attention to connections between the everyday and broader processes, in his call for research into racialised and ethnicised identities to ask,

‘What is the relationship between the mobilisation of performance of racialised and other forms of ethnicity and identity at the local, micro, more ethnographic level and the larger thing that brought us into the field at the beginning, namely a racialised world ... a world in which material and symbolic resources continue to be deeply unequally distributed?’ (Hall 2006, cited in Alexander 2009, 474)

Hall (in Hall and Grossberg 1996) has argued that, for him, poststructuralism marked an extension of the structuralist project to engage with and map out the broader forces which shape our lives, but without the organising structure of universalising, teleological grand narratives. Ahmed (2000, 90) evokes the dynamic this mode of attention demands,

‘So many stories, so many journeys: each one fantastic in its particularity (how did it feel, what happened here and there?) and yet mediated and touched by broader relationships of social antagonism (the history of the British empire, class relations and the politics of sexuality and gender)’.

The connections posited to explain the recurrent patterns mapped in this thesis are intended to be fleeting, temporary and ready for the next iteration. In this way, I claim a situated form of knowledge premised upon ‘interpretation, translation, stuttering, and the partly understood’ (Haraway 1988, 589; Rose 1997). This thesis does not claim to be representative of British migrants in Auckland, Aotearoa New Zealand, but instead aims to generate critical, theoretically-informed examinations of a range of their experiences (see also: Conway and Leonard 2014, 25). Back (2007, 183) has argued that the purpose of research is best characterised as ‘enriching the stories that we tell about ourselves and the world in which we live’. It is in that spirit that I offer this thesis.
I have used the most recent designation of neighbourhoods, following the amalgamation of the Auckland Region into the Super City. However, as will become clear, many participants still used former terms. In particular, many commented on ‘the North Shore’ area to refer to affluent coastal suburbs in the north of the city.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>‘British’ identities: Nationalised/racialised/ethnicised</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Neighbourhood¹⁵</th>
<th>Arrival date/ years since arrived</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abbey</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Mid-forties</td>
<td>English/White</td>
<td>House-wife</td>
<td>Mission Bay, Ōrākei Ward</td>
<td>2013 – 7 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aileen</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Late-fifties</td>
<td>Scottish/White</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Titirangi, Waitakere Ward</td>
<td>1986 – 28 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amy</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Late-forties</td>
<td>English/White</td>
<td>Logistics manager</td>
<td>Torbay, Albany Ward</td>
<td>2008 – 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beryl</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Late-seventies</td>
<td>English/White</td>
<td>Office administrator/ House wife – now retired</td>
<td>Meadowood, Albany Ward</td>
<td>1960 – 53 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Late-sixties</td>
<td>Northern Irish/White</td>
<td>Labourer in ports</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>1969 – 44 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassie</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Early-thirties</td>
<td>English/White</td>
<td>Dental health</td>
<td>Whangaparaoa, Albany Ward</td>
<td>2011 – 3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Mid-twenties</td>
<td>English/White</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Torbay, Albany Ward</td>
<td>2007 - 6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chloe</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Late-fifties</td>
<td>English/White</td>
<td>District nurse</td>
<td>Ellerslie, Ōrākei Ward</td>
<td>1988 – 25 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Early-fifties</td>
<td>English/Caribbean</td>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>Takapuna, North Shore Ward</td>
<td>2003 – 10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudia</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Mid-thirties</td>
<td>Scottish/White</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Lynfield, Puketāpapa Ward</td>
<td>2010 - 3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Late-fifties</td>
<td>English/White</td>
<td>Health services</td>
<td>Three Kings, Puketāpapa Ward</td>
<td>1982 - 21 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Early-seventies</td>
<td>Welsh/White</td>
<td>Teacher - retired</td>
<td>Henderson, Waitakere Ward</td>
<td>1985 – 28 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Early-sixties</td>
<td>Welsh/White</td>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>Okura, Albany Ward</td>
<td>1999 - 14 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹⁵ I have used the most recent designation of neighbourhoods, following the amalgamation of the Auckland Region into the Super City. However, as will become clear, many participants still used former terms. In particular, many commented on ‘the North Shore’ area to refer to affluent coastal suburbs in the north of the city.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ellery</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Late-fifties</td>
<td>English/White</td>
<td>Real estate</td>
<td>Takapuna, North Shore Ward</td>
<td>1995 – 18 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma and Sam</td>
<td>F &amp; M</td>
<td>Late-twenties</td>
<td>English/White</td>
<td>Pharmacy technician &amp; IT</td>
<td>Brown’s Bay, Albany Ward</td>
<td>2013 – 6 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiona</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Late-fifties</td>
<td>Welsh/White</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Brown’s Bay, Albany Ward</td>
<td>1997 – 16 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Late-fifties</td>
<td>Northern Irish/White</td>
<td>Publisher</td>
<td>Epsom, Albert-Eden-Roskill Ward</td>
<td>1984 – 30 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Late-forties</td>
<td>English/White</td>
<td>Health consultant</td>
<td>Devonport, North Shore Ward</td>
<td>2012 – 1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Late-forties</td>
<td>English/White</td>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>Mairangi Bay, Albany Ward</td>
<td>1996 – 17 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivan</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Late-seventies</td>
<td>Scottish/White</td>
<td>Merchant navy - retired</td>
<td>Narrow Neck, North Shore Ward</td>
<td>2007 - 6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Mid-forties</td>
<td>English/White</td>
<td>Office manager</td>
<td>Devonport, North Shore Ward</td>
<td>2000 – 13 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jaqueline</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Late-fifties</td>
<td>English/White</td>
<td>Office administrator</td>
<td>Titirangi, Waitakere Ward</td>
<td>1995 – 18 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia and Charles</td>
<td>F &amp; M</td>
<td>Both late-fifties</td>
<td>English/White &amp; Welsh/White</td>
<td>Teacher &amp; teacher</td>
<td>Devonport, North Shore Ward</td>
<td>1979 – 34 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorna</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Late-forties</td>
<td>English/White</td>
<td>Associate professor</td>
<td>Titirangi, Waitakere Ward</td>
<td>2008 – 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Early-thirties</td>
<td>English/White</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Freemans Bay, Waitemata and Gulf Ward</td>
<td>2009 – 4 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maggie</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Late-fifties</td>
<td>English/White</td>
<td>Yoga therapist</td>
<td>Devonport, North Shore Ward</td>
<td>1980 – 33 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Early-fifties</td>
<td>English/White</td>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>Albany, Albany Ward</td>
<td>2010 – 3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Age Group</td>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Years Active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merrick</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Early-fifties</td>
<td>Welsh/White</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Te Atatu Peninsula, Waitakere Ward</td>
<td>1986 – 23 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathan</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Early-forties</td>
<td>English/White</td>
<td>Tutor</td>
<td>Central business district, Waitemata and Gulf Ward</td>
<td>2005 – 8 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Early-sixties</td>
<td>English/White</td>
<td>Store manager</td>
<td>Bayswater, Albany Ward</td>
<td>2005 – 8 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul and Dorothy</td>
<td>M &amp; F</td>
<td>Late and mid-seventies</td>
<td>White/English</td>
<td>Housing inspector – retired &amp; PA - retired</td>
<td>Orewa, Albany Ward</td>
<td>1969 – 44 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penny</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Early-forties</td>
<td>English/Caribbean</td>
<td>Health services</td>
<td>Blockhouse Bay, Whau Ward</td>
<td>1999 - 14 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippa</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Mid-fifties</td>
<td>English/White</td>
<td>Health services</td>
<td>Glenfield, North Shore Ward</td>
<td>2004 – 9 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Mid-fifties</td>
<td>English/White</td>
<td>Health services</td>
<td>Laingholm, Waitakere Ward</td>
<td>1983 – 30 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Late-twenties</td>
<td>English/White</td>
<td>Charity sector</td>
<td>Grey Lynn, Waitemata and Gulf Harbour</td>
<td>2009 - 4 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serena</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Early-forties</td>
<td>English/South Asian</td>
<td>Educator</td>
<td>Titirangi, Waitakere Ward</td>
<td>2004 – 9 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stan</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Late-forties</td>
<td>English/White</td>
<td>Tradesman</td>
<td>Torbay, Albany Ward</td>
<td>2009 – 4 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theo</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Early-thirties</td>
<td>English/White</td>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>Beachlands, Franklin Ward</td>
<td>2004 – 9 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom and Sandra</td>
<td>M &amp; F</td>
<td>Both late-thirties</td>
<td>English/White</td>
<td>Car mechanic &amp; civil servant</td>
<td>Brown’s Bay, Albany Ward</td>
<td>2001 – 12 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veronica</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Late-eighties</td>
<td>Scottish/White</td>
<td>Administrative roles - retired</td>
<td>Orewa, Albany Ward</td>
<td>1956 – 56 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.10 A table of participants’ characteristics
Figure 5.1 Chris, Central Business District
Chapter five. ‘The good life’: temporal and spatial imaginaries of Aotearoa New Zealand

Introduction

‘AUCKLAND
Last, loneliest, loveliest, exquisite, apart …’
(Rudyard Kipling 1896)

‘From the other side of the world,
From a little island cradled in the giant sea bosom,
From a little land with no history
(Making its own history, slowly and clumsily
Piecing together this and that, finding the pattern, solving the problem,
Like a child with a box of bricks) …’
(Katherine Mansfield 1909)

The first extract is part of a larger poem documenting cities of the British Empire by a noted imperial enthusiast, and the second from a prominent writer who examined the ambiguity of her twentieth-century Pākehā society. The imagery evoked in the two extracts above, of alluring seclusion and a youthful nation, frames the following analysis.

Nineteenth century British migrants to Aotearoa New Zealand, Phillips and Hearn (2008) suggest, were often seeking greater economic opportunity, social freedom and security in ‘the farthest promised land’ (Arnold 1981). In his research with contemporary English migrants, Pearson (2012) claimed that ‘sentiments of seeking social, environmental, and material improvement in a now far less distant land suggest that classic migrant aspirations for an arcadian ideal are still being reinvented’ (p. 164). However, Pearson’s analysis of the commonalities between more recent English migrants and their colonial precedents concludes with their shared quest for improvements in their lifestyle. He tracks affinities in the ongoing pursuit of a pastoral and suburban aesthetic, “‘getting on’”, enjoying accessible recreational pursuits, [and] bringing up children in a more “‘natural’ physical and social environment’, but Pearson does not expand on how pursuits of an arcadian ‘good life’, and the specific geographical and historical imaginaries of Aotearoa New Zealand attendant to that, might
evidence colonial continuities. Benson and Osbaldiston (2014, 12) have argued that there is a sparsity of literature which centralises (post)colonial (dis)continuities in lifestyle migration research (for several exceptions see: Knowles and Harper 2009, Korpela 2009; Benson 2013). This chapter builds and expands upon Pearson’s analysis, through a critical examination of how British lifestyle migrants’ ‘imaginings of destinations and understandings of migration contain colonial traces’ (Benson 2013, 316).

We routinely make sense of places, spaces and landscapes, and the connections and separations between them, in our everyday lives, and these ‘popular geographies’ are central to the conduct of social life (Gregory 1994, 11). In an argument that knowingly echoes Wright Mills’ ‘sociological imagination’ and his linking of the intimacy of biographies with broader historical and social processes, Gregory (1994, 11) argues that such ‘popular geographies’ travel ‘through social practices at large and are implicated in myriad topographies of power and knowledge’.

Imaginaries of places and the lives available there play a central role in lifestyle migration (O’Reilly and Benson 2009). In this chapter, I focus, in particular, on culturally significant geographical and temporal imaginings of Aotearoa New Zealand, as they relate to dominant themes which emerged when participants reflected on the lifestyles available to them. I connect a dominant ‘island’ trope of isolation and relative insignificance and a notion of the country as ‘young’ with positive aspects of the lifestyles participants reflected were available to them, such as a sense of opportunity, space and a verdant natural landscape; as well as less positive aspects, such as a perception of parochialism and being ‘cut off’ from the world. I argue such spatial and temporal imaginaries reflect colonial continuities.

As the opening quotes revealed, and as already discussed in chapter three, these collective imaginaries of contemporary British lifestyle migrants have historical legacies and reflect wider imaginings about Aotearoa New Zealand.

In order to situate the following analysis, I want to expand on the framing of participants as lifestyle migrants, and stress that their pursuit of an enhanced lifestyle was enabled by their favourable experience of the labour market. A longitudinal immigration survey in 2005, which interviewed over 7000 migrants from various regions of origin in Aotearoa New Zealand, found that migrants from the UK and Irish Republic were the most likely to state the ability to achieve their desired lifestyle, the relaxed pace of life, climate and natural environment, small population and better access to outdoor or sporting activities, as what they most liked about living in Aotearoa New Zealand (Badkar 2006, 60). Although often enabled by relative privilege, for lifestyle migrants ‘aesthetic qualities including quality of life are prioritised over economic factors like job advancement and
income’ (O’Reilly and Benson 2009, 11). However, the concept of lifestyle migration is not intended to flatten motives into a single dimension, nor is it divorced from economic aspects (Knowles and Harper 2009).

Most participants had to work to support themselves in Auckland. Watson et al.’s (2011) study of British migrants’ employment experience paints a picture of predominantly professional or managerial ‘skilled’ migrants extending their previous careers, as well as seeking more enjoyable employment. The majority of participants seemed to have found work commensurate with their qualifications relatively easily. There were a few exceptions who had a more difficult route, but they had achieved a job they were satisfied with eventually. British migrants tend to experience a relative ease of integration into the labour market in Aotearoa New Zealand, comparable with South African migrants, but in contrast with migrants from countries in Asia and the Pacific (Zodgekar 2005; Badkar 2006, 32; Grbic 2010; Watson et al. 2011). As Smith (2006, 54; italics in original cited by Benson 2012, 1686) has argued,

‘[T]he ability to realise a particular idea of oneself is reliant on access to economic resources and powers of symbolic legitimation, neither of which are distributed equitably . . . In this respect certain individuals are much better placed to be successful ‘authors’ of their own lives than others’.

The stories below, which reflect on ‘the good life’ available to British migrants, should be understood in the context of participants’ relative privilege.

The following analysis is organised into four parts. First, I examine how participants’ mobilities were framed through escape, before exploring aspects of ‘the good life’ associated with Aotearoa New Zealand, such as a slower pace of life, a sense of opportunity and safety. I suggest these were often associated with a smaller population, geographical isolation from other places and a sense of being somewhere peripheral. Secondly, I unpack understandings of Aotearoa New Zealand as at ‘the end of the world’ and argue that such common tropes of unsettling remoteness reanimate colonial spatial imaginaries. The spatial patterns of their residency mean that many British migrants in Auckland can be described as pursuing a ‘suburban arcadia’ (Fairburn 1975). Thirdly, I engage in greater detail with this spatial pattern of living and the greater sense of space commented on by many participants, before revealing a common dynamic among participants of expressing appreciation for their spectacular natural surroundings, but contrasting this enthusiasm with a perceived lack of culture and history. Finally, I critically address a popular understanding among participants of Aotearoa New Zealand as ‘young’, and perhaps ‘immature’, in relation to ‘older’ places, such as the UK. I
argue that this understanding erases longer histories on the land and, in doing so, contributes to a ‘white-washing’ of Aotearoa New Zealand. This perspective also exhibits a problematic ‘denial of coevalness’ (Fabian 1983), or the contemporaneity of other places, thus blocking an imaginary which allows for the multiplicity of other trajectories (Massey 2005).

5.1 In pursuit of ‘the good life’: escape and opportunity

Tom: ‘... there was one moment that made me realise ... we got back to Gatwick airport in mid-December and it was really early in the morning and obviously at that time of year it’s very cold. The car was parked about nine deep in some airport car-park ... and it got stuck on the M25 at seven o’clock in the morning and it was just a car-park and I said to Sandra, “look at all these poor people going to work in this”. There were people sitting there with laptops in their cars. I could see ten years in the future, and I thought this will be us. We’ll both be doing this. We’ll both be doing something horrific like this, and we just didn’t want our lives to be like that. And that was really one of those moments you just think this is just nonsense, and that was - that was where the line was drawn’.

Tom was in his thirties and had migrated twelve years previously with his English wife, Sandra, who we will meet later. After their return from a holiday in Aotearoa New Zealand, it was an imagined future of cold, crowded car-parks that he pin-points as the genesis of his migration. The search for a better life is often a relative endeavour pitted against a monotonous, stressful or meaningless life left behind (O’Reilly and Benson 2009, 3). The construction of a negative image of Britain through a ‘bad Britain’ discourse among British emigrants has been documented elsewhere (see, for example: O’Reilly 2000, 99; Benson 2011, 8). This discourse was evident among many participants when framing their motivations to migrate as stories of escape or when contrasting Aotearoa New Zealand with the UK post-migration, but it was not exclusive from fond recollections of the UK. Sandra, Tom’s wife, was later keen to temper his story, saying ‘if we had to go back to England it would be ok, we know where we’ve come from. We like that place’. As with several others, for her, rather than wanting to leave a negatively portrayed UK, she just felt she was able to access a better lifestyle in Auckland. As Theo illustrates, who was in his thirties and had migrated around ten years previously with his English wife, ‘I don’t hate Britain, I’m not gonna come here and all I do is say bad things about it, not really, just that on my level it’s better here than it is there’. In fact, a significant minority were aware of and would distance themselves from the ‘bad Britain’ discourse, associating it with compatriots who were somehow disloyal or too negative about the UK, even as they might participate in it later in the same interview. Moreover, as Pearson
(2014, 514) documented among contemporary English arrivals, there was sometimes a tension between ‘wishing to preserve a positive sense of “your country” in the face of its acknowledged shortcomings, whilst seeking to avoid condemnation from others’. The latter point marks a sensitivity among participants to displays of pride in being British, which I will explore further in chapter six.

Alternately, Martin, in his fifties who had migrated three years previously, was particularly invested in ‘the bad Britain’ discourse,

‘I just think the UK’s finished. There’s just too many people there, the ones that are working are being taxed to the hilt to pay for the lazy bastards that aren’t, um, they don’t seem to be able to dig themselves out of the- they’re always under the thumb of Europe … they wanna get out of the EU, block the tunnel off, fill that in, get rid of all the illegals’.

Martin’s opinion fits into a broader ‘narrative of decline’ tracked among the British in the UK (Fenton 2008; Clarke et al. 2009), which for him centred upon overcrowding, the ‘strivers and skivers’ rhetoric encouraged by the current Conservative government in the UK, a loss of sovereignty to Europe and, ironically, discontent at immigration levels. In relation to this discourse of a ‘bad Britain’, although Charles and Julia described the England they migrated from in the 1980s as ‘pretty grim’ in a description which echoed Martin’s in the 2000s and Veronica’s appraisal of Scotland in the 1950s, I have kept in mind the difference in experience between migrants who left and arrived from different places and at different times. However, with regards to the differences between cohorts, as the majority of participants arrived during or after the period of immigration reforms in the late-1970s and 1980s which removed ‘kinship’ preference, this division has not provided a central part of the analysis (see Pearson 2012, for a comparison between generational cohorts of English migrants in Aotearoa New Zealand).

Figure 5.2 Lucy, lunch on Ponsonby Road and a walk in the Hunua Ranges
As well as the ‘bad Britain’ discourse, there was an existential element to some participants’ reflections on why they had migrated. Lucy was in her thirties and migrated to Auckland four years ago. In her talk about life back in the UK, she points to a justification for emigration as a way of physically escaping social ennui,

‘I think a lot of my friends are stuck in a rut back at home even when I talk to them now it’s like “ah, what you doing?”’, “ah, you know same old stuff”.

Claudia was in her thirties and had moved to Auckland three years ago with her Scottish husband. She similarly contrasts a language of stasis and doldrums with a new-found dynamism post-migration,

‘Life was just pretty stale, nothing’s happening, nothing’s going to happen, it seemed difficult to branch out and make new friends … moving here was exactly the change that I needed, and I feel like life is moving forward again. I have plans, I have goals, I have things that I’m working towards, yeah, it feels like I’m moving again’.

Her sentiment resonates strongly with Hage’s (2005, 471) engagement with migrant motivation,

‘… it is when people feel that they are existentially “going too slowly” or “going nowhere”, that they are somewhat “stuck” on the “highway of life”, that they begin contemplating the necessity of physically “going somewhere”’.

The physical crossing of borders was only one part of an ongoing desire for a life which is ‘going somewhere’. When Claudia first arrived and had yet to make friends, she started to build a life by going online to see what events were coming up and buying tickets. Three years later, every November, at the end of spring, this process had become a tradition. In contrast, when she lived in Edinburgh, Claudia said that she would hide every August when the population trebled for the Festival. In a similar vein, Lucy led a busy social life on top of her full-time job as a teacher, made up of coffee mornings, ‘dinner parties’ (said by her in a pseudo-posh voice), winery tours, walks in the nearby Waitakere and Hunua Ranges, camping, music and art festivals, BBQs and picnics (see figure 5.2). Whereas she recalled ‘if I met up with my friends in England or in London it would be like, “ah, see you at the pub”’. A notion of ‘escape’ to a place seen as offering an enhanced lifestyle shaped many participants’ stories, which were organised to varying degrees in contrast with a negative idea of Britain. Next, I want to expand on some of the patterns which emerged in participants’ reflections on ‘the good life’ available to them.

A new-found, slower pace of life was often contrasted with an oppressive, fast-paced Britain. Theo now lived in Beachlands with his wife and their young child, a quiet, coastal suburb popular with British migrants. He worked as a consultant and commuted to work, via
ferry, to his firm in central Auckland. Although he had previously lived in ‘a little village’ in the Midlands, he had reflected with his wife about the difficulty of returning to England.

‘Here’s a lot more laid back, um, we talked about that before, I think we’d struggle with the pace of life if we went back to England. It’s very much more competitive and go, go, go and that’s even compared to Auckland I imagine somewhere else it’d be even more relaxed’.

Tom, who moved from a city in Yorkshire, England, to Brown’s Bay, another coastal suburb popular with Brits, vividly expressed the differences between the countries when he recalled visiting London,

‘... a couple of years ago ... I spent three days in London and I couldn’t wait to get out of there. It just did my head in. It’s just too oppressive now. The UK is like- New Zealand runs at fifty miles per hour, the UK’s at one hundred, and it’s really obvious when you go there. It’s like- it was just like [pushed his body back, dazzled face]’.

In contrast to these negative portrayals of life in the UK, many participants associated typical ‘Kiwi’16 lifestyles with outdoor leisure, a better work-life balance and the centring of family.

The pohutukawae-lined Tamaki Drive heads east from the city centre along the waterfront to Mission Bay, an affluent coastal suburb where Abbey lives. She had migrated with her English husband and two young children just six months previously from Surrey, one of the Home Counties bordering London. She was one of the few participants on a generous relocation package with her husband’s job. We talked while she unpacked her shopping in the kitchen, which led to a large living area and a bright, blue swimming-pool in their back-garden. As with several others, when negotiating where to migrate to they had excluded the US, as they thought the work ethic was too extreme. She told me, ‘it’s a better quality of family life here ‘cos I think Kiwis are very into the whole “your weekend’s your weekend”. Whereas in Britain people work ridiculous hours’. Although the other side of this perspective was that it was not uncommon for participants to comment on local bureaucracy being inefficient and New Zealanders not working very hard. Sam, in his twenties, had arrived six months previously from Cambridge with his English partner Emma, to a corporate job in IT. As an example of the normal way in which such attitudes might be dropped into conversations, one afternoon he told me about his planned move to Hamilton and the organisation involved in starting a new

---

16 The term Kiwi, Turner (2007, 91) suggests, means, ‘A person whose identity primarily derives from identification with the nation of New Zealand, as opposed to any primarily non-national identification (whether Muslim, Kurd, or local Tūhoe), is commonly called ‘Kiwi’. Kiwi designates a kind of cultural capital’. Kiwi tends to be used to refer to white New Zealanders.
job, he rolled his eyes and said, ‘knowing this country that should take at least a month’.
Despite pursing a slower pace of life, slow bureaucracy was frowned upon.

As explored in chapter two, there has historically been a myth of classlessness in Aotearoa New Zealand. In an exploration of whether contemporary English migrants still considered the country as classless, Pearson (2013) found that although this perception was more marked for those who came prior to the 1970s, who were often working class and in pursuit of social mobility, it still framed the journey of more recent, generally middle class, arrivals, for whom lifestyle factors tended to outweigh career progression (p. 92). He concluded that ‘viewing one’s migration as circumventing forms of constraint’ connected the cohorts, but he argued status rather than class was now discursively prominent (p. 97). My study complements his findings. Interestingly, rather than commenting on class explicitly, the smaller population of Aotearoa New Zealand was often associated with an opening up of potential, appositely captured in the phrase to be ‘a big fish in a small pond’.

As with several others, Julia connected the smaller population directly with a greater likelihood of social mobility. Julia was in her fifties and had migrated with her Welsh husband, Charles, who we will meet later, over thirty years previously. They migrated as restrictions for British arrivals began to tighten but were able, with the connections and capital of his father, a chartered accountant who had emigrated from the UK several years earlier, and an inheritance from his grandmother, to invest in a small business and meet the requirements for immigration. They both later trained as teachers. She now had a senior position and had written textbooks in her field. She reflected,

‘... we’ve been lucky really it’s a lot easier to do well here ... because it’s a small base, we’ve done quite well for ourselves really’.

However, their relative financial and social privilege was not reflected on in our conversations. After selling his business in the UK and emigrating three years previously, Martin found employment as an engineer for a local company in Auckland. He also associated a smaller population with more opportunities, telling me,

‘...no one’s gonna give you hand-outs here, but there’s so much potential and opportunities. It just boils down to numbers I mean when you think that, um, the UK and New Zealand occupy about the same land mass ... we’ve got just over 4.2 million in New Zealand total. Sixty-six million and counting in the UK. I think there’s twelve million in London alone. It’s just unreal’.

An ‘overcrowded’ Britain was frequently unfavourably contrasted with a more sparsely populated Aotearoa New Zealand, as I will return to in section 5.3.
As well as a smaller population, distance from other places was also connected with opportunity for participants. Serena was in her forties and had migrated nine years ago with her Pākehā partner, whom she met while he was living in her home city in northern England. She illustrates this perspective through her perception of a place-specific can-do attitude.

‘… here in New Zealand you’re almost in isolation and it almost- there’s this idea - OK New Zealand is isolated … there’s this aspect of - and that’s something I do like about the culture – yeah, I can do that. That’s an aspect that I’d- or like, so things that I probably didn’t lean to before – “oh I might be able to do this”. Wouldn’t even enter my head in the UK, “oh I can’t do that because of this, this and this” where here I kind of think, “oh well actually I might be able to do that”. So in terms of that mind, it’s kind of shifted’.

‘Number eight wire’ is a part of popular culture in Aotearoa New Zealand. The phrase is meant to convey a culture of ingenuity developed through having to improvise when materials were difficult to obtain because of distance from other countries. The notion of isolation raised by Serena is a central theme I will return to in section 5.2.

As another aspect of the opportunity associated with a smaller population, distance and a general sense of being in a peripheral part of the world, many participants commented on their sense of a reduced social hierarchy (see also: Pearson 2013). Chris, in his fifties, had lived ‘under the flight path of Heathrow in a terraced house’ in London before he migrated with his two children and Pākehā wife, whom he had met in London, ten years previously. He offers one, particularly glamorous, example of a participant who had enjoyed the greater status accessible in a ‘small place’. Chris described how his previous job meant that when he first arrived he would travel,

‘… up and down the country. I was doing a lot of work with Tourism New Zealand so you meet the Prime Minister, just like that, you meet MPs, you meet heads of large companies, it’s easy, ‘cos they’re there. In the UK, again, almost impossible ‘cos its smaller, you know’.

Due to an aspect of his career and lifestyle, he had become briefly famous making it into the local news. During this period, he had enjoyed several invitations to exclusive events, for instance, he was invited to sail on the British yacht during the America’s Cup held in Auckland and to the New Zealand Fashion Week. For Chris, this lifestyle and enhanced status, he repeated a few times, would have been ‘impossible’ in the UK. However, when he lost his internationally-based job during the global financial crisis, Chris found,

‘The experience I had as a salesman didn’t quite fit in the major corporates that existed here. So you’ve got milk – Fonterra, you’ve got Air New Zealand, you’ve got some power companies, you’ve got the Government in Wellington. Otherwise most of the business in New Zealand is small business. I did not quite fit’.
He struggled to find an equivalent role in Auckland and although eventually successful, Chris illustrated how, even for elite ‘skilled’ migrants, ‘[g]lobal space it turns out is not an isotropic surface of sameness after all. Rather, international movement forces adjustments to highly variable business opportunities’ (Ley 2004, 158).

Bell (1996, 39) has suggested that islander status and distance from anywhere else, ‘means New Zealanders can view their country as unspoiled, untainted, independent; a safe haven a long way from the bad things in the rest of the world’ (emphasis added). As another example of notions of ‘the good life’ associated with Aotearoa New Zealand being relatively out-of-the-way, many participants’ sentiments supported the country’s reputation as a ‘safe’ place (Dürr 2007). Claudia had previously lived in the centre of Edinburgh, Scotland. She illustrates the embodiment of this sense of safety through her story of an encounter in the street,

‘... before, like, if I passed a group of kids I naturally sort of puff up a little bit ‘cos you never know if there’s gonna be trouble or not ‘cos kids in the UK are awful. At least they are in Edinburgh. Like today, I parked my car there were some kids crossing the road as I was about to drive out and they were looking at me and I was thinking, “are they gonna throw stuff at my car? Are they gonna pull the finger?” But no, they just wanted to make sure they could cross the road and they waved at me and it was all fine. Kids here are not interested in causing trouble. They just want to hang out with their friends just like back in the day in the UK’.

Claudia, in this respect, gave the impression of not only having travelled across space, but back in time, having returned to a more innocent age. Amy, in her forties, first visited Aotearoa New Zealand on holiday, then again for a longer visit as part of a world trip, before migrating on a trial run eighteen months later. When we met she had lived there for five years. In another angle on Aotearoa New Zealand’s reputation as a safe place, Amy told me,

‘... how much more street-wise I feel than some of my Kiwi friends ... the thing that drew me here is that they’re so open, but sometimes I feel like they’re naïve! [laughs]’.

As a final example, Tom fell into laughter relaying a story run in his local suburb’s paper about someone losing their favourite sandal on the beach,

‘...and that sums up New Zealand, ‘cos it’s brilliant. It doesn’t have all these horrible problems in the world, you know. It’s missing lots of things - like knife crime. People say, “oh you can’t do this, you can’t do that”’ but I don’t get mugged when I’m walking through the street either and I can leave my car out overnight somebody’s not gonna scratch it or- you know, so it misses lots of things but it misses the good stuff and most of the bad stuff as well’.
As Tom infers in his final sentence, similar to Amy with her reference to naivety, there were less positive associations to living in an ‘innocent’ place, for instance, boredom or immaturity, as I will explore further in section 5.4.

Nevertheless, as with ‘the Bad Britain’ discourse mentioned earlier, a few participants questioned popular imaginaries of ‘the good life’ which circulated about Aotearoa New Zealand. For instance, Nathan, who was in his forties, had migrated around five years ago and was studying and working in a university. He was cynical about aspects of Aotearoa New Zealand’s reputation,

‘There’s this perception about New Zealand being this wonderful crime free country that’s just like paradise in the South Pacific, and the reality of it’s very different to that. That was, kind of, a bit of a shock. There’s quite a lot of poverty here in a lot of ways I think. Unfortunately, largely in Māori and Pacific communities ... within that there’s quite a big gang culture ... I think it’s important to explode the myth of the tourist sell thing, which is kind of accurate but not, because they’re certainly not as clean and green as they make out they are here, as well’.

In one of the few other explorations of lifestyle migrants in an urban locale, Griffiths and Maile (2014) usefully complicate British lifestyle migrants’ investment in social imaginaries of place in Berlin, arguing that,

‘...although these imaginary signifiers or ‘place images’ (Shields 1991) are in circulation they are used in very different ways according to the individual biography, experience, psychic investment and fantasy, and social circumstances’. (p. 153, see also Benson 2012; O’Reilly 2014a)

I have outlined some dominant themes when participants’ reflected on ‘the good life’ available to them, including a relaxed pace of life, a sense of greater opportunity and safety, arguing that related to each theme was a sense of Aotearoa New Zealand as isolated, sparsely populated and peripheral. In the next section, I critically engage with that geographical imaginary and explore some of its negative associations.

5.2 On living at ‘the end of the world’: isolation and distance

‘New Zealand is isolated from South America, its nearest neighbour to the east, by some 4500 miles of ocean, while to the south there are 1600 miles of sea to the Antarctic continent; Australia lies 1230 miles to the west and 2500 miles to the north-west is New Guinea ... This isolation and this degree of remoteness have lasted for at least seventy million years’.

(Godley 1961 cited by Pound 2009, 49)
A sense of distance, isolation and insignificance, despite ‘a thousand countervailing influences’, still lingers in popular geocultural imaginaries of Aotearoa New Zealand (Calder 2011, 190). This spatial imaginary of remoteness, although not unrelated from the country’s positioning, as Godley outlines above, is intimately related to understandings of space developed during colonialism, as we saw in chapter three. This section critically unpacks a dominant spatial imaginary of Aotearoa New Zealand as distant, isolated and peripheral among participants.

With at least a twenty-four-hour flight and around twelve hours’ time difference, the material fact of distance from loved ones was a significant source of difficulty and unsettledness for many participants. After thirteen years, Jane, in her forties, was planning to return to the Midlands, England, with her husband and children when we met so that she could be near her increasingly frail parents. She said, ‘I would be very happy, if it wasn’t for family. I could stay here and I’d be perfectly happy and die here’. She explained why she felt that she had to go back,

‘I hold a lot of guilt, as well as the need to be closer to my family at the stage they’re at now, and that’s got stronger and stronger as time’s gone on. And for me personally, I feel that it- it probably is the right thing for me to do to go back ... just so that I don’t have that, um, awful split feeling thinking I’ve done the wrong thing all the time’.

Although a negative and damaging emotion, Baldassar (2014) has suggested that guilt is also a way of expressing care and concern. She goes on to argue that it can be a positive motivating force, encouraging migrants to put significant time and energy into keeping in touch from a distance. Such guilty feelings are part of moral relationships that reproduce gendered cultures of care which mainly affected women in her research with Italian migrants in Australia. In accord with her research, it was more often female participants in this study who expressed guilt. For most, their guilt was part of motivating return trips as often as they could afford to and regular calls, emails and gifts back to the UK. However, for two participants, in the year I was there, they returned to the UK long-term in order to be closer to their family. In chapter seven I will reflect on how romantic, rather than familial, intimate entanglements, encouraged emigration to Aotearoa New Zealand.

However, as well as literal distance from those left behind in the UK, ‘geographies of interpellation’ (Gregory 1994, 203) which hailed Aotearoa New Zealand as at the end of a seemingly flattened world held common currency among participants. Daniel was in his fifties and first arrived in Aotearoa New Zealand twenty-one years ago with his now-former wife, who was Pākehā. As an illustration of this geographical imaginary, he recalled,
‘It did feel very much when I came out here that I was literally at the end of the world. There was no- it was the last bus stop on the route’.

Henry was in his late forties and came to Auckland with his Pākehā wife and their three children seventeen years previously, leaving behind a one-bedroom flat in South London. His preconceptions of Aotearoa New Zealand reaffirm this geographical imaginary,

‘My feeling about New Zealand was like- it’s not quite right, it’s this sort of paradise at the end of the world’.

As an example of more recent arrival who shared in this imaginary, Theo told me in a common-sense way, ‘I know how remote New Zealand is to the rest of the world’. A sense of distance, and isolation, is not unique to British migrants, as expanded upon in chapter three. For example, the Auckland Polish Association’s website offers to help ‘Polish newcomers to assimilate in their new country whilst walking “upside down at the end of the world”’. In fact, the ongoing prevalence of this geographical imaginary has led Smith (2011) to describe it as ‘[t]he tyranny of the tyranny of distance’.

Maggie was in her fifties and first arrived in the Bay of Islands in Aotearoa New Zealand over thirty years ago. She had lived in several parts of the country, but ended up in the northern coastal suburb of Devonport, an area popular with Brits. To get to her house I took the fifteen minute ferry across the harbour from Auckland’s Central Business District (from now on referred to as the CBD in line with local idiom). Her house was light and airy with a sign up saying ‘what if all the hippies are right?’ One afternoon, as we looked through the photographs she had taken for the photo-elicitation aspect of the project, she described her feeling of distance,
‘I really like that, because we are at the end of- it feels like you are at the end of the earth here. You’re not close to Europe, you’re not like America, an enormous continent, you know, when you’re on a big continent you can feel you’re on a big continent even though you can’t see it all. And- um, and here you could feel, and I have in the past felt, like, “what’s happening in the rest of the world?” [dramatic voice], you know, especially when I lived in smaller places in New Zealand I did start to feel a bit ... there’s all these things happening and here I am, sort of, in this little- very little, small, very forgotten corner of- of the world’.

For Maggie, living in the largest city, the passing of ships and the flows of international visitors they brought to the local area, helped her feel connected with the wider world. As with several others, Julia connected a sense of isolation with missing the ease of accessibility of Europe when living in the UK, as she said, ‘that I miss ‘cos it is quite isolated New Zealand. I mean we’re lucky that we can afford to get out of the place but for people that can’t I think it can be a bit isolating really’. In her seventies, Dorothy migrated from Manchester with her English husband Paul, who we will later meet, first as ‘ten pound Poms’ to Australia, then back to England, then back to Australia and finally on to Aotearoa New Zealand forty-four years ago. Dorothy further illustrated a sense of being isolated, telling me, ‘being at this end of the world you feel like you’re missing out on what’s going on’.

Smith (2011, 119) has critically examined what she calls ‘a rather jaded island topos’ in Aotearoa New Zealand with its recurring motifs of unsettling remoteness. She argues such metaphors and tropes ‘reinscribe other elsewhere as the hidden centres of settler culture’, and in doing so divert energy away from building or expressing more affirmative affinities ‘that settler being in place’ might offer (p. 114). In this way, the popular sense of isolation among participants reanimates colonial geographical imaginaries. Smith (2011) looks to the influential Pacific scholar and poet Epeli Hau’ofa (1994) for a challenge to colonial ways of seeing and categorising the world. In his response to a colonial imaginary of the Pacific Islands as small and isolated, Hau’ofa posited a re-imagined consciousness in which water, rather than an empty space, forms an abundant connecting tissue for Oceania. Although land has a different significance for Māori and many more recent arrivals in Aotearoa New Zealand, his intervention illustrates the way in which seemingly common-sense spatial understandings act as a ‘representational matrix’ and can block other ways of understanding space (Brabazon 2000). In the next section, I examine the way in which another central aspect of ‘the good life’ available in Aotearoa New Zealand, access to a beautiful natural landscape, was connected with another imaginary with colonial precedents, that of Aotearoa New Zealand as ‘young’.
5.3 ‘Suburban Arcadia’: the dynamic between idealised natural landscapes and a ‘lack’ of culture

‘Whether it’s the ruggedly beautiful west-coast surf beaches, or the glistening Hauraki Gulf with its myriad islands, the water’s never far away. And within an hour’s drive from the city’s high-rise heart there are dense tracts of rainforest, thermal springs, wineries and wildlife reserves. No wonder Auckland is regularly rated one of the world’s top cities for quality of life and liveability’.

(Lonely Planet 2014, 60)

Although Auckland is a large, sprawling city, the appreciation of ‘a sense of space’ was almost ubiquitous among participants. Martin first travelled to Aotearoa New Zealand from rural Somerset in England and the house he had been born in with his English wife for a special trip after their children stopped coming on family holidays. Three weeks into their month-long journey around the South Island, ‘… we’d already decided we were gonna move out here. That was it’. When I asked him to expand on what it was that made him want to migrate after his holiday, he provided an illustration of this ‘sense of space’,

‘There’s no one- one individual thing but it was- um, probably the biggest is the fact there’s less people, um, to give you an example: years ago we used to go down to the Corn tops in Exmoor to walk the dog … you could be in the middle of Corn Tops or Exmoor and you’d very seldom see anyone. In recent years it’s got so bad they’ve actually got an ice cream van which drives up a dirt- well pretty much a gravel-track to the middle of the moors to sell ice creams ‘cos there’s so many people! If the weather’s nice even the most remote parts of the UK now are crawling with people. If you want solitude or not to have to- not that I’m unsocial or anything but there’s certain things I like doing I don’t want anyone around. Long walks in the middle of nowhere was one of them. But you can’t do that in the UK. You have to go up into the Welsh mountains, the Scottish Highlands there’s very few places left like that in the UK, but half an hour outside of Auckland you can find places like that, you know, so the fact that there’s fewer people’.

A smaller population in Aotearoa New Zealand was contrasted with a dystopian, overcrowded UK. In another example, Jaqueline was in her late fifties and came to Auckland with her three young children and husband when he got a job offer eighteen years previously. At the time, she was reluctant to give up having her family nearby, her part-time job and ‘a happy life’ in Bristol. However, her new-found appreciation of Auckland after having returned to visit the UK echoes a common comparison among participants,

‘I really noticed there was so much more space here everywhere. The first time we went back, I remember the roads were so narrow, there were so many cars, and the houses were tiny. … Just so many more people. Yeah, so many more people. Even living in Auckland, we just seem to have so much space, freedom and all those typical things. …
It’s just the numbers. It’s just so crowded over there and it’s so lovely when you come back here. You can go on a beach and nobody else is there. You know what it’s like in the UK. You have this beautiful day. I get up really early and go out to the beach. There is just a traffic jam from one end of the country to the other and people all sit ... You come here and you go out to Piha [a West coast beach] on a Saturday, like on a day like this, and there will be nobody there, hardly’.

The empty beach was a recurring story among participants. The ability to access open, natural landscapes, and a smaller population was often connected with a sense of greater freedom, and opposed to an overly congested UK.

![Figure 5.4 Lorna, a view from the lounge](image)

The view from behind Lorna’s detached house, in figure 5.4, looks out onto bush and the Manukau Harbour and hardly evokes an urban lifestyle. She told me, ‘[t]his is my lounge ...or the view from it. I love that view, I love the sense of space it gives me, and freedom’.

Although migrants from the UK and Europe are spread throughout the Auckland region, Gilbertson and Meares (2013, 8) found that they were the only migrant group with significant numbers in the rural and peri-urban parts of the region. Gilbertson and Meares (2013, 8) concluded that ‘[t]hese locations suggest the strong attraction of British and European migrants to coastal locations, and their ability to pay to live in these areas’. A few of the younger participants lived in the gentrified, inner-city suburbs in shared living arrangements, but these were often still detached houses with gardens. However, most participants lived further out from the CBD in coastal suburbs.

Claudia’s reflections on two photographs, one of a farm near her house in the coastal suburb of Lynfield to the west of the region and another of Auckland’s city-centre skyline, illustrated a broader pursuit of suburbia among participants.
‘We did not get a skyline like that in Scotland [photograph to the left]. Nowhere in Scotland. I just- I just love this. I just love this city. Especially at night. ... Auckland is a city of suburbs which is kind of like a lot of little villages ... I feel like I’ve got the best of both worlds where I’ve got the village life in this ginormous city that’s almost as big as Paris or something. ... in my suburb just down from me is a farm with all these sheep. It’s about ten kilometres from here, maybe eleven kilometres from here. Sheep! [see, right] ... Yeah, and that’s why I bought out there, because I can’t imagine anywhere else, you know, where get to live in such a massive place as Auckland, Auckland is the same sort of population as Edinburgh and Glasgow combined, and yet I can still live someplace that has sheep’.

In the twentieth century Auckland’s development was characterized by a spread of sprawling suburbs centred around employment and major transport lines. This pattern of growth led to problems servicing the area, ‘and earned the city the dubious sobriquet of “a string of suburbs connected by a sewage system”’ (Chalmers and Hall 1989, 85). Although much has changed since then, rather than being prized for its centre, there is still a popular idea of Auckland as a network of suburbs without a well-developed centre (Calder 2011). For many participants, having the choice of both urban and rural landscapes – suburbia (Swaffield and Fairweather 1998) - was a large part of what they appreciated about living in Auckland. Their pursuit of ‘clichéd images of the New Zealand suburban dream’ can be connected with historical ‘pastoral idylls’ (Perkins and Thorns 2001, 30-51 referenced by Pearson 2012, 161) and the pursuit of a ‘suburban arcadia (Fairburn 1975), as explored in chapter three.

The natural environment and a warmer climate was central to participants’ sense of a better lifestyle in Aotearoa New Zealand. When I asked for her migration story Veronica exclaimed, ‘1956 you want me to go back there? You want me to go back to 1956?’ She told
me of coming to Aotearoa New Zealand with her husband, two children and pregnant as a ‘ten pound Pom’. Now in her late eighties, Veronica left Aberdeen, Scotland, ‘only a few years after the war’ because ‘wages weren’t good, it wasn’t the lifestyle that I really wanted.’ A neighbour had emigrated to Aotearoa New Zealand and said that there was a need for someone like her first husband ‘to help out in the prison situation’. When he offered to sponsor them, they took the opportunity. I met her after she had retired to Orewa in a northern coastal suburb. She recalled,

Figure 5.6 Veronica, Orewa Beach. Cropped to maintain anonymity

‘It was just marvellous to come out here. The sunshine ... When we saw how beautiful a place it was and how far superior the living state was. ... it was a treat to come out here. I’ll never regret it. A beautiful place. Look at this place, look at it!’

When I asked why they had migrated, time and time again, participants would gesture to the landscape and the weather.

The natural world was often split from culture among participants. For instance, as we looked at photographs he had taken of the Waitakere ranges, Henry reflected on missing ‘old stones’ in the UK, meaning old buildings, a theme I will return to in section 5.4.
‘Yeah, I definitely do, but what we always come back to is, it is a beautiful country. It has the most amazing flora and fauna, and the fjord lands are just paradise. They’re just astonishingly beautiful, where people haven’t messed it up’.

In this way, Henry suggested a split between nature and people, as he later developed

‘...there’s very few wild places in England ... people and the land are the same thing to some degree ... whereas here they’re separated, other than like farms. ... that’s something that’s cool about New Zealand as well, how ancient the natural world is here. Whereas, as I was saying, in England everything’s- the cultures old but what used to be there you can’t see it anymore’.

The land which is now Aotearoa New Zealand was isolated from human contact for eighty million years, developing unique flora and fauna (Ginn 2008). However, the idea of a static, eternal ‘nature’, which is ‘external and antecedent to society, culture and nation-state’ (Ginn 2008, 339), has been refuted for a more dynamic perspective attentive to ‘natureculture as relational entanglement’ (Ginn 2008, 343). Nevertheless, this dynamic has popular currency.

Cultural studies scholar Bell’s self-parodying commentary in ‘Inventing New Zealand: Everyday Myths of Pākehā Identity’ illustrates a popular dynamic which emerged among participants of contrasting Aotearoa New Zealand’s beautiful natural landscape with a supposed lack of culture and history:

‘National identity based on physical geography, and on idealisation of lifestyles within nature, is persistently used as our claim to fame. We are far less notable for what we have in terms of everyday cultural creation that we have ourselves made, such as intellectual property, service, or glamorous or interesting towns. ... Perhaps it is because we feel we have little else to offer that nature gets such high mileage’. (Bell 1996, 34)

In a perspective which resonates with Bell’s commentary, when she reflected on the differences between the two countries, Abbey told me,
'I mean it’s different, but it’s different better in many ways I think, in terms of the natural beauty and stuff that you can do. Obviously it doesn’t have history and culture and all that kind of stuff, but for us as a family that’s possibly not such a big deal … I mean if we were a family that was really into the arts and buildings and all that kind of stuff then I guess we’d really miss all the amazing museums, stately homes, cathedrals, the theatre and the night life in London. But, you know, with the age of the kids that we’ve got, that wasn’t really part of our life’.

Abbey constructs a binary between the UK or, more specifically, London, as a sophisticated cultural hub, and Aotearoa New Zealand, as a naturally beautiful, arcadian landscape ideal for young children. As discussed in chapter three, her comments echo a dynamic developed between London and Aotearoa New Zealand in the twentieth century, which portrayed the former as a site of metropolitan sophistication, and the latter as an arcadian agricultural hinterland (Barnes 2012; see also: Hammerton 2010, for an internationally comparative paper on post-war British migrants in ex-British settler societies which documents a historical precedent to such sentiment). Dorothy’s husband, Paul, thought of his adopted country as home, however, in another example of this pattern of understanding, Dorothy explained why she would have preferred to retire in the UK,

‘New Zealand is a great place to bring up children definitely but when you get to our age, retirement age, you want something a bit more stimulating than what there is in New Zealand. You’re only going from one beach to another beach. It’s not an old country, it’s a new country and it hasn’t got those years or depth of history of buildings or anything. I mean all over Britain it’s different from one end to another’.

In these examples, Aotearoa New Zealand is perceived as lacking history and culture, in a move which elides the longer presence of Māori on the land and diverse local cultures, and it is to a criticism of this former exclusion that I turn next.

5.4 On living in a ‘young’ country: the erasure of Māori histories

‘New Zealand’s approach to cultural diversity and a nation-building project could be viewed as immature: because it has been so dominated by historical connections with the UK, the country and its people have yet to work out what the main elements ought to be’. (Spoonley 2015, 56)

As with the notion of being at ‘the end of the world’, an understanding of Aotearoa New Zealand as ‘young’ extends beyond British migrants. The comments made by prominent demographer Spoonley above, in relation to national identity and citizenship, illustrates a wide-spread construction of Aotearoa New Zealand as ‘young’, and the way in which, first, this understanding can carry associations of immaturity, and, second, it is intimately connected
with the nation’s colonial past. For many participants, comments on the ‘youth’ of the nation were tied to their experience of the built landscape. For instance, Claudia said,

‘I mean living in Edinburgh you’re surrounded by old buildings. My old flat was built in 1840, which is probably when I think New Zealand started being settled by white people, um, so New Zealand’s very new’.

In this example, Claudia separates out the histories of ‘white’ and indigenous arrivals to the country. However, not everyone did, as I will examine later. This section critically examines the popular imaginary of Aotearoa New Zealand as a ‘young’ country among participants.

I met Chris one afternoon at his house in the coastal northern suburb of Takapuna to drive the route of his new commute and visit some of his favourite haunts. As we travelled in his meticulously cared for BMW, he illustrated this common perception of ‘youth’ as he reflected on the city,

Figure 5.8 Chris, the ferry terminal

‘So remember this is the city now. This is it. No historic buildings to talk of. There’s the ferry terminal which is probably the oldest thing. There’s no character to Auckland. Building-wise the architecture has no character: New York has character, Hong Kong has character - the skyscrapers, London has got character - it’s completely different ‘cos its London, Paris is stunning and beautiful in every way, but here’s got nothing ‘cos it’s not that old. In five hundred years’ time it might have developed into something. Right now, what is it? Queen Street - you haven’t got the Mall, Buckingham Palace, Houses of Parliament, St Paul’s Cathedral. I come from a culture full of history. Here is just a brand new country. I think people don’t realise that when they come here. New Zealand is a brand new country ... it is a baby country! Four million people. It’s a large village. It’s Birmingham spread out [laughs] ... It’s backward in one sense. Did I tell you what my saying is for New Zealand? This is the best third world country in the world’.

Chris’ reference to Birmingham re-enacts a southern English snobbery, about the Midlands in this instance, but towards the north of England more generally. He highlights the potential for negative associations with a smaller population, such as parochialism, and draws on a life
course metaphor where he contrasts ‘a baby country’ with ‘a culture full of history’. However, his appreciation of aspects of the UK was simultaneous to preferring to live in Aotearoa New Zealand because the former was ‘too busy’ and ‘too expensive’. Wetherell and Potter (1992) have suggested that for many British people, ‘New Zealand exists somewhere “down under”, not exactly a “third world” nation, but not quite of the “first world” … famous only for the butter, the sheep, the rugby players, the mountains and for the cities which seem to be closed at weekends’. (p. 4)

Over two decades after publication, they seem to have captured something of Chris’ position in their reflections.

Tom and Sandra further illustrate the pattern of placing Aotearoa New Zealand at a position on the life course behind the UK and consequent value judgements attendant to that.

Tom: ‘I mean the politics here is like watching two five year olds arguing over a conker, you know, in a playground, you know. It’s juvenile the politics in New Zealand. And economically I suppose New Zealand, in terms of its maturity, is a tee- still a very- still a teenager’

Sandra: ‘It’s just developing’

Tom: ‘It’s only just started puberty really as a country New Zealand and England’s a very mature place’.

I want to suggest that when participants projected a sense of maturity and cultural sophistication onto the UK, they could claim sophistication through association (see also: Schech and Haggis 2004), a trend I examine further in section one of chapter six. Fabian’s (1983) insights on the development of ‘evolutionary time’ during the Enlightenment period is illuminating in this respect. The universalising notion of time this process introduced, he argued, created a grid of intelligibility which positioned a ‘civilised’ West in the present ‘as the pinnacle of human progress’ while places outside of that were understood as inhabiting more or less ancient states of cultural development (p. 32). This process enabled the ‘denial of coevalness’, or the simultaneity and contemporaneity, of different places, exhibited by participants above. Fabian (1983) argues that this cosmological myth helped to legitimise various imperial projects and has frightening magnitude and persistence (p. 35).

However, Martin offers a counter-example to popular understandings of Auckland as culturally lacking.

‘Yeah, I said before, not a city person, never thought I’d take to city life … [but] I like the buzz I like the fact there are a lot of opportunities in the city. There’s a great life. It’s never a dull moment, to be honest’.
Single, following his recent divorce, and with a friendship group made up of younger colleagues, Martin was experimenting with new experiences and enjoyed the excitement of Auckland. In addition, as Lucy and Claudia illustrated earlier, several other participants originating from both urban and rural areas in the UK also commented on the urbane excitement of living in Auckland. While understandings of Aotearoa New Zealand as at ‘the end of the world’ and as ‘young’ were resoundingly popular, imaginaries of place among participants were polyvocal, complex and sometimes contradictory too (Griffiths and Maile 2014, 153).

Finally, I want to examine whether or not participants drew a distinction between the longer presence of Māori when commenting on the ‘youth’ of Aotearoa New Zealand. Merrick, in his fifties, had migrated twenty-three years previously with his then-Pākehā partner, whom he met while they were both living in London. As an example of the significant minority who did make a distinction, he told me, ‘in a sense it’s a fledgling country. It’s a very small history of what they call the Pākehā, the white people, but of course they have a massive history here with the Māori’. In another example, Nathan too clarified, ‘...I do think it’s different here because there isn’t the sense of history, European history obviously, because it’s 200 years old here’ (emphasis added). However, many participants did not differentiate between the longer presence of Māori when commenting on ‘the youth’ of Aotearoa New Zealand. Tom offers a particularly explicit example of this perspective,

‘New Zealand’s a colonised country, like Australia, so there’s no history here. There’s no-there isn’t really a lot of culture here that’s come up through the ages, so to speak. British people are very rich in, you know, the whole culture and identity it goes back hundreds of thousands of years’.

Tom’s comments are particularly ironic in relation to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples who have inhabited what is now known as Australia for some 50,000 years (Anderson 2000). His talk erases indigenous histories and cultures in a way which resonates with discourse justifying the colonisation of Aotearoa New Zealand in the first place, during which colonised peoples were considered to be history-less and the land ‘uncultivated’ and so ‘empty’ (Hokowhitu 2004, 266; see Ballantyne 2015 for a historical analysis of such perceptions among colonial-era missionaries).

To return to Fabian’s (1983) criticism of ‘the denial of coevalness’, in a conversation about gangs in Auckland, Jane illustrated a stadial understanding of indigenous peoples as at an earlier stage of development than ‘Europeans’ at colonial encounter,
‘... it’s only 150 years ago Māori people- where they are now to where they were 150 years ago is a massive step from when the Europeans got here. I think there’s an element of forgetting that their culture has had to catch up relatively quickly to what the Europeans may see as acceptable. There’s quite- there’s still a big tribal, you will have heard of all the tribes, but I think there’s a load of tribal mentality in the gangs that are around. They’re still like warriors of 150 years ago and, uh, violence that goes along with that’.

A ‘denial of coevalness’ could be linked with the pathologising of Māori culture as violent, a perspective popularly captured in the film ‘Once Were Warriors’. In a criticism of this perspective, Taonui and Newbold (2011, 371) argue that gang membership among Māori is better explained through high levels of inter-generational poverty that accompanied the loss of lands, continuing structural inequalities and racism. Finally, Jackson (2009, no pagination) has offered a cogent rebuttal of such essentialism, arguing that Māori could more properly be historically framed as ‘once were gardeners ... poets and singers’ (see also: Hokowhitu 2004, 263-4). I address participants’ perceptions of Māori, indigenous politics and biculturalism further in chapter eight, where I return to the politics of temporality with regards to understandings of settler colonialism as ‘over’.

Conclusion

Conradson and Latham (2007), in an exploration of the affective intensities associated with London for young New Zealanders, found the city facilitated a highly valued feeling of ‘being in the heart of things, an embodied state that is both valued and closely linked to New Zealand’s former status as a British colony’ (p. 231). New Zealanders’ aspirations for the ‘buzz’ of London reflects an interesting contrast to ‘the good life’ many British migrants sought in Aotearoa New Zealand. A dominant pattern emerged in which participants contrasted a fast-paced, grey, cold, over-crowded and lacklustre life in the UK, for a slower-paced, safe, relaxed, outdoors lifestyle in a naturally beautiful and warm landscape in Auckland. However, there was another, more negative, aspect to the lifestyle associated with the country, for instance, participants also commented on a lack of cultural sophistication, boredom, missing ‘history’ and feeling cut off from the world. I argued that both positive and negative aspects were shaped by a dominant understandings of Aotearoa New Zealand as ‘isolated’ and ‘young’.

Following the call for more research with lifestyle migrants to pay attention to the ‘colonial traces’ of their imaginings of places and the lives available there (Benson 2013), first, this chapter examined colonial continuities in the dominant understanding of Aotearoa New
Zealand as at ‘the end of the world’ and isolated among participants. Far from insulated from the world, following Massey (2005, 9), spaces such as Aotearoa New Zealand ‘are the product of interrelations’. Participants’ geographical imaginaries of Aotearoa New Zealand as peripheral and culturally lacking can be related to a metropole-periphery relationship established during British imperialism, which developed into an urban-hinterland dynamic in the twentieth century (Barnes 2012). As Smith (2011, 114) argues, this dynamic of distance and isolation from ‘silent centres’ continues to deter attention from more productive affinities with proximate cultures that ‘settler being in place’ might offer.

Secondly, a dynamic emerged among many participants of considering Aotearoa New Zealand as rich in spectacular natural landscapes, but as culturally and historically lacking. I linked this trope with their widespread understanding of the country as ‘young’. Such an understanding could cast the UK as, in contrast, ‘older’, and, perhaps, more ‘mature’, and consequently confer status to the speaker through association. I criticised this imagining because of its frequent erasure, either implicitly or explicitly, of Māori histories and diverse local cultures. Moreover, I want to argue that the ‘denial of coevalness’ inherent to this perspective means, as Massey (2005, 69) put it: ‘[c]oexisting heterogeneity is rendered as (reduced to) a place in the historical queue’. A more expansive imagination would allow ‘a fuller recognition of the simultaneous coexistence of others with their own trajectories and their own stories to tell’, with distinct, if not unconnected, histories, and, potentially, their own futures too (Massey 2005, 11).
Chapter six. ‘I’m not somebody that sort of dwells on things having to be British’: British migrants’ reflections on their migrancy and performances of Britishness

Introduction

In her book on Britishness, Ware (2007, 7) suggested that ‘[u]ntil recently one of the most characteristic British things you could possibly do is not talk seriously about what it means to be British. Not unless you were a white supremacist with an axe to grind’. As discussed in chapter three, there is a marked trend among British nationals, and often in particular English nationals, to distance themselves from overt expressions of patriotism (see, for example: Condor 2000; Fenton 2007; 2008). This trend has also been noted among British emigrants. Coles and Walsh (2010, 1318) have suggested that ‘many British expatriates wish to distance themselves from a “colonialist” and “imperialist” Britishness or, indeed, sometimes from any identification with British national identity at all’, in a statement which associates this distancing directly with Britain’s past. In their research with British intra-European migrants, O’Reilly (2000; with Oliver 2010) and Benson (2011) both emphasised the desirability, to varying degrees of success, of integration into the ‘host’ society for British lifestyle migrants. In his study with contemporary English migrants in Aotearoa New Zealand, Pearson (2014, 513) found overt signs of nationness were rare, and that visible signs of ‘waving the flag’ and ‘vulgar displays abroad’ were frequently condemned by men and women of varied ages, length of residence and occupations. This chapter complements this research on Britishness but extends it through an examination of participants’ reflections on in/appropriate behaviour for migrants in the site of Auckland, in relation to themselves, and that of their compatriots. Moreover, through attention to the potential for differences in the meaning of displays of patriotism between Britain’s constituent nations, it examines an aspect of ‘British’ emigrant experience otherwise underexplored (for an exception, see: Hammerton and Thomson 2005).

Nationalist historian Sinclair (1961, 41) described Aotearoa New Zealand as having grown up ‘in an English dream’ which he suggested had ‘profound – and pathetic – consequences’ (cited by Barnes 2012, 4). This history shapes a particular local sensitivity to overbearing or superior performances of Britishness, and points to the blurred boundaries of Britishness with Englishness. This sensitivity can be related to a phenomenon in Pākehā society called the ‘cultural cringe’. A legacy of its history as a British colony, and a more prosaic long-
term urban-hinterland dynamic between Aotearoa New Zealand and London, which has been fading in significance since the twentieth century, this term describes ‘an insecure attitude to local culture’ in relation to other cultures and, more specifically, historically with Britain (Horrocks 2004, 280 cited by Barnes 2012, 270). However, as nineteenth century aspirations for a ‘better Britain’ show, Aotearoa New Zealand did not always map its relationship to the UK deferentially (Barnes 2012, 271). Moreover, as shown in chapter two, although certainly privileged, historically arrivals from ‘Home’ did not always have a favourable reception with Pākehā New Zealanders. This chapter situates contemporary British migrants’ experiences within this particular context.

This chapter is organised into four parts. First, the figure of ‘the whingeing Pom’ is a part of popular culture in Aotearoa New Zealand. I examine participants’ avoidance of, and reflections on, the characteristics associated with this figure, as well as a subtle form of cultural capital associated with Britishness if practiced right. Secondly, I explore the related figure of ‘the bad migrant’, who was criticised as narrow-minded and too focused on recreating Britain socially and culturally. ‘The bad migrant’ who fails to integrate is further explored in chapter eight, in relation to Britons who do not acknowledge Māori or bicultural practices, and the censure of failure to integrate to an imagined ‘host’ society also reappears in chapter seven, which focuses on participants’ relations with people who appear to have East Asian heritage. As I argue in this chapter, the act of designating ‘the bad migrant’ as ‘fixed’ and parochial, in contrast to themselves, revealed participants’ own hopes and aspirations for their migration, and indicated a classed aspect of their relations with compatriots, which I address in the third section of the chapter. In the fourth section, I explore variations between the meaning attached to expressions of patriotism between English and Welsh nationals. Finally, I examine the way in which ironic ‘flag waving’, among English participants, reaffirmed a general trend of distancing oneself from overt displays of British patriotism.

6.1 ‘The whingeing Pom’ and the cultural cringe

‘How can you tell when a plane full of Poms has just landed?

The whining carries on after the engines have been switched off’.
Wellings (2011) dates the use of the term Pom back to a newspaper in Australia in 1912. He claims the word, which can be affectionate or derogatory, is an abbreviation of ‘pomegranate’ which plays on the word ‘immigrant’ and was used to refer to the reddish complexion of new, sun-burnt arrivals. The label is also linked with demonised post-war British migrants involved with unionism, labelled the ‘British disease’, and another popular origin tale suggests that it is an acronym of ‘prisoners of her majesty’ or ‘mother England’ in reference to the historic forced transportation of convicts from Britain to Australia. This section examines British migrants’ tendency to avoid association with the ‘whingeing Pom’, a figure evoked in the widely-known opening joke to this section.

Most participants wanted to avoid being seen as a ‘whingeing Pom’. Similar to Pearson’s (2014, 514) research with English migrants, they appeared to accept that behaviour associated with this label was negative, not only as a way of gaining acceptance among locals, but on principle. However, several Welsh and Scottish participants said it was a label for the English, not them (see also: Hammerton and Thomson 2005, 147). Maggie’s reflection illustrates how participants might adjust their behaviour to better fit in. When she arrived in the 1980s to the Bay of Islands she was aware of ‘potential negativism about Poms’,

‘I used to think I better be careful of how I say some things and not really go on about England much, you know, there were things I was a bit coy about because I didn’t want to accentuate my Englishness’.

For Nathan, who arrived in the 2000s, when he first met the Pākehā friends of his partner, he recalled,

‘I very much felt that I had to fit in and go along with it or be, not ostracised, but if you didn’t want to go along with it, it’s kind of like you’re a stuck up Pom or whatever’.

Many participants explained that they would avoid being negative about their new country in front of locals, and might even express relief at being able to talk about their opinions with me during our interviews. At the end of our first interview, Henry said,

‘It’s actually nice to be able to talk about these things. I’m aware, looking around [glances around to each side], I hope that no one’s hearing- listening [laughs] ‘cos honestly, New Zealanders get really offended if you point out the slightest, massive problems that there are. They do get very offended, and I don’t like to offend people’.

Although, in what could have been a related trend, I noticed that participants would also sometimes express concern that they were being too negative during interviews, as we saw with Jane in chapter four. George and Fitzgerald (2011, 5) noted a similar pattern in their research with later-life European migrants, in which any story of hardship or displeasure was
quickly followed by one of appreciation. They suggested, partly, this pattern was a way for participants to narrate their migration as worthwhile, but ‘also reflected the imperative that migrants felt to avoid appearing ungrateful or overly critical of New Zealand society – an expectation keenly felt at times by the authors in their own migration experiences’ (p. 5).

Chris, who arrived in the 2000s, illustrates how participants’ might distance themselves from the figure of ‘the whingeing Pom’ and ‘poor’ performances of Britishness, at the same time as claiming positive associations with that national identity.

‘Sometimes, when we do kids sports and the English are on the side-lines, right. They tend to whinge more because they know more about football than anybody else on earth [laughs] ...it was embarrassing, in a way, for me being British, yeah, that this guy was carrying on like that. And I think probably what winds up the New Zealanders in a way is- all I can see is the English come here with an attitude that they’re better: they come from a more sophisticated country, which had more- which had M&S and Waitrose, you know? Buses that ran on time-ish, train service, so they think they come from something better. When in fact they’re just coming to a different country and they’ve got to realise you’re coming to a different country. You’re coming to New Zealand and New Zealand is what it is. It’s a very, very young country. You can turn around say its 200 years old-ish, you know, that’s it’.

In the extract, Chris illustrates the inverse of the phenomenon of ‘the cultural cringe’ in Pākehā society introduced earlier, a sense of British cultural superiority. He also slips between ‘English’ and ‘British’, and the man he was referring to on the side-lines turned out to be Scottish, which exhibits a broader tendency for slippage between these terms, especially among English participants (Langlands 1999).

Although many participants would distance themselves from overt displays of their national identity and negative characteristics associated with the whingeing Pom, a recurring sense of subtle cultural capital attached to being British was evident among several participants, as has already been explored in chapter five. For instance, when I asked Amy, who had moved from a corporate job in Newcastle, England, to another in Auckland, how she thought British people were treated she replied,

‘Actually mostly alright, um – it’s gonna sound odd - workwise I actually feel like I got more respect from being British. It’s as if they expect that you know more because you come from this more advanced, technological culture. ... People expect that you knew heaps of stuff because you came from somewhere that was more experienced ... it feels pretty good. You feel as if you’re ahead of the game’.

Lucy, who had previously lived in London, also pointed to a vague sense of metropolitan sophistication.
‘... I can’t think of an example but I get a sense that sometimes I felt like I know something or I’m more knowledgeable because I’m British, “oh, I know more about that, because I-” - not know more, but already knew that because I was British. But I can’t think of an example (Katie: mm) um, because I’ve been like “oh, yeah well we’ve, sort of, done that in the UK, or I’ve seen that before”, or something like that’.

In her book ‘Tracking the Jack’, Brabazon (2000, 18) found Union Jack flags and British names in shop signs, restaurants and material culture inferred style, glamour and sophistication in Australia and Aotearoa New Zealand. She suggested that these symbols were fashionable, even as elements of British colonial history were not (Brabazon 2000, 21). Although pompous or chauvinistic assertions of Britishness were particularly problematic in this context, whether related to an imperial past or the phenomenon of ‘cultural cringe’, perhaps not unrelatingly, Britishness could also be associated with positive, ‘metropolitan’ associations. In the next section, I want to expand on the negative characteristics associated with the whingeing Pom in Aotearoa New Zealand, such as a superior attitude or propensity to complain, to consider how a perceived failure to integrate, more broadly, was viewed negatively among participants.

6.2 Little Britains: British-themed commercial establishments, friends and sense of humour

Figure 6.2 Claudia, the British section at the supermarket

‘...when I lived in the United States for a few years we used to go to an establishment called the British Shoppe to buy treats like mince pies and crackers at Christmas or chocolate digestives and fruit pastilles when we were homesick. This was a chintzy but lucrative outlet for imported goods where pictures of the Royal Family and the Union Jack helped sell the idea that Britishness could be bottled and packaged for export.
... just being in a room full of Birds custard, Mr Kipling cakes and Sharwood’s curry sauce made us feel strangely attached to the old country in a way we couldn’t really understand. Sometimes I found it quite overwhelming, and occasionally it brought tears to my eyes just to walk through the door and hear the jangling old-fashioned bell. There was something about the smell, too, that made me long to be back in England. I found this very disorientating because I have always thrived on living in unfamiliar places’.
(Ware 2007, 16)

When I spent time at British-themed shops, the staff identified regular British customers whom they had developed relationships with. From my observations, rather than a perfunctory trip to pick up food, most customers would visit for pleasure. I watched people move slowly around the aisles and gasp in recognition at brands. If they were with someone, people would often hold up products, excitedly or with reverence, and share memories – ‘my mum used to buy this’. I heard the phrase ‘a taste of home’ over and over. Like Ware’s nostalgia-filled visit to the British Shoppe above, most participants I spoke with claimed to only visit such shops on special occasions, for instance, to buy a tin of Roses chocolates at Christmas. However, a significant group claimed not to visit at all. For this latter group, their relation with British-themed shops is perhaps better represented by Ware’s distancing herself from her longing for England at the end of the extract above.

There was a marked trend of participants distancing themselves from British-themed commercial establishments. Grace was in her late fifties and had migrated thirty years previously after meeting her former Pākehā partner while he was travelling in the UK. As an example of this attitude, she interrupted me before I had finished asking if she went to any British shops or pubs,

‘I really don’t do that; I don’t do it at all. My stepson has married a lovely lady from Birmingham and Stella is right into all of that. You go into her house and she’s got little Union Jack things up all round the place and she would shop at those British shops. I don’t. I don’t even miss that ... I’m here, I’m eating New Zealand food and there’s no- I don’t look for McVities Digestives [laughs].’

In another example, Tom and Sandra were also playfully dismissive when they replied,

Sandra: ‘I don’t seek out British shops, like we don’t go for a food shop or anything like that, I don’t need –’

Tom: ‘we don’t need to buy Frosties’

Sandra: ‘no [laughs]’

Tom: ‘for like ten dollars a packet – ooh I feel at home now, ooh really well nourished’.
As Tom points out, such shops could be expensive, but he also indicates how compatriots who did indulge in buying British products could become figures of fun. Sarah was in her late twenties and had arrived four years earlier, first, on a working-holiday visa, and then transitioning to a permanent residency visa when her employer offered to sponsor her. Although she was a fan of buying familiar brands from the UK as ‘little treats’ in the dedicated section at the supermarket, as shown in figure 6.2, in response to my asking what she thought about British shops or pubs, she said,

‘[laughs] I’m not enamoured with them, no. It’s just a little bit embarrassing I think, going a little bit too far … no, no I wouldn’t go and visit them, no, no, not at all’.

These responses are a stark contrast to Petridou’s (2001) study of the profound importance of recreating ‘a taste of home’ through food for Greek migrants living in England. However, this trend could be linked with the entanglements of British and Aotearoa New Zealand foodscapes, which I return to in chapter seven. As Lorna illustrated, the purchase of local products did not necessarily mean changing one’s habits significantly, ‘when we arrived here we didn’t try and buy the British stuff, we bought the normal New Zealand alternative … there’s very little stuff we haven’t been able to get a pretty good like for like’.

For those who did visit British shops, it was often told as a confession, for instance, Claudia said, ‘I do buy Heinz salad cream, I have to admit’. Otherwise, such visits were described as trivial, as Lucy illustrates,

‘Oh, I’ve been to a couple just for a laugh really. I certainly wouldn’t go on a regular basis just because they’re British or anything like that. I’ve been to the shop in Browns Bay I think twice, and both times it was just by chance … no, I’m not bothered about things like that. I’m not somebody that sort of dwells on things having to be British’.

The negative associations of ‘dwell’ point to Lucy’s valuation of compatriots who were focused on things being British. Generally, visiting such stores was viewed as acceptable for the occasional treat, as a light-hearted or nostalgic trip, but those who went regularly were held as faintly ridiculous. Moreover, to be overly focused on recreating the cultural trappings of Britain was associated with narrow-mindedness. For instance, Chris told me,

‘I love Jaffa cakes but I’m not into that. I don’t need British stuff ‘cos I like Asian food, I like all kinds of food, ‘cos I’m more into exploring. And I did not come here to- I came here to- my persona is I’m English but I did not come here to- oh, I’m gonna go to an English pub do English- no. So that wasn’t part of my plan’.

Chris points towards how the migrant who explores new horizons was a highly valued subject position. In fact, as I will expand later, this popular perspective could take on a moral
imperative (see also: Benson 2011, 30), in a logic pithily illustrated by Martin when he said, ‘I want to broaden my horizons rather than just be narrow minded’.

As well as a tendency for participants to distance themselves from British commercial establishments, and I will return to the British-themed pub later, many would also down-play how many British friends they had, to paint a more integrated or cosmopolitan friendship group. Aileen had developed a passion for languages after a trip to Paris, France as a teenager, and travelled in Europe and South America before meeting her partner, who was Pākehā, while living in Australia, and migrating, with him, to Auckland after they had their first child. When I asked if she had heard that her suburb, Titirangi, was sometimes referred to as ‘Britirangi’ because of its popularity with British migrants, she replied, ‘No really? Because there’s so many British people? Oh that puts me off actually, I don’t gravitate I tend to go the opposite way’. However, at another point in our conversation, she realised with some surprise that, ‘…a lot of my friends are British actually ... I don’t kind of think of them as Brits, we’re all living here ... but if I were to count them up I’d probably have quite a few British friends’. For participants who wished to distance themselves from homophily, when they reflected on their British friends they emphasised that their shared nationality was not something they considered. For instance, Sarah described her social group as, ‘quite mixed, yeah, quite a few Kiwis, yeah. A few British migrants kind of thrown in there but not deliberately at all, mainly Kiwis’. When I asked her what her relationship was like with other British migrants, she said,

‘I’ve got quite a few [British friends] actually, and that’s just been through, I haven’t gone to seek them out or joined like a British society they’ve just been friends of friends. Oh, quite a few I met through my running club and they’ve become really good friends. Actually Zoe who lives here is British as well, and her partner Declan is Irish. Yeah, good relationships ‘cos they’re great people. I don’t have the relationship because they’re British’.

In what reflected a broader pattern, Sarah stressed that her relationship with other British migrants had not happened by design.

However, a minority of participants had mostly compatriots for friends. Sandra told me, ‘at this stage most of our friends we have here are English pretty much’ and described weekends spent going out for curry and a few beers in their local neighbourhood and watching British television and films with their friends at each other’s houses. Tom, her partner, explained ‘it’s just easier to get on with them, and it’s not ever been our intention has it? It’s just naturally happened’ (emphasis added), to which Sandra added, ‘no, not at all quite the opposite’. Their comments can be interpreted against an overarching norm of integration, and as reflecting a broader pattern in which participants would reflect on their being attracted to
compatriots as friends or British practices in a way which stressed their lack of intention.

Martin and I met one afternoon in the New Inn\(^{17}\), an English ale house. He often visited in the evening on the weekend to watch the sun set and call his family and friends in the UK. I asked him about his thoughts on British shops or pubs and he illustrated the ambiguous inhabitation of integration for some participants,

’You can’t get anywhere more British than the New Inn. For a very, very long time I avoided coming down here. Everyone said “ah, you’ve got to go to New Inn ‘cos, you know, it’s where all the Poms hang out”, but I didn’t wanna be a Pom. I still think- I’m working towards being an honorary Kiwi (Katie: aha) and, um, so I didn’t wanna come here. So I did, I stayed away for ages, but I suppose it’s like the lure is too strong, but I will say sometimes it gets embarrassing down here (Katie: Oh yeah?) … there’s guys and girls that just they want England here they don’t wanna be Kiwis as such they just want Britain to move here. I mean if they had their way they’d move everything in Britain that they wanted to New Zealand and it doesn’t work like that, you know, you’re in a different country, I think you’ve got to try and blend in not stand out. But, yeah, they get loud and, you know, talking about football’ (emphasis added).

Martin framed his visits as something he had resisted. However, despite describing the pub as ‘my local at the moment’ he distanced himself from ‘bad migrants’ who are overly focused on recreating Britain. As I will expand later, the characterisation of ‘the bad migrant’ could have classed connotations.

For those who had mostly compatriots for friends, sense of humour was invariably a part of their explanation. Stan had migrated four years earlier with his English wife and son when she saw Aotearoa New Zealand was recruiting police officers. He described an easy migration from his previous life in Shropshire, England to Torbay, a northern, coastal suburb

’… it’s quite easy to adapt. I mean you go to work every day, like you do in England. It’s just a nicer place to live. There’s beaches everywhere and just nicer countryside, nicer views, the weather’s nicer’.

When I asked him if he had encountered any cultural differences moving here he replied, ‘um, no not really ‘cos I don’t really- I stick with the English I suppose … all my friends here are English. I don’t really mix with the Kiwis’. He had imagined, prior to migrating, that he would have more local friends. He had a few negative experiences early on which left him feeling that ‘everybody was trying to rip us off’, but the main thing, for Stan, was ‘I think their sense of humour’s different’. Within the English group of participants, half brought up sense of humour, either as something they miss, or because New Zealanders did not understand when they were joking.

\(^{17}\) I have given the pub a pseudonym to protect anonymity.
Henry: ‘How many New Zealanders does it take to change a lightbulb? Why would you change the bulb? New Zealanders are a bit straightforward. Don’t bother trying to tell jokes, you’ll have to explain them’.

Amy: ‘Some Kiwis don’t get my sense of humour. Brits get it immediately. If you’re sarcastic a Brit will understand before you’ve finished the sentence, whereas a Kiwi will be like “really?”’, or they might get offended and you’re thinking, “no honestly I was joking!”’

Popular cultural commentators have commented on a supposed national obsession with a distinctive sense of humour in England (Paxman 1998; Fox 2004, 61). As Fox (2004, 64-5) put it,

‘The popular belief is that we have a better, more subtle, more highly developed sense of humour than any other nation, and specifically that other nations are all tediously literal in their thinking and incapable of understanding or appreciating irony’.

However, not everyone felt this way. The other half of the English participants did not bring it up, and nor did any of the Welsh, Scottish or Northern Irish participants. While Julia, from England, told me how similar she found the sense of humour, and for Emma, again English, the difference was not to do with New Zealanders not getting her jokes, but instead she said ‘they’ll try and catch you out a bit, I think. I’ve heard a couple of Kiwis say, “Oh, the British are really gullible”’. In the next section, I will examine the classed aspect of ‘the bad migrant’ more closely.

6.3 The classed aspect of ‘the bad migrant’ who does not integrate

I did not introduce the term integration into our interviews, and not every participant used this term explicitly, but an ideal of adapting to a ‘host’ society framed many conversations about migrancy. Sandra illustrated this logic, but also, bearing in mind her social circle of mostly English friends, the differences in interpretations of what successful integration might mean,

‘For me personally my opinion is that too many people move and want to take their old habits with them and I think that’s wrong. They fail in emigrating ... I’m a deep believer that you- you accept the lifestyle of where you’re moving to. I don’t believe that- the same as in England. Like people who say “well, I think we should turn it into a mini-Pakistan” or whatever, it isn’t. You’ve moved to a new country. You need to respect the land that you’ve moved to’.

Sandra illustrates the popular ‘when-in-Rome’ logic (Clarke and Garner 2010, 89) among participants, and their frequent positioning of themselves as guests (O’Reilly 2002, 190). She also shows how the characteristics of ‘the bad migrant’ could more easily be attributed to cultures which were seen as more visibly different. While British migrants, despite their living
in suburbs popular with other Brits and having mostly compatriots as friends, for instance, could more easily claim to have integrated. In the next chapter, I will develop an argument that the ‘host’ society was perceived as narrowly Pākehā and white for a significant number of participants. This view has a broader basis than just participants in this study, Bell (1996, 12-13) argues that the strongest place in public representations of Aotearoa New Zealand ways of life are, ‘the events, celebrations, lifestyle and material consumption of the more advantaged group … symbols of Pākehā culture are the dominant icons for national identity’. Although in chapter eight, I will examine other more expansive and inclusive imaginaries of the ‘host’ society among participants.

The aspersions cast on the figure of ‘the bad migrant’ could have connotations of social class. Martin illustrated this aspect when he described the characteristics of ‘the bad migrant’,

‘I’ll tell you a little story. Before I came out, again it was in the lead up to leaving the UK, I had to call British Gas in ... The guy showed up round the house ... got chatting ... he said “oh, I was in New Zealand”, straight away, “oh really? Well, I’m off to New Zealand in a few months’ time. Why’d you come back?” “The pubs shut at 8, don’t put any footy on the TV, lagers crap and you can’t get the Sun newspaper” [said in a mocking voice]. And I just got this vision of someone who- all he wanted to do was to move his little bit of England over to New Zealand, and above all that’s what I hate’. The way Tom and Sandra presented their migration, career-paths - as a self-employed engineer and a civil servant, respectively - and even their leisure-time, were noticeably highly-organised and future-oriented, as Tom put it, they were ‘living life on purpose’. They described their difficulty making friends without the social markers from home.

Sandra: ‘It sounds awful but you automatically align yourself with people who are similar or to where you want to aspire. You don’t end up aligning yourself with people who are very dodgy. And so when people say where they’re from you have an idea, and you naturally align. When you come here you don’t know or recognise where people are from, so therefore you almost have to go through this test phase with people until you think yeah they’re spot on or hmm they’re a bit rough’.

Our conversation moved onto the New Inn, an English ale-house in a northern coastal suburb, which was a trigger point for a lot of these more explicitly classed comments. They drank there sometimes because they liked the selection of Yorkshire beer and the people that worked there, but said,

Sandra: ‘It’s a little bit rough ... you do get everyone from everywhere in there, so that’s why some nights it can be really nice other nights you get the gobbies in there and you think hmm feels like the England that we’ve left’

Tom: ‘it’s full of builders from Dagenham, you know, really? Ooh’
I will next examine further participants’ reflections on this pub.

When I visited the New Inn for a pub quiz one evening, the Mancunian compere asked questions about the UK Premier League and said pounds not dollars. The interior design recreated a typical pub in Britain, with dark-wood panelling, red-leather seat-covers, a log fire and pictures of London, Britpop, Monty Python and the ubiquitous ‘Keep Calm...’ poster decorating the walls. Over the months I visited, the customers appeared to be of mixed nationalities, if predominantly white, but there was a marked presence of British accents. Stan had found work as a tradesman when he migrated to Auckland. In another example of the classed connotations participants’ held on compatriots who drank in The New Inn, he said,

‘I’m not very keen on that because, um, it’s like being in a pub in England with really loud English (Katie: ‘oh ok’) Cockneys I call ‘em Cockney loud-mouth Londoners and you get them- we never had them in Shropshire, but you get them round here. I don’t like that so much’.

Tom, Sandra and Stan were from northern areas of England, but interestingly positioned the supposedly ‘loud-mouthed’ patrons of the New Inn as from southern parts of England. In their research with British migrants in the Costa del Sol, Spain, Oliver and O’Reilly (2010, 60) found a similar classed aspect to their participants’ relations with compatriots who were critical of those who wanted to recreate ‘Britain in the sunshine’. For instance, one of their participants said, ‘we never go in the British bars! Have you seen the sorts of people they get in those places?’ As with Oliver and O’Reilly (2010), integration into an imagined ‘host’ society was a way of accruing social distinction among my participants, and conversely they distanced themselves from the characteristics of ‘the bad migrant’, who acted as an internal boundary marker among this group.

There was another smaller group of participants who were critical of compatriots who they thought had failed to integrate into Aotearoa New Zealand, but whose criticism had a different basis. Penny first travelled to Aotearoa New Zealand on a working holiday visa to visit some friends, who were Pākehā, that she had met while they were living in London on their ‘overseas experience’. She ended up marrying one of them, and had been living in Auckland for fourteen years. In this example, she distanced herself from ‘a certain type of British person here’,

‘...some people come and they’re not interested in the country, they’re interested in leaving a place that they didn’t like or that’s “gone to the dogs”’ [drops voice to imitate
someone moaning] or whatever people say ... I avoid the North Shore Brits, ‘cos they live in enclaves and they think it’s safe and secure, and you’re thinking yeah safe and secure is one thing but that’s not living to me. Living is around everything - not about safety and security and people who look the same. I’m not interested in that ... I think if I wanted to live with a load of British people I’d live there! [laughs]’

Again, ‘the bad migrant’ is cast as narrow-minded, as well as politically conservative.

Moreover, Penny illustrates the way this figure could be attributed to British migrants who choose to integrate into a particular middle-class and majority white demographic associated with the northern coastal suburbs. I will examine further examine participants’ reflections on migrant enclaves in chapter seven.

In her research with English nationals, Condor (2000) suggested that through their criticism of bigoted compatriots, her participants could implicitly distance themselves from such characteristics (p. 192). Similar to Condor, Benson (2011) has argued convincingly that stereotypes about British migrants for her participants in the Lot, France often reveal more about the people who used them, the way they evaluate and categorise social life and their aspirations for their migration, than they did about those they claimed to represent (p. 126).

For participants in this project, stereotypes about their compatriots’ poor migrancy or performances of Britishness, although associated with perceptions of working and middle class groups, found stability through associations with narrow-mindedness and the failure to adapt to their ‘host’ society, bearing in mind that the latter was variously understood.

This classed pattern of relating to one another can be linked with recent research on culture, class and distinction in the UK. Insofar as there is a dominant expression of cultural capital in Britain, Bennett et al. (2009) argue, it is a middle class tendency to eclecticism, or an omnivorous orientation, in which reflexive appropriation and a spirit of openness to a diversity of cultural products grants distinction. They suggest that this orientation is contrasted with “fixed” or “static” tastes, which can be portrayed as narrow and restricted, and, by implication, those of the working class (p. 254). In a similar pattern, by ‘fixing’ ‘the bad migrant’ as narrow-minded and parochial, with attendant class associations of either supposedly ‘narrow’ working class, or ‘politically conservative’ middle class tastes, participants could position themselves as, conversely, open-minded. However, as desirable as a spirit of openness to a diversity of cultural products was, as we will see in chapters seven and eight, there were still boundaries in place.
6.4 Celtic capital and ironic ‘flag-waving’: the differences in meaning of signs of nationness between Britain’s constituent nations

As seen in chapter three, there is a tendency for English nationals to have more difficulty separating national pride from shameful British imperial activity in comparison with Scottish or Welsh nationals, for instance (Jones 1992; Williams 2005; Condor and Abell 2006). The ability to claim an identity of victimhood can offer a valuable, if potentially reactionary, position from which to speak (see, for example: Skeggs 2004, 58; Valentine 2008, 334). For instance, in a commentary on ‘race’ and racism in Wales, Williams (1995) has criticised what she calls ‘the tolerance thesis’. She argues that ‘Welsh people’s claim to an understanding and empathy with oppression’ (p. 119) can lead to an inability to reflect on racism in Wales, which is viewed as an English problem, following the logic that ‘oppressed peoples cannot be oppressors’ (p. 120). It appears that a difference in meaning of patriotism between Britain’s constituent nations can be traced in national ‘descendants’ beyond Britain’s borders too. In an exploration of ancestral heritage-tourism in Scotland, Basu (2005, 147) has explored the attraction for the ‘morally dispossessed’ descendants of settlers in ex-British settler societies to participate in a collective ‘Celtic dreaming’, which casts them as victims rather than perpetrators of displacement (see also: Curthoys 1999). In Aotearoa New Zealand, Paterson (2012) has suggested that English ancestry is felt to be awkward for Pākehā New Zealanders reclaiming their migrant origins due to a stronger association of England with the British Empire. Although all nationals from Britain and Ireland were involved in the thousands of individual actions and intentions that made up imperialism, and effective power quickly devolved to settler elites in Aotearoa New Zealand, Paterson (2012) suggests, however naively, that those of Catholic Irish background and to a limited extent the Scottish, and I would add the Welsh, may ‘reclaim as association with their ancestral homelands with slightly less postmodern angst than those of purely English origins’ (p. 125). In this section, I examine the potential for differences in the meaning of patriotism between English and Welsh participants.

Overt expressions of patriotism were generally felt to be less acceptable for English, in comparison to Welsh, Irish and Scottish, participants. For instance, Martin told me ‘I don’t go around with England t-shirts and England hats on and Union Jacks plastered everywhere … I don’t go out of my way to be English. I decided to come here and I want to blend in’. Nathan, from the Midlands, England, illustrated how this aversion to signs of nationness could be linked with negative historical associations with England,
'I think there is a general perception that the English historically are the bad guys ... the Scots hate us and the Irish do, obviously, and the Welsh do. Everyone hates us, you know [laughs].'

There were exceptions to this rule, watching sports teams is an obvious one, although several participants explained they had switched allegiances to local teams, such as the All Blacks, as part of their settlement process. Morris dancing was one example of an overt English expression of national cultural identity; although as mentioned in chapter four many attendees were Pākehā New Zealanders. However, this group also appeared to distance themselves from chauvinistic or imperial associations with Englishness. When I watched them perform at several public events, each time a member would announce that the dance was an ancient English tradition from the Cotswolds and derived from Pagan ritual. Through channelling folk cultures, the group appeared to circumnavigate more difficult associations with Englishness.

The most overt, and least self-conscious, displays of patriotism I saw were from Welsh nationals. Although, this trend may reflect my access to the Welsh Society and the Welsh Club, I want to argue it also indicates a different association for signs of ‘Celtic’ nationness. David, who we met in chapter four, had grown up in a small town in the Swansea Valley in Wales. He met his partner, who was Pākehā, while they were both working in London. When he was made redundant, they decided to migrate to Auckland in the 1980s. David described himself as ‘a Welsh man full stop and a Brit if you like as well. I can certainly relate to being a Brit and a Welsh man’. He had the Welsh flag on a bumper sticker on his car, wore a hat with the red dragon when we went to an amateur British tournament rugby match together and had been involved in teaching the Welsh language to a small group of friends, the latter being of particular political significance to him. In relation to potentially negative associations with his nationality, David’s relationship with his national history was complex. He spoke of ‘keeping quiet’ during Treaty training sessions at work because of Welsh missionary involvement with mistranslations. However, when he recalled someone telling him he was a Pākehā, he told me, ‘I say, “no I’m a Taff!”’ repeating the rhyme, ‘Taffy was a Welshman, Taffy was a thief, Taffy went to the butcher’s shop and stole a leg of beef!’ In this way, he distanced himself from the potentially politicised identity of Pākehā (Spoonley 1991), through identifying as a ‘Taff’.

Although perhaps fondly appropriated, this rhyme points to a history of cultural marginalisation of Welsh people in the UK. It was a way for David to claim a more ambiguous identity than that of a settler in Aotearoa New Zealand, in a trend I will return to with Merrick in chapter eight. Not all of the Welsh participants I spoke to were as vocal in their patriotism as David, and next I turn to a more representative example.
I met Charles when he responded to a poster I had put up in his suburb of Devonport. He was in his late fifties and from Cardiff in Wales, but educated in boarding schools around the UK, where he had developed a Home Counties English accent. He usually identified as British, because of a perception of its greater inclusiveness, telling me ‘I think British is a nice expression because it’s sort of- it almost captures the essence of multiculturalism’. Charles opposed this identity to his distaste for ‘huge nationalism, you know ... in certain times in the UK you’ve got lots of sort of- the St George Cross and whatever, wherever you go’. However, he was‘... quite proud if anyone calls me Welsh’, and, in contrast to his distaste for the English flag, told me,

‘... actually when we go sailing we quite often - we’ve got a family flotilla - we put a huge Welsh flag up on the mast, an enormous great big Welsh flag’.

Although it is important to note that not all participants from Wales engaged in such patriotic displays, the contrast between Charles’ perception of an English and Welsh flag highlights the differences in meaning attached to overt displays of patriotism between the nations, which I argue can be connected with different historical associations and, perhaps, a recent documented rise in cultural capital attached to ‘Celtic’ identities (Harvey et al. 2002, 14, referencing Bourdieu 1984).

Figure 6.3 Henry and Daniel’s flags at work

However, through claiming a playful, ironic position, a minority of English participants did display signs of their British nationness. Henry decorated a space at his work, where he and some other English migrants had been placed together, with Union Jack flags (see figure 6.3, left), which he explained to me, repeatedly, were ‘kind of- it’s a little ironic’. Henry then went on to add, ‘there’s something about being English in New Zealand that feels funny’. For Henry, his hanging a flag at work was a response to his sense that English culture was sometimes maligned. He explained,
'... as an English person, regardless of whether I-, I'm not some Colonel Blimp or anything, but until you come away you don't realise that, you know, I am English, and I grew up in England and learnt all the things about being English. And when you go away from there you realise, yeah, they're actually part of you and if someone doesn't respect those they're not respecting you, much like anything that really is part of your character I suppose ... I'm a very much, kind of, into neuroscience and that, sort of, you know, that's what you develop, that's how your brain develops when you grow up. It's not entirely hard wired but it's pretty much- by the time you're an adult therefore that's what- that's what you are'.

Henry stressed that the flag was ironic and distanced himself from the jingoistic figure of 'Colonel Blimp', a pompous stereotypical British cartoon character created by a New Zealander. However, in response to a perceived sense of animosity from Pākehā towards the English, Henry's national attachment is conveyed as almost irresistible, in a biological explanation of a national habitus (Edensor 2002).

Daniel also had a space at work which he had decorated with a Union Jack flag (see, figure 6.3, right. Photograph cropped to protect anonymity),

'I think I called this [photograph] my corner of the empire ... people talk about, ‘oh, are we gonna have a raising the flag ceremony?’ They're gonna come and stand round at the end of the day and lower the flag and all this kind of stuff, so we have a good laugh'.

As with Henry, Daniel's 'flag-waving', which this time had explicit imperial overtones, was performed in a playful way, which worked to distance him from potential negative associations. In a similar pattern as that described when intellectuals or artists who read popular novels or watch Westerns transform such works into props of distinction through distancing or ironic readings which are thus still governed by the organising principles of the bourgeois aesthetic habitus (Lahire 2004, 7-10 referenced by Bennett et al 2009, 26). Even as Henry and Daniel's 'flag-waving' illustrated exceptions to the general avoidance of displays of patriotism among British, and especially English, participants, through their self-consciously ironic and distancing performances, they can be argued to reaffirm those principles.

Conclusion

In their paper on the event of 'Britfest' in Melbourne, Australia, Wills and Darian-Smith (2003, 71) found that many British migrants were not interested in 'self-ethnicisation' or increasing their visibility as a community. In a compelling explanation for this dominant pattern, which could be extended to Aotearoa New Zealand, first, they argued that many British migrants in Australia are happy to maintain the comfort of being 'invisible migrants'
with all the privileges attendant with this status, as their ability to remain inconspicuous was linked with the avoidance of recalling the consequences of settlement and racism. In ex-British settler societies, explicit displays of Britishness can have negative associations. Secondly, Wills and Darian-Smith (2003) suggest that most participants did not feel the need to assert or display their Britishness partly ‘because it is all around them in the continuing inheritance of British political, social and cultural colonialism’ (p. 79). This latter point is an aspect of participants’ experience I will address in the next chapter further, which addresses their perceptions of cultural affinity with Pākehā.

Participants tended to distance themselves from being overly focused on recreating Britain socially and culturally. However, this did not mean that their nationality was not part of many of their habituated, everyday lives (Edensor 2002). Their Britishness was present in both self-conscious and habitual ways. For instance, Amy realised, she claimed unconsciously, that she chose British films ‘nine times out of ten’ from the rental store, Stan reads ‘The Sun’ and ‘The Shropshire Star’ online every day, and Jane later admitted, despite initially distancing herself from such practices, to buying British Marmite on occasion, as well as a passion for drinking tea and mostly watching satellite channels which broadcast British television at home. Such examples illustrate that for many participants ‘they have carried their history with them in the patterns of life, habits, memories, continuities and discontinuities that make identity and link it to place’ (Wills and Darian-Smith 2003, 79).

This chapter analysed the way in which participants would distance themselves from negative characteristics associated with ‘the whingeing Pom’, and more generally from the figure of ‘the bad migrant’, who was portrayed as narrow-minded and overly focused on recreating Britain socially and culturally. The latter figure revealed participants’ aspirations for their own migrancy as, alternately, adventurous and open-minded, and a classed dynamic to patterns of relations between British migrants. In chapters seven and eight, I will unpack further how participants imagined the ‘host’ society to which they had to integrate.

Among participants who did have British friends and visited British-themed commercial establishments, I tracked a language of lack of intention and the frequency with which sense of humour was often drawn on, among the English, when they reflected on this aspect of their lives. This chapter also paid attention to variation between Britain’s constituent nations. In a recent interview, which touched upon patriotism, for the English specifically, and its entanglements with class, Bennett (with Higgins 2015), the playwright, suggested that,
‘To be patriotic – to be English – is partly to be sceptical of one’s country, and of patriotism itself. ... Being sceptical about patriotism is a part of patriotism – a refined sense of patriotism, I think. Demonstrations of patriotism always make me uncomfortable, but I don’t think that makes me less of an Englishman.” He laughs. “I don’t know. It makes you sound so pompous if you put it like that’.”

This chapter explored the way in which displays of patriotism was more sensitive for English participants, which it contrasted with the example of two Welsh participants. There is a romanticism associated with Celtic identity which has been documented more generally (Harvey et al. 2002), while Britain’s constituent nations have different historical associations in the ex-British settler society of Aotearoa New Zealand. Finally, I noted that English migrants could, and did, engage in ‘flag-waving’, but usually ironically, in a mode of display which reaffirmed the more typical stance among participants of the avoidance of displays of patriotism.
Figure 7.1 Daniel, pictures at home
Chapter seven. Intimate Others and other Others: national belonging and relations with Pākehā and ‘Asians’

Introduction

‘An overwhelming preponderance of British migrants in New Zealand’s flows until the 1980s produced, to use McKinnon’s (1996) recently coined phrase, a nation formed largely of “kin-migrants”. Relations between immigrant and native born may not be strictly kin-like in anthropological terms, and, as with all family relations, not necessarily harmonious, but “the British” clearly were, and, to a lesser extent, remain, an “intimate other” within the New Zealand nation-state.

(Pearson 2000, 98)

The concept of ‘the British World’ conveys ‘the real and imagined common origins, culture and identity’ which connected the globally dispersed sites impacted upon by the British Empire (Bridge and Fedorowich 2003 10-11). Bridge and Fedorowich (2003) argue that this network extended beyond the political boundaries of formal empire, and has a lingering presence after its demise. In the nineteenth and early twentieth century in Aotearoa New Zealand, it has been widely argued that British migrants saw themselves migrating to a ‘better Britain’ (Ward 2007; Phillips and Hearn 2008; Belich 2009). However, what significance such arguments have for contemporary British migrants in Aotearoa New Zealand has, until recently, been little researched (Pearson 2013, 82). Research with British migrants has tended to argue that whiteness and sufficient shared socio-cultural attributes can make migration to Aotearoa New Zealand easier to some extent ‘in a British world that has been dislocated, if not completely lost’ (Pearson 2014, 507, 518; see also: Watson et al. 2011). However, the assumption that they smoothly assimilate into a majority culture has been extensively problematised (see, for examples in Australia: Wills and Darian-Smith 2003; Hammerton 2011; and in Aotearoa New Zealand: Pearson 2014). In Pearson’s research, he has addressed the nominal national orientations and national sentiments expressed by contemporary English migrants in Aotearoa New Zealand (Pearson and Sedgwick 2010; Pearson 2014). In this chapter, I build on his research through a focus on the apparent attraction of migration to somewhere seen as familiar among participants, the awareness of British antecedents which was prompted by particular landscapes and the common notion of ‘shared ancestry’ with some Pākehā New Zealanders. The latter half of the chapter then builds an argument, drawing
on Hage (1998), and an analysis of participants’ relations with those who appeared to have East Asian heritage, about the unequal distribution of national belonging.

Hage (1998) seeks to understand the ‘subtleties of the differential modalities of national belonging as they are experienced within society’ (p. 51, emphasis in original). He conceptualises nationality through Bourdieu’s notion of cultural capital to argue that it has a cumulative nature, that it is unequally distributed within the nation and that accumulated national cultural capital tends to be proportional to national belonging (ibid. 53). Migrants arriving in a new nation can accumulate ‘nationality’ through various ways, such as acquiring the language, the accent, specific tastes and duration of residence, for instance (ibid. 54). However, the extent to which migrants can accumulate ‘national capital’ is linked to their embodiment and the cultural possessions and dispositions that they bring with them. In the context of Australia, he suggests,

‘Being male, European, of British descent, of Irish descent, Protestant, Catholic, rich in economic capital or a good sportsperson, or having white skin, an Aussie accent or blonde hair, all of these operate as national capitals in the sense that their possession allows the person who owns them to claim certain forms of dominant national belonging.’ (p. 56)

Hage’s discussion of dominant forms of national belonging references an analytical distinction he draws between ‘passive belonging’ and ‘governmental belonging’. The former refers to the sense of being part of the nation so that one ‘fits into’ or ‘feels at home’ within it, and expects to have the right to benefit from the nation’s resources (p. 45). The latter refers to the ‘possession of the right to contribute (even if only having a legitimate opinion with regard to the internal politics of the nation) to its management such that it remains “one’s home”’ (p. 46, emphasis in original).

To elaborate on the mode of governmental belonging, Hage introduces the figure of ‘the spatial manager’ who worries about ‘too many’ migrants. The undesirability of ‘too many’ does not occur in the abstract, Hage (1998) argues, but assumes a definite national space in which something is deemed undesirable (p. 37). Such ‘undesirability’ acquires its meaning in relation to what he calls a ‘spatial-affective-aspiration’. In other words, an ‘idealised image of what this national background ought to be like’ (p. 39, emphasis in original). The fragments which emerge of an idealised homely nation are generally incoherent. In fact, Hage (1998, 41) suggests that they are more akin to a structure of feeling than a physical, house-like construct. In such a national image, a centre is constructed that represents ‘real’ belonging, the characteristics and dispositions of which people strive to acquire and have recognised, while, alternately, others are cast as not ‘properly’ belonging. The last two sections of the chapter, in
particular, draw on Hage’s argument in order to explore, and problematise, the way in which participants’ relations with Pākehā and with peoples who appeared to have East Asian heritage revealed a hierarchy of belonging and otherness in Aotearoa New Zealand.

The chapter is organised around four parts. First, I address the ongoing popularity of travel between the UK and Aotearoa New Zealand, and, in an associated pattern, the significant number of participants who had migrated because of a romantic relationship formed with a New Zealander they had met while they were travelling in the UK. I then examine the attraction for many participants of migration to a familiar ‘exotic’. Secondly, I explore participants’ awareness of their national antecedents in Aotearoa New Zealand, through an exploration of the way in which particular landscapes were seen as familiar and the popular notion of shared ancestry with Pākehā. Thirdly, I analyse the experience of ‘blending in’ and a sense of themselves as ordinary among many participants, and relate this to their enhanced ability to accrue national capital in this context. In contrast, the final section examines participants’ encounters with peoples who appeared to have East Asian heritage in order to highlight the way in which participants might exclude such groups from dominant modes of national belonging in Aotearoa New Zealand.

7.1 Aotearoa New Zealand as familiar and ‘exotic’

A popular rite of passage, many young New Zealanders travel in their twenties and thirties on their Overseas Experience (OE). ‘Within the range of possible destinations, Britain retains a particular prominence, in part because its colonial legacy affords preferential visa access to New Zealanders’ (Conradson and Latham 2005, 234). In relation to this pattern of travel, Barnes (2012, 275) has argued,

‘Empire is now long gone, but echoes of this old relationship remain. Although no longer a ‘Mecca’ for colonial pilgrims, London still functions as a New Zealand city. It is the most popular staging point for New Zealanders on their big OE, and a key destination for expatriate working New Zealanders ... For many of these – perhaps the majority – London is home, and their presence weaves a new set of linkages between the metropolis and its former hinterland’.

Her comments on the frequent travel between the countries usefully situates some dominant trends among participants. First, a third of participants had already travelled to Aotearoa New

---

18 The working holiday and grandparent entry visas enable greater access for New Zealanders to the UK, than the US might, for instance.
Zealand, whether on holiday, to visit their partner’s family or for work, and so it was a familiar destination prior to their migration. Secondly, for around a third of participants, romantic relationships with New Zealanders, most of whom they had met while the latter were travelling and living in the UK, were the driving force of their migration. As Walsh (2009, 429) puts it, ‘[l]ove must surely be one of the most significant factors in contemporary transnational practices, yet theorists have been reluctant to name it explicitly’. Finally, the desire for a familiar ‘exotic’ was another prominent theme when participants reflected on their attraction to Aotearoa New Zealand, which I examine next.

Similar to the experience of many participants in this study, Conradson and Latham (2007) suggest that for New Zealanders,

‘... moving to London did involve encountering difference, but this was not an entirely unanticipated difference. Although it can be overstated, the shared cultural background of the two countries confers a degree of mutual intelligibility for travellers from New Zealand who arrive in Britain (and vice versa) ... This familiarity helped make global relocation a less daunting prospect’. (p. 242-243)

In another usefully analogous argument, Dürr (2007) has suggested that for German tourists, ‘New Zealand simultaneously represents European-ness and Otherness, which creates a balanced sense of familiarity, distance and exotic[ism]’ (p. 74). I want to suggest that for many participants Aotearoa New Zealand was attractive because of a perception it was both familiar and ‘exotic’\(^\text{19}\). A perspective which Sarah succinctly illustrates in her reflection on coming to Aotearoa New Zealand with her sister, initially as part of their ‘gap year’,

‘...it’s English speaking, of course, a safe country, it’s got that kind of- it’s exciting and new, but it’s also a similar culture, so it’s not entirely scary as a kind of a young person going to a new place’.

For many participants, although they often sought out adventure or change through their migration, this endeavour was tempered by the desire for a relatively familiar social and cultural environment.

When participants recalled where they had considered moving to, it was common for people to list Aotearoa New Zealand, Canada and Australia, and less so South Africa and the US. Their choices reflected popular migratory destinations more broadly among British emigrants (Finch et al. 2010, 29). For instance, Theo had travelled to the US, France and to

\(^{19}\) I recognise the problematic colonial connotations of the term ‘exotic’ but in this case, perhaps, it is apt. I use it to infer the adventure of moving to ‘an exotic and foreign territory’, as in the Oxford English Dictionary definition cited by Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin (2007, 88), cognisant of the subjectivity of exoticism, and its problematic history of attachment to ‘non-Western’ locales.
various locations in the UK previously on a corporate graduate scheme, and was keen when his partner suggested working abroad. They wanted to move somewhere English-speaking, his experience of a hostile climate and stressful work culture put him off the US, reminiscent of Abbey’s concerns in chapter five, and a ‘gut feeling’ that ‘it seemed nicer than Australia’ meant they considered Aotearoa New Zealand and Canada. For them, it came down to ‘New Zealand let us in and Canada never really happened’. The frequency with which these destinations were listed points towards the salience of language, but also the influence of a perception of cultural commonality for participants when imagining ‘the good life’. In another example, Abbey explicitly articulated a desire for cultural similarity, telling me,

 ‘I would only go to the States, Canada or Australasia. I’m not interested in going anywhere poor, dangerous or where it’s not English. Just because I don’t need to learn a new language. Cultural experiences are great for holidays but I don’t need to live it for three years was my feeling’.

However, Ellery, in her late fifties, who had migrated eighteen years previously, illustrates how a desire for cultural similarity could also be explicitly racialised. As she recounted her decision-making, she said ‘I wanted a safe country, or a country that was perceived to be safe … I know this might sound awful but predominantly white [and] English speaking’. Next, I explore participants’ notions of similarity, in relation to people and places, post-migration.

7.2 Awareness of British antecedents: familiar landscapes and notions of shared ancestry with Pākehā

‘English trees in my garden

We planted trees in a faraway land

In between the palms and the succulent grove’.

(Finn 2007)
In chapter two, I introduced the concept of ‘worlding’ (Spivak 1985) to describe the social, political, cultural and ecological transformations brought about by British settlers seeking to make Aotearoa New Zealand into a ‘better Britain’ (Crosby 1986; Dunlap 1999; Bell 2014). Related to this concept, I want to explore the way in which particular landscapes could evoke ‘intimations of homeliness’ for participants. ‘Intimations of homeliness’ conveys the way various fragments from a migrant’s daily life in their adopted country can trigger positive forms of nostalgia which remind them of home and thus ‘offer possibilities of homely feelings’ (Hage 1997, 4). I acknowledge the memory of former landscapes in new environments is hardly exclusive to British arrivals (see, for example: Tolia-Kelly 2004; Conradson and McKay 2007). However, I want to situate participants’ everyday, place-based ‘positive encounter[s] with a person, a sound, a smell or a situation’ which offered ‘an intimation of an imagined homely experience in the past: an experience of “back home”’ (Hage 1997, 5) within a specific history of ‘worlding’ in Aotearoa New Zealand, in order to understand how this process still has affective resonance in the world we live in now.\footnote{Although I have not included the reflections of participants who found their new landscape markedly different and actively longed for what they had left behind, as this section is, instead, exploring the possibility of finding comfort in recognisable landscapes, it is important to note that this trend was also evident.}

Several participants photographed aspects of the landscape which reminded them of the UK. Maggie, for instance, photographed an Anglican and Catholic church and some oak trees in her suburb of Devonport (see figure 7.2), and reflected,

‘I think they look pretty English those- the styles are very similar; the grave stones are very similar. So you can feel that really strong- or it could be British, some of them have that Celtic cross on and that kind of thing [...] and there’s also Oak trees here, you know, there are some of these plants that, um, obviously British people brought with them to
remind them of home ... something of home when you’re going to the other side of the world type thing’.

Although few participants affiliated themselves with historical mass arrivals of Britons, Maggie illustrates how everyday encounters with specific aspects of the landscape could prompt an awareness of national antecedents. Henry was a trained botanist and was knowledgeable about Aotearoa New Zealand’s ecology. He vividly described a Proustian ‘madeleine moment’ during a foggy autumnal morning walk through Victoria Park to work, a name which speaks of a British colonial presence in Auckland,

Figure 7.3 Henry, Victoria Park

‘...it reminds me so much of London parks, with all the big trees, and- and because they’re all not New Zealand natives they all lose their leaves, and I walk across there and it really is very similar to walking across a park in London, and gives me that- especially when it’s all foggy and cold, ‘cos it’s early in the morning and, I don’t know, there must have been something about the light or something but I just thought I’ve got to take a picture of the park because it’s a bit- it’s one of the most similar experiences to being in England that I’ve had in New Zealand ... it’s actually quite nice to go in to work on the bus, get off the bus, walk across the park to go to work, it’s like- it’s like being in England. ... you kind of- particularly on a foggy day, and you kind of go through these- and you find these landscapes that are entirely imported, usually autumn - trees and things like that, certain times of year, and you go wow this is like- [voice of wonder] this is- this is England put into New Zealand’.

Deciduous trees introduced into the subtropical environment, autumnal light and fog mobilise a potent reminder of home for Henry, which evoked a feeling of positive nostalgia (Hage 1997).
In another example, Daniel had taken the photograph below on a trip to Christchurch and explained why he wanted to include it,

Figure 7.4 Daniel, a trip to Christchurch

‘... when I saw it I thought this just reminds me of England and so - why I took a photograph of this particular thing - it reminds me that there are places around New Zealand that are- to me it’s like- in a way I tell my brain “ah, this is very much like home”’, so it doesn’t feel so foreign to me ... it is comforting, it makes me kind of feel that sense of, um, because I’m seeing it, it must be- you know, it’s okay. I’m seeing it so the world- my world is okay. It makes the world okay in some way. If I was to be in a completely foreign place, if I was say, like, to live in Japan and in a completely foreign culture I suppose I would go through major culture shock, but to me New Zealand is so much like England it’s almost like it’s just, like, the same. It’s almost like a cousin. It’s like just going off with your aunty, you know ... I think that’s what New Zealand means to me in many ways, it is, it’s like visiting your aunty or someone very much like your mum, and you see all the similarities, but they’re not quite the same’.

Daniel’s extract illustrates several broader trends among participants. As with several other participants, he contrasts the relative ease of his migration to Aotearoa New Zealand with somewhere more ‘foreign’. Although just as common among participants, was his alluding to a remainder of difference. He highlights the way a perception of familiarity could evoke comfort. In chapter eight, I will further explore how awareness of Britain’s colonial presence in Aotearoa New Zealand could also evoke discomfort for participants. Finally, he frames the similarities between the two countries through a language of family and relatedness, a central theme I develop in the following section. Next, I further explore participants’ awareness of their national antecedents through an exploration of notions of shared ancestry with some Pākehā New Zealanders.

---

21 This interview followed from the initial instructions, which asked participants to take photographs ‘as a British migrant’, which I later changed, as discussed in chapter four. Nevertheless, I think the sentiment, even if problematically guided, is interesting.
Fenton (2010) has highlighted the overlapping etymologies and meanings of ‘race’, ethnicity and nationality. Although he emphasises that the concepts remain distinct, he suggests that the three concepts share a ‘core’ because: ‘[c]ommon to all is an idea of descent or ancestry and very closely implicated in all three we find the idea of shared culture’ (Fenton 2010, 12). As he put it, in an expansion of this point,

‘This idea of shared ancestry may not be as precise as the genealogies of extended families … but there is nonetheless a repeating theme of “people coming from the same stock”’. (Fenton 2010, 12)

However, this sense of shared ancestry is not innate. ‘People or places do not just possess cultures of shared ancestry’, Fenton (2010, 3) argues, ‘they elaborate these into the idea of a community founded upon these attributes’ (emphasis in original). The way in which an idea of Englishness, Britishness and ‘Anglo-Saxonness’ was dispersed across ‘the British World’ to bolster a myth of commonality has been extensively critically examined (see, for example: Young 2008; Belich 2009). In the contemporary context, as Cochrane (1994, 2) has argued in relation to the ongoing myth of ‘Anglo-Saxonness’ in Australia, this myth depends not on any natural legacy, but on ‘…real people [who] have made choices about ancestry and associated traditions’. If, as Lester (2012, 5) has argued, ‘…colonial ideas of racial difference are continuously re-worked rather than simply inherited’, so too are colonial ideas of racial sameness. Following this argument, I explore, and problematise, the way ‘cultures of relatedness’ (Fenton 2010) were enacted by participants in their encounters with Pākehā with British heritage.

The idea of shared ancestry with Pākehā held common currency among participants. For instance, Paul, a self-described ‘ten pound Pom’ from England, told me ‘when you do ancestry, you find out a lot of people have come from England’. When I asked Martin if he had ever considered the historical connections between Aotearoa New Zealand and the UK, similarly, he told me,

‘Obviously you’ve got to take into consideration most of the white people are here because of Captain Cook … I mean the Kiwis always refer to, um, England as being the old country or, ‘cos, you know, like any- not every Kiwi, but a lot of Kiwis you get talking to they go back a few generations they were Poms as well (Katie: Hmm) You know, so the countries always had that close relationship- I mean I suppose that’s why it’s so easy, one of the reasons why it’s so easy to come here, you know, ‘cos you just, sort of, I think they’re generally quite accepting anyway, but especially accepting of Poms, you know, they just sort of- you know they always want to- um, who was I talking to recently? A customer at work. He said “oh where’d you come from?” I said where. He said, “ah, my grandparents came from Cardiff”. I said, “oh yeah it’s just over-“’, “ah yeah”, he said … ‘we went over last year, oh yeah we had about six weeks in the UK’, and started rattling off all the cities he went to’.
Although chapter six problematised a universally positive reception of British migrants, these two extracts illustrate a common notion of shared ancestry, and as the example of Martin indicates, the way such connections could ‘carry particular weight socially, materially, [and] affectively’ in this context (Carsten 2000, 1 cited by Nash 2003, 180). Claudia’s story further illustrates the normalcy of the idea of shared ancestry in encounters with Pākehā in everyday life, and the way it was associated with enhanced acceptance. When I asked her how people reacted to her as a Scottish person, she replied,

‘Usually fine. A lot of people like the Scottish and want to tell me about which Scottish ancestry they have. My physiotherapist’s ancestors are from near where my parents lived. It’s nice to share that. Other people I’ve met either they themselves were born there, or their parents were from there, or their grandparents’.

As Nash (2003) has shown, in her research with third generation or later Irish migrants living in ex-British settler societies who are doing their family trees, connections to places matter to people, as well as connections between people. In encounters such as these, an imagined shared ancestral ‘home’ evoked a sense of connection for participants in specific moments and spaces with Pākehā.

A notion of shared ancestry or cultural commonality could shape participants’ encounters with Pākehā even when they experienced social friction. When Henry told me about a survey at his children’s school, he illustrated how the notion that Pākehā were similar, because they had ancestral connections with the UK, could be drawn on in defence against a perception of resentment,

‘…the English people were not counted as separate from New Zealanders when they did that survey. So New Zealanders, for all their chips on the shoulder “we hate the English ‘cos they’re so arrogant” and this that and the other, they actually don’t think of us as very different because it’s obviously true we’re not … where did New Zealand- white New Zealanders come from? They came from Ireland and England almost exclusively’.

Neil was English, in his sixties and arrived eight years previously with his English wife. I met him at his work, in a British grocery store. Although he made a different argument, he, similarly, said,

‘… obviously you probably relate to the Kiwis better than some other nationalities ‘cos they’re almost English anyway, not quite. They don’t like to think they’re English but they can’t help it. They’re from an English background whether they like it or not’

As these examples indicate, Pākehā may not always identify with their British, or in particular English, historical connections enthusiastically (see, for example: King 1985; Tuffin, Pratt and Frewin 2004; Bell 2006; Paterson 2012).
As already noted in chapter six, there were differences in experience between Britain’s constituent nations. It is interesting to note that many of the most enthusiastic anecdotes told to me by participants about Pākehā relaying their ancestry were not stories of English heritage. In contrast to the previous examples, for several participants from Wales and Scotland, it was Pākehā enthusiasm, rather than distancing, from their shared ancestry that they commented on. Merrick, from Wales, told me one night, as we sat in an Irish pub discussing Pākehā who attend the Celtic Summer School, ‘they’re like born again Christians aren’t they? More zealous than the locals!’ In another example, Aileen, from Scotland, said,

‘… people will say “oh I’m Scottish”- I’ll go, “you are?” Like two generations back, you know, “my great-grandfather was Scottish”, “oh yeah?” To me that’s like [pulls a disapproving face], you know, because- hmm … to me Scottish is if you’re born there’.

Aileen appeared to reject an ancestral idea of national and ethnic affiliation for a geographical one. Although she later contradicted this understanding when she explained that, although she was born in Scotland, her Welsh mother made her ‘fifty per cent’ Welsh. Kiely, Bechhofer and McCrone (2005) in their exploration of the work of ‘birth’, ‘blood’ and ‘belonging’ as identity markers in Scotland have argued that birth tends to carry the most significance. However, Aileen points to the difficulty of disentangling understandings of nationality and ethnicity, whether considered through connections with place, biologised ancestry or cultural practices.

As Fenton (2010, 12) argued, closely implicated in the idea of common ancestry is the idea of shared culture. As we saw earlier, many participants were attracted to Aotearoa New Zealand because of a perception of cultural familiarity, and many, if not all, would stress aspects of similarity between the places post-migration. For instance, when I asked Theo what his experience of settling in had been, he said,

‘Uh, it is, to be quite honest, so close to England, it really isn’t that different. ... there’s probably a few things we noticed to start with ... you still commute to work, to Auckland city, you’re still doing engineering in the same way, you drive on the left, cars are the same, people are the same really, it’s almost too the same really, there’s no- there’s the classic things like a corner shop being a dairy and a few silly things but ... they’re just things you stuff up a few times and then get used to’.

When expressing similarity between the nation’s cultures, participants would often remark on the continuity of their working lives, taxes, driving and the banalities of life. However, while many participants commented on a sense of similarity, no participants claimed that the national cultures were coterminous with each other (see also: Pearson 2014). All of the participants experienced the vivid dilation of being in a new place, the intimate frustration of working-out banal tasks which went unthought in their previous life and the re-learning and
re-processing of ‘habits, objects, names and histories that have been uprooted’ (Ahmed et al. 2003, 9).

I next return to Claudia, in order to examine more closely the way such perceptions of cultural similarity could be connected with notions of shared ancestry, and a broader trend among participants in which they could struggle to clearly articulate what was Pākehā and what was British. Claudia was born in Auckland, to parents who had travelled over as ‘ten pound Poms’, but they travelled back to Edinburgh, Scotland when she was still a baby to be nearer family. Growing up with a New Zealand passport and hearing stories from her siblings and parents she developed an ongoing fascination with the country, and had migrated three years previously. When reflecting on why she had taken the photograph below in our photo-elicitation interview, Claudia said,

Figure 7.5 Claudia, Scotch broth

‘I think food is a really important way to keep in touch with my- my culture [adopts pseudo-serious voice]. It’s weird talking about culture when you live in someplace like this because everybody else is kind of, you know, um, well there’s a huge proportion of European descendants and they say words like “wee” and they sound like they could be Scottish with the words that they choose. It’s weird. At other times I am made aware of how Scottish I am. Especially when I say something like, uh, roof and they’re like woof, woof, woof [laughs].

British colonialism shaped culinary fashions in Aotearoa New Zealand so that by the twentieth century most food that was considered traditional had British origins, with the Sunday roast, baking and orthodox British (especially English and Scottish) dishes part of the repertoire of the Pākehā household (Bedford and Spoonley 2012, 251); although there is now also an increasingly cosmopolitan foodscape, too. Claudia’s final sentence supports Pearson’s (2014, 515) findings in his research with English migrants that, even if they felt a profound sense of
belonging in Aotearoa New Zealand, few would claim to ‘possess all the credentials for “localness”’, partly because New Zealanders would not recognise them as such.

Finally, Maggie articulates the limitations of the notion of shared ancestry explored so far. Maggie took a photograph of Waitemata Harbour during the Tall Ships event, in which ships race from Sydney, Australia to Auckland Harbour,

Figure 7.6 Maggie, Tall Ships

‘Oh wow, oh Tall Ships came past! When the Tall Ships came past, do you know, I thought about the waka, the canoe, the Māori canoe that first came from the Pacific, from Polynesia down to here. That’s how their ancestors got there, and I thought that’s how my ancestors from Britain came in, on tall, um, square ships’.

Maggie talks of her ‘ancestors’ arriving to Aotearoa New Zealand in a way resonant with the sense of relatedness explored above. However, she made a separation, when later reflecting on a recent trip back to the UK, between her ancestors in the UK and her felt connection with Aotearoa New Zealand,

‘I just realised in a nutshell my- I just reflected on it every now and then that my roots go very, very deep in Britain like ancestors back, back, back it just felt that that’s that’s that’s that’s that’s that’s that’s that’s that’s that’s that’s that’s that’s that’s very different. So that’s my roots, but this is my home’.

British antecedents were perceived in the social, cultural and even ecological, landscape among participants, and this could evoke a sense of familiarity or comfort. However, the connections with place and people these prompted were not given as much ‘weight socially, materially, [and] affectively’ (Carsten 2000, 1 cited by Nash 2003, 180) as kinship more conventionally conceived. The sense of ‘shallow roots’ evoked by Maggie points to how conventional notions of biologised ancestry were still significant. In addition, as seen earlier with Aileen, where you were born and, as illustrated by Claudia, the ability to practice
nationality in a way recognised by ‘locals’, still governed many participants’ sense of connection to place, even as they drew on ‘wider circles of ethnic and national belonging’ (Ahmed et al. 2003, 9).

Wills and Darian-Smith (2004, 6) have warned that the idea of Anglo-Saxon kinship and ‘spurious notions of racial identity’ have crept back into public discourse in Australia. In this context, they highlight the hazards of affirming a notion of ethnic commonality in their research with white, post-war British migrants. There is a danger that through focusing attention on participants’ notions of shared ancestry, this research could bolster essentialised understandings of identity. In Aotearoa New Zealand, in a now postcolonial version of what was previously a nationalist reluctance, historian Pickles has suggested that a re-examination of Britishness is considered ‘awkward’, ‘uncomfortable’ and perhaps even ‘irrelevant’, with a central concern being ‘that revealing a British past is assumed to be the same as reasserting it in the present, in the process denying indigenous and multicultural voices’ (Pickles 2011, 91). Her comments could be extended to research on lingering aspects of ‘the British World’ in Aotearoa New Zealand, too. However, I argue that this focus, rather than sustaining it, can better understand, and thus challenge, simplistic notions of a passive legacy and naturalised inheritance of Britishness in ex-British societies (see also: Barnes 2012, 6).

7.3 Ordinariness and ‘blending in’

Participants often commented on the significant number of British migrants living in Auckland, but it was frequently seen as making their presence ordinary. For instance, when I asked Chris, in an interview at his work-place, how people responded to his accent, he said,

‘...there’s enough British here working, it’s no real surprise, but you do get asked the question, where is that accent from? Or, is that a British accent? ... but we’re considered as normal people [laughs]’.

Although at other points in our conversation he had reflected on being racialised as different because of his Jamaican heritage in Aotearoa New Zealand, he felt that the large number of other British migrants meant that his accent was considered ‘normal’. Theo illustrated a hierarchy of otherness when he said, ‘we’re not that unusual, like you’re unusual if you come from Iraq or something’. When I asked Lucy if she felt accepted, she reflected directly on whether she had felt ‘foreign’ in Auckland,
'Definitely, yeah, definitely, there are so many British people here it’s ridiculous, I’ve just been corresponding with a friend from England actually who, I’ve not spoken to him for years, many years, but him and his wife are thinking about moving out here. And he asked me the question ... do people look upon you as a foreigner? And I’m like seriously there are so many British people here you’re not a foreigner at all, you know, half the population in Auckland is British!’

Key to a sense of their ‘ordinariness’ among participants, was a perception of the large number of other British migrants. However, an awareness of a significant presence of British migrants, but a sense that this presence conveys ordinariness, contrasts with the way in which increasing numbers of migrants from countries in East Asia were perceived by several participants, which I will address in the fourth section of this chapter.

Besides the generally benign label of ‘the whingeing Pom’ explored in chapter six, in contemporary Aotearoa New Zealand, British migrants do not tend to be included in what Noble (2005, 188) calls the ‘production and regulation of strangeness’. As suggested in the previous examples, participants would frequently comment on their sense of themselves as ordinary. Part of an experience of ‘fit’ and being ‘in place’ in relation to the spaces one inhabits is acknowledgement by others. As Noble (2005, 114) argues, ‘[o]ur ability to be comfortable in public settings also rests on our ability to be acknowledged as rightfully existing there: to be recognised as belonging’. In an example of the way white British migrants could experience such recognition, Sarah recalled a time when she had become aware of how her physical appearance shaped her reception from New Zealanders,

‘... there was a time when I was at a coffee shop with a colleague, who is a Kiwi but her parents are Indonesian, and the person in the coffee shop was asking my friend where she’s from. And she’s a Kiwi but because she looks different, she’s not Caucasian, it was assumed that she was not from round here, whereas I was’.

Sarah’s experience illustrates the way in which participants who could be categorised as white tended to be recognised as legitimately national by the dominant cultural grouping, meaning they had an enhanced ability to accrue national capital (Hage 1998). An appearance of whiteness offered the privileges of ‘invisibility’, at least until they spoke, for such British migrants (Wills and Darian-Smith 2003, 79).

For Charles and Julia their whiteness and a significant presence of other British migrants in their suburb were both part of their feeling of being ‘in place’ in Auckland. They lived in the affluent suburb of Devonport in the northern coastal suburbs.

Charles: ‘it’s been a very easy migration because where we live is so (sighs) ... well it’s so easy to assimilate ... I mean we’re very lucky with where we live as well ‘cos I mean Devonport is-’
Julia: ‘Devonport’s wonderful.’

Charles: ‘well it’s very, um, mono-ethnic I mean there’s- there’s mainly sort of British people here, I guess, an established community, but we- we blend easily’.

Charles’ experience of ‘blending’ in to his local neighbourhood resonates with Ahmed’s comments on whiteness, where she suggested, ‘[t]o be comfortable is to be so at ease with one’s environment that it is hard to distinguish where one’s body ends and the world begins’. She argues that sense of comfort and fit arises due to the fact that some places are organised around some bodies more than others, as she put it, ‘[w]hite bodies are comfortable as they inhabit spaces that extend their shape’ (2007, 134, emphasis in original). I later asked Charles to expand on what he meant by ‘mono-ethnic’ and, I think partly in his discomfort, he ended with playful answers,

Charles: ‘yeah, in that there are mainly white people here, but there are within that, ah ... a couple of days ago in The Herald [I read] there’s quite a proportion of Māori, Pasifika, Asian, but the European percentage was higher- is quite high in relation to the rest of Auckland. But, you know, when you just walk around, I mean my focus is either on the beach or the yacht club and commuting, um, and most people I see are sort of white people, yeah’

Katie: ‘yeah, and why do you think that is?’

Charles: ‘well I think it’s evident that, um, its- in terms of real estate and values it’s a pretty expensive place to live and the Māori- I guess there’s pockets that you know that they are it- but I guess this, my own little back garden is [sucks in breath], um, when- when I see people walking their dogs they’re invariably sort of European and they’ve sort of got nice little trim dogs’ [wife: laughs].

Charles ability to feel himself reflected in his neighbours, whether through their perceived whiteness, Europeanness, Britishness or apparent prosperity, evidenced through their pets, meant he could ‘blend easily’ into his neighbourhood.

The experience of Serena, who had Bangladeshi heritage, confirms the racialised, and classed, specificity of Charles’ experience. Serena lived in Titirangi, another affluent, coastal suburb which was popular with British migrants in the west of Auckland. However, her reflections on her local neighbourhood contrasted with Charles and Julia,

‘... this is very white middle class round here too and I am not white and we often have these conversations with regards to, you know, perhaps how people view me has an element of, um, um, I don’t know, I don’t know, you know, I relate to particular people, and particular people kind of relate to me, and um, and um, yeah I think there’s a cultural thing there I reckon ... we are kind of very aware because sometimes we question whether we should remain in this area’.

Serena had fond memories of easy sociability where she grew up in a working class neighbourhood in a city in the north of England, and she had considered moving to more
ethnically diverse neighbourhoods in Auckland to try and recreate closer relationships with her neighbours. For those who did not identity as white, although only a small minority of participants, each recalled an experience of being made to feel ‘out of place’ by Pākehā New Zealanders because of their appearance, and thus emphasised the privilege of relative ‘invisibility’ for other participants who were racialised as white. However, they all also commented on the changed landscape of racialised tension, in which Caribbean and South Asian communities were a less prominent national Other because of different histories of migration. In the next section, I address participants’ relations with peoples who appeared to have East Asian heritage, a group who, in contrast, could be considered a prominent Other in this context (Butcher and Spoonley 2011).

7.4 Other Others and national belonging

A tendency to analyse white settler relations with ethnicised and migrant groups and indigenous peoples separately has been widely criticised (Hage 1995; Anderson 2000; Veracini 2012). Following such criticism, I briefly want to address the ordering of this material. I will return to participants’ relations with ethnic and cultural difference more broadly in chapter eight, which focuses, in particular, on participants’ perceptions of biculturalism, indigenous politics and Māori. However, I have addressed participants’ othering of those who appear to have heritage from East Asia in this chapter, rather than in chapter eight, because this organisation allows for a contrast to be drawn between the sense of their own ordinariness addressed earlier in the chapter.

Nations are imagined and contested as a specific ‘space of belonging’ (Ahmed 2000, 97), in which some bodies are marked as more valuable than others, and this value can be exchanged for national belonging (Hage 1998; Skeggs 2004, 19). In a discussion of the figure of the stranger, Ahmed (2007, 162) has argued that,

‘...we recognize some people as strangers, and that “some bodies” more than others are recognisable as strangers, as bodies that are “out of place”’. (emphasis in original)

As argued in chapter two, there is a somatic norm to belonging in Aotearoa New Zealand, which tends to imagine dominant modes of belonging as white, with some space for Pasifika and Māori peoples (Voci and Leckie 2011; Rocha 2012). Many of the initial migrants from countries in Asia came from China, with the first recorded arrival dating back to 1842, and more significant numbers arriving in the 1860s drawn by the gold rush (Ip and Pang 2005).
Despite their lengthy presence, as neither the colonisers nor the colonised, the Chinese, and migrants from Asia more generally, have historically been excluded from national narratives of belonging, and have been actively discriminated against (Ng 2003; Butcher and Spoonley 2011). As I will expand, and partly problematise, in chapter eight, for the most part, participants were supportive of multiculturalism in Auckland and associated cultural and ethnic diversity; which was connected with excitement, sophistication and even maturity as a nation. In the following, however, the focus is upon a minority of participants who were worried about ‘too many’ migrants from Asia, associated imagining of dominant modes of national belonging and the advantages of a narrow idea of Pākehā as the ‘host’ society in terms of the ability of participants to claim to have integrated.

When Veronica, in her late eighties, took me to her window to show me her local area, she starkly illustrated an ironic anxiety about ‘too many’ migrants,

‘...we are being taken over by the way, we are being taken over by the Chinese. As I sit here I could show you about four, five over there that’s all Chinese [pointing out]. All of that’s Chinese [more pointing] They’re taking over, so we’re just going to have to get used to it, but nobody will believe me. In ten years’ time we’ll be visitors here. They’ll have taken over. God, how awful’.

Veronica’s concern was echoed by a member at one of the meetings of the Welsh Society, who said ‘the yellow race is taking over’ to which the predominantly later-life migrants contributed their own stories of the increasing presence of peoples ethnicised as Asian. Although this topic was not brought up often at meetings when I was in attendance, her comment was not received as surprising. The chromatic symbolism, evidenced in this example, reflects European attempts to order difference and claim superiority by casting peoples from East Asia as yellow, not white (Bonnett 2000, 20), and a fear of Asian encroachment which has a long legacy in ‘Western’ culture (Wei Tchen and Yeats 2014). However, these examples mark an extreme opinion across the group, and such sentiment was generally only voiced by older participants.

While such explicit animosity was unusual, a broader sense of anxiety attached to migration from East Asia could be traced among participants. When I asked Daniel, in his fifties, who had migrated twenty years ago, what his impression of New Zealanders attitudes towards non-British migrants was, he replied,

Daniel: ‘There’s a sense of, “mnmh, bloody hell. What’s gonna happen here?” And I don’t know whether it’s my stuff or whether it’s Kiwi impressions. But there’s a sense of I don’t want this country to be owned by Chinese, I feel that myself. But I wonder whether I feel that because it’s part of the Kiwi psyche?’

Katie: ‘Sure’
Daniel: ‘So there’s a sense of, okay, well you can come, and you can be, but don’t take over. It’s scary to think that-- the figures show that in the not too distant future the make-up of the country will be something like, you know, fifty per cent European, whatever it is, and the rest is gonna to be something else, isn’t it? Polynesian being quite high and Chinese rising to something like fifteen, twenty per cent’.

Although Daniel was supportive of a multicultural future in Auckland, in a position I will explore further in chapter eight, and he had step-children who had South Asian heritage, a decline of the predominance of whiteness in Aotearoa New Zealand was commented on as a cause of anxiety.

In Devonport, Ivan and I sat across from one another over a cup of tea and a Guinness in the same British-themed pub that I had met him in a few days before. Ivan was in his late seventies and had come on a family reunification visa to retire near his daughter six years previously, following the death of his wife. When he mentioned that there was a growing Asian population, I asked him for his thoughts on that,

Ivan: ‘I haven’t been really involved, because it’s not until you go across the water, you know, when you get the ferry across to the other side and you walk up Queen Street and you think you’re in a different country, because all you can see is all the Chinese walking by, you know, up and down Queen Street. On this side, you don’t see nearly as much of that. There are the occasional ones. They seem to get into little enclaves and stay to themselves which I think is wrong. It shouldn’t be allowed’

Katie: ‘So it’s a bit separated almost?’

Ivan: ‘If you don’t integrate properly then all you’re doing is creating enclaves which will end up causing trouble in the future as they grow and they want their own rules. It’s like saying, you know, because you’re a Muslim you want to live by Sharia law, even if you’re living in New Zealand. No, Sharia law isn’t part of this country so you live by this country’s rules, and that’s, you know, that’s- when you have these little enclaves, that’s what changes things. They’re bringing their country to ours. It’s the same in the UK and England, ghettos in Birmingham, in Leeds and in Bradford, they’re all Pakistani and Indian, and they’re no go areas for the cops even, you know, because they rule themselves, and it’s all wrong. They should live by the rules of the country they’re living in’ (emphasis added).

Queen Street, the main commercial strip running through the CBD, is a popular site of Asian retailing and restaurants (Friesen 2008, 14), and this concentration drew comment from several participants (for similar findings in research with Pākehā, see: Terruhn 2015, 174). Ivan slides from Asians to Muslims to Sharia law in a metonymic slide which connects a relation of resemblance, where ‘[w]hat makes them “alike” may be their “unlikeness” from “us”’ (Ahmed 2014, 44), and his use of ‘ours’ in the highlighted text is significant. In an extension of the figure of ‘the bad migrant’, outlined in chapter six, Ivan frames his anxiety about ‘the Chinese’ forming enclaves through the argument that migrants should integrate to an imagined host society. His indignation at feeling as if he was ‘in a different country’ reflects an
expectation of what Aotearoa New Zealand ‘ought’ to be like (Hage 1998, 39). However, in his avoidance of going ‘across the water’ from the North Shore to Auckland’s CBD, Ivan reveals his own enclave-like behaviour.

As illustrated earlier through the experience of Charles and Julia, and as broader studies attest, British migrants do tend to be concentrated in certain suburbs in Auckland (Watson et al. 2011; Maré, Pinkerton and Poot 2015, 21). Ivan himself lived in the North Shore Ward, an area with a higher than average number of British migrants, at ten per cent of the area, rather than the average of seven per cent across the city (Statistics New Zealand 2013a). He also regularly drank in a British-themed pub run by Scots, where he had made friends with a large group of regulars. Ivan recalled the first time he visited the pub alone,

‘I just walked in, walked up to the bar and ... I asked for a pint and the bloke at the bar says where abouts are you from? ‘Cos he was a Scotsman [laughs] so we- and he says that one there is and that one there, the next thing you know you’re just in the middle of a big crowd talking to each other and that’s how easy it is, you know’.

In this quote he conveys the potential comfort of being around compatriots. However, Ivan persistently denied that he sought them out. Instead, he said that he visited this pub because it was the most convenient, and that his days in the Merchant Navy meant that he made friends easily. Ivan illustrates the advantages for British migrants of being able to claim to have integrated without having to significantly change one’s habits. The popularity of his local pub and suburb with Pākehā New Zealanders, also, meant that Ivan could cast his behaviour as integrative to the ‘host’ society, which was narrowly imagined as Pākehā. On the other hand, visible signs of a different ‘ethnoscape’ on Queen Street, and the concentration of other racialised and migrant groups in particular suburbs, were seen as signs of their failure to integrate. Importantly, this perspective glosses over the present benefits for British migrants of a history of colonialism which ‘involved making other people play by British rules in their own countries’ (Clarke and Garner 2010, 89, emphasis in original). Moreover, it illustrates the way that integration could be understand as a set of individual choices and failings, such that systemic discrimination or obstacles were not taken into account (ibid.).

Claudia was more understanding about barriers to integration for other ethnicised groups. However, she offers another example of a lack of self-awareness about enclave-like behaviour among British migrants. Claudia lived in Lynfield, an area inhabited predominantly by groups who identified as Asian, with the next largest group being those who identified as European (Statistics New Zealand 2013e), and worked in the CBD. When explaining the
difference between migrants from the UK and other migrants who were perceived as less culturally similar, Claudia said,

‘You’ll notice in the CBD there’s a lot of, I think it’s mostly Koreans ... I guess immigrants will set up little community pockets. Maybe it’s because I am white, I’m from Scotland, and most of the other white people at some point in their history seem to have come from Scotland or the UK [laughs], maybe we don’t have those same pockets. But, yeah, other cultures do ... there’s not the same kind of pockets, there probably was. I guess it’s the new immigrants that form these little pockets of communities and eventually they’ll spread out just like everybody else. But New Zealand’s not hugely different from the UK, its different, it’s different enough, but it’s the same language you drive on the same side of the road, um, culture is really, really similar so it’s not a huge shock. But I think if you come from like Korea maybe that’s a completely different environment so, yeah, you would want to keep your- you would want to keep that community thing going for sure’.

Claudia repeats the sense of cultural familiarity and shared ancestry with Pākehā explored earlier in the chapter, which she links with British migrants’ greater ease of integration. However, her perspective fails to recognise the less marked, but still evident, trend of residential clustering among her compatriots.

However, many participants who lived in predominantly white, affluent suburbs popular with British migrants, as we saw with Charles and Julia, were aware of the demographic of their neighbourhood. In fact, for many participants, their awareness of compatriots was part of their appreciation of the suburb, or at least commented on humorously. It was rarer for participants to frame their own residential concentration with compatriots through ‘the bad migrant’ trope. However, a minority of participants were critically reflective about the concentration of British migrants in particular suburbs, in a trend I will expand upon in chapter eight. For instance, in an extension of her comments in chapter six, Penny said,

‘North Shore’s a funny place. There’s not a lot of brown people over there. No, that’s not true. There are in Beach Haven and- but generally it’s very white. So there’s lots of South Africans, lots of English people, yeah. So over there it just seems like- I mean you buy the lifestyle when you go there. A lot of people come here ‘cos they want the sea view and all of those things and that makes absolute sense to me. But there’s clusters and pockets of people who just- ah- Whangaparoa [a North Shore Bays suburb] is one of them, where they’re just all English and they’re not interested in, not even assimilation, that’s not it, but not even integration. They’re not interested in that, so that’s why I’m not interested in them particularly. Double standard but- because they just want to be here with themselves. It bothers me. It bothers me a lot. I mean I know some people who live on the North Shore and they’re English and they’re OK. But- but there’s great swathes of people who I wouldn’t really want anything to do with because they can be bigoted and racist and not understanding of the country, and they’re not humble about being here and that makes me quite cross. So I avoid them’.
As Penny illustrates, although not a majority position, British migrants who lived in suburbs with a concentrations of compatriots, in the North Shore especially, could be criticised through ‘the bad migrant’ trope.

For a final example, Paul and Dorothy were in their seventies and were open-minded about increasing ethnic diversity in Orewa, their suburb in the northern coastal area of Auckland. When they started to talk about different migrant groups moving to the area, Paul said, ‘it doesn’t bother me’. They told me about their relationship with a local baker from Cambodia and offering him ongoing feedback on his Cornish pasties. However, an anecdote about their citizenship ceremony in Aotearoa New Zealand pointed to the limits of their open-mindedness,

Dorothy: ‘when we went to become citizens we had to swear if you like, if you please in front of a Chinese man [laughs] and that just-

Paul: ‘allegiance to the Crown’

Dorothy: ‘the Crown, yes’

Paul: ‘which I have always swore allegiance to’

Dorothy: ‘we’ve done that’

Paul: ‘in a- in the’

Dorothy: ‘the RAF’

Paul: ‘the RAF, yeah. We thought it was rather funny that there was this-’

Dorothy: ‘a Chinese man’

Paul: ‘a Chinese gentleman’

Dorothy: ‘not even a Māori, or a Kiwi [laughs] it was a Chinese man’.

As Ip (2003, 249) has argued, in Aotearoa New Zealand ‘[t]o many, the Chinese are still (and always will be) “new” and “foreign”’. Among the group of participants outlined above, who ranged from extreme to more representative views, there was often a particular imaginary of what dominant modes of belonging to the nation looked like. In subtle and less subtle ways, that imaginary shaped their encounters with peoples who appeared to have East Asian heritage.

---
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Conclusion

Boris Johnson (2013), while Mayor of London, wrote an article titled ‘The Aussies are just like us, so let’s stop kicking them out’ for The Telegraph, a UK news publication. It centred on the story of Sally Roycroft, an Australian school teacher who had to leave the UK after her visa ran out. In the article, he talked about the UK having ‘betrayed the Commonwealth’ through its relationship with the European Union, and suggested strengthening relationships with countries such as Australia and Aotearoa New Zealand by developing a ‘bilateral free labour mobility zone’. His endeavour to intensify connections between certain ex-British settler societies and the UK seems unlikely to meet with success in the current British political climate of anti-immigrant rhetoric; however, this chapter aimed to explore this sense of commonality – ‘just like us’ - as it was lived by British migrants in Auckland. Following Pearson’s (2000) framing of British migrants as an ‘intimate other’, in his more recent research with contemporary English migrants, he suggested, at least to date, they ‘have neither become a separate ethnic community, nor completely disappeared into a preponderant national population with similar ancestry in the country they have moved to’ (2013, 97). This chapter built on his argument to further unpack some of the nuance for contemporary British migrants of being kin, but not quite in Aotearoa New Zealand.

First, I outlined the significance of travel, intimate ties enabled through high rates of mobility between the countries and imaginings of Aotearoa New Zealand as a familiar ‘exotic’, in prompting participants’ migration. As Barnes (2012, 275) put it, such mobility and intimacy ‘weaves a new set of linkages’ between the UK and Aotearoa New Zealand. In the second section, I examined participants’ awareness of their national antecedents through their reflections on the way in which familiar landscapes could evoke ‘intimations of homeliness’ and their relations with Pākehā. I conceptualised the frequently commented on notion of shared ancestry with Pākehā as evidence, not of a pre-existing ‘essence’, but of their participation in ‘cultures of ancestry’, or essentialising practices. For many participants their accent, though it sparked the ubiquitous question ‘where are you from?’, did not mark them as particularly unusual. Thirdly, I analysed a sense of being ordinary among participants and argued their ability to ‘blend in’ was a benefit linked both to the significant number of British migrants and a racialised dominant mode of national belonging, which valued whiteness, as well as being linked to class, cultural tastes and a whole host of other aspects.

23 My thanks to Jessica Terruhn for this phrase.
In the final section, the chapter shifted focus to participants’ relations with people who appeared to have heritage from East Asia. As will be explored in the next chapter, many participants were positive about cultural and ethnic diversity in Auckland, although, even then, this perspective often belied an assumption that there is ‘that which is not diversity’ (Lentin and Titley 2011, 175). This section explored the worries, of a minority of participants, about ‘too many’ migrants from Asia, which, following Hage (1998), revealed a mode of governmental belonging. Such concerns often drew on a version of ‘the bad migrant’ trope, introduced in chapter five, which criticised other migrant, or just ethnicised, groups for failing to integrate. I argued the ability of many participants to claim to be integrated, without having to particularly adapt their tastes or practices, reflected a specific privilege of British migrants which can be linked to their relative ‘invisibility’ or at least ‘ordinariness’ in Pākehā society. As Veracini (2012) has argued, relations with both exogenous and indigenous Others are central to any exploration of a ‘settler imaginary’, and in the next chapter, I turn to a focus on the latter.
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Chapter eight. Settler Imaginaries: biculturalism, multiculturalism and unsettling relations

Introduction

‘Engaging with Māori does not mean assimilating them. It does not mean being assimilated by them. ... Pākehā and Māori are joined at the historical hip. We will trip and we will dance. We must argue and we must love.

The most difficult thing about majorities is not that they cannot see minorities, but that they cannot see themselves. There is no contrast, no dissonance, everything is white on white...’ (Colquhoun 2004 [2012], 38)

The white solipsism addressed by celebrated Pākehā poet Glenn Colquhoun above is one consequence of the last 175 years of settler colonialism in Aotearoa New Zealand, which has sought to push te ao Māori, the Māori world, to the margins of society (Bell 2015). Despite such efforts, Avril Bell has argued that Pākehā cannot go about their daily lives oblivious to indigenous existence (Bell 2008, 851); although I outline below the ways in which some of my participants may choose to. The influence of indigenous cultures on everyday life within Aotearoa New Zealand is apparent in artefacts, symbols, language and protocol (Bell 2014, 85).

As Smit (2010, 66) outlines,

‘Māori language, symbols and customs play a strikingly prominent role in New Zealand’s national imagery, shaping and illustrating the public face of the nation for both domestic and overseas audiences. ... Indigenous culture and language are more broadly visible across public life in New Zealand than in most other settler societies. Government ministries and departments feature Māori names and symbols; Māori ceremonies are common in public institutions; and some Māori words and phrases have achieved common currency among European or Pākehā New Zealanders’.

This chapter examines participants’ experiences of this social, cultural, political and aesthetic milieu, as a group for whom a national ‘we’ may evoke particular historical significance in this space, a claim I will expand upon later. The position of migrants within the globalising conjuncture of contemporary settler spaces has received growing interdisciplinary attention (Hage 2003; Veracini 2012; Saranillio 2013). However, within geography this has only been limited so far (Kobayashi and de Leeuw 2010). In a general atmosphere characterised as ‘one of Pākehā grumbling and complaining about Māori claims and assertions rather than a solid wall of public ignorance or resistance’ (Huygens 2011, 72), I track participants’ experiences of
bi- and multiculturalism and their relations with Māori, which have so far escaped attention in the contemporary period.

‘Settleness’, as Macoun and Strakosch (2013, 432) put it, writing from Australia, ‘constitutes a pervasive identity that informs all spaces of our society, and manifests powerfully in our collective desires, fantasies and needs’ (p. 432). Smith (2010a) has drawn on queer theory to conceptualise settler colonialism, akin to heteronormativity, as a power relation that conditions all subjects and social life (p. 42-44). In this way, settler colonialism is conceptualised as normative, analogous and intersecting with other norms such as whiteness and patriarchy (Morgensen 2011). Turner (2011) describes the memory work involved in collective forms of place-making, explored in chapter two, through which Aotearoa New Zealand was and is made homely by new arrivals, but which displaces indigenous political difference24, as ‘settler dreaming’. Bell (2014) suggests dreaming of the disappearance of indigenous peoples is at least in retreat, if not entirely past (p. 104). However, it continues, she argues, ‘in individual denials of indigenous difference and presence’ and ‘in the continuing desires for an assimilation that would leave our societies multi-hued populations of Westerners’ (ibid. 211). Veracini (2010) has critically engaged with the settler perspectives and practices which he conceptualises ‘transfer out of existence’ indigenous peoples. In chapter three I introduced Bell’s (2014) notion of a ‘settler imaginary’, which I have already explored in relation to participants’ understandings of dominant modes of national belonging in chapter seven. Next, I want to explore this imaginary through particular attention to participants’ relations with indigenous and ‘exogenous’ Others.

The following analysis is shaped around five key tropes; the inhabitance of which are dynamic and overlap. First, ‘the grievance industry’ addresses the way colonial reparations were cast as unfairly privileging Māori and participants’ desire for a unified national identity. Secondly, I consider contemporary liberal racial imaginaries and the ‘inclusive erasure’ of indigeneity through multiculturalism. Thirdly, I address the temporal and spatial aspects of participants’ discomfort with, and undermining of, the Treaty of Waitangi and indigenous political difference. Fourthly, I explore some of the various ways in which participants would express support for biculturalism, and its relations with modes of national belonging. Finally, I

---

24 Strakosch and Macoun (2012, 45) identify indigenous political difference as an aspect of indigenous existence regularly targeted for elimination:

‘Indigenous political difference that cannot be contained or expressed within the confines of the settler state cannot be tolerated by the settler-colonial project, even if this project can absorb some elements of Indigenous society, culture and even land ownership’.

They argue that it is indigenous sovereignty within a sovereign settler state that is most unsettling.
explore examples of everyday, continuous efforts to unsettle settler-indigenous relations in two participants’ lives.

8.1 The grievance industry and dreams of ‘one people’

In a speech made in 2004 by Don Brash, the then leader of the opposition National party, he warned against ‘the dangerous drift towards racial separatism in New Zealand and the development of the now entrenched Treaty grievance industry’. Instead, he stressed the need for ‘one law for all’ and called for the abandonment of ‘race-based privileges’ which he located in targeted social policies seeking to address Māori disadvantage. The speech galvanised the white electorate and increased his party’s support by seventeen per cent in subsequent opinion polls (Bell 2014, 50). In Aotearoa New Zealand, the common understanding that Māori are privileged is deeply entrenched (Nairn and McCleanor 1991; Wetherell and Potter 1992; Borell et al. 2009). Around half the participants in this study were against biculturalism due to variations on the theme that it unfairly privileged Māori. In particular, many participants were against the redistributive aspect of Treaty reparations. Douglas described the Treaty as ‘a gravy train’, slang for getting money for nothing. Ivan told me, ‘they should have ripped that Treaty up ten years ago … it’s all take, take, take’, and Paul said of biculturalism, ‘I don’t care so much as long as [Māori] are not sitting around holding their hands out. In other words, they’re willing to work. New Zealand doesn’t need parasites’. In this way, colonial reparations were depoliticised, as Brown (2006, 16) put it, ‘a political phenomenon’ was removed ‘from comprehension of its historical emergence and from a recognition of the powers that produce and contour it’ (emphasis in original). Colonial reparations became conflated with welfare benefits premised on indigenous dysfunction and settler generosity, rather than sovereign entitlement (Veracini 2010, 45).

A desire for a single national identity, criticised by Turner (2011, 16) as the dream ‘of one people and one country’, shaped a minority of mostly older participants’ sense of biculturalism as unfairly privileging Māori. From this perspective, to claim a Māori identity ‘when one should simply “pass” as Pākehā’ was seen as an intentionally divisive act (Poata-Smith 2013, 42). For instance, Paul and Dorothy told me,

Paul: ‘I find it strange that a person can be a Māori with a name like-

There were also a minority of those who disliked biculturalism because it did not go far enough, merely paying ‘lip-service’ to Indigenous concerns, as Serena put it.
Dorothy: ‘Atkinson or something strange like that’

Paul: ‘you think well there’s no such thing as a ‘full-blooded’ Māori with an English name, why did they deny the English bit? I mean they can only be half and half at best, somewhere along the line, so they say they’re Māori instead of saying they’re English, and they consider themselves Māori, there must be an advantage to being Māori’

Dorothy: ‘they keep having all these ‘settlements’ [pronounces dismissively] and look there’s one tribe at the moment who’ve had five final and complete settlements for all the wrongs and now they’re on again with another one. It’s just a money making carry on...’

Paul: ‘they should be New Zealanders and that’s it’.

The questioning of indigenous authenticity is a central strategy to undermine ‘special’ indigenous rights (Bell 2014, 50). Later, I will examine how participants might challenge ‘genetic’ or ‘racial’ indigenous authenticity, at the same time as expressing enthusiasm for Māori culture. However, during the interview, Dorothy made the disclaimer ‘there’s some good Māori’ and next I want to explore further how this division was drawn on by participants in order to expand on the ideal of reconciliation and a singular national identity.

For those who were critical of Treaty processes, discussed in chapter two, and Māori political activism, many would separate Māori ‘troublemakers’, who were considered a minority who sought to arouse discontent to further their own political end, from people they met in their everyday life (Nairn and McCleanor 1991, 248). For instance, Ivan said,

‘I mean a couple of Māoris (sic) are members of the bowling club, members of other bowling clubs that I go to. I find them alright. Don’t get me wrong, individually they’re alright. It’s the people who- it’s like, the people in charge - the tribal chieftains - they’re the ones that- “you owe us a living”, you know, and half of it is a load of codswallop to begin with ... it’s not the individual people. I mean, the people are fine. It’s the actual political people - tribal chiefs or whatever you call them - that makes life a misery for everybody else, or makes life difficult for everybody else. ‘Cos, you know, we’re trying to be progressive and get ahead and they want to hold you back, unless you pay them enough money’.

Ivan illustrates a broader pattern, documented in various ways throughout this chapter, in which Māori are acceptable as long as they assimilate, or, as I will argue in section three of this chapter, as long as their difference is contained to de-politicised cultural expression. The temporal imaginary he draws on which constructs a split between a forward-looking nation and the regressive nature of negotiating colonial reparations is also further addressed in section three. Next I will explore the way in which many participants’ based their criticism of biculturalism on the idea that multiculturalism was fairer and more inclusive.
8.2 The inclusive erasure of multiculturalism

Auckland is the gateway city of Aotearoa New Zealand, the largest Polynesian city in the world and the fourth most ethnically diverse city in the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (International Organisation for Migration 2015, 39). There have been several broad studies which have tracked a positive reception to multiculturalism in Aotearoa New Zealand. Ward and Masgoret (2008) found that eighty-nine per cent of New Zealanders endorse multiculturalism, and Gendall, Spoonley and Trlin (2007, 18) found that more than half of all New Zealanders agreed that ‘the “white majority” in New Zealand needs to get used to a more multicultural society’. In Auckland, the Quality of Life Survey (Nielsen 2009, 139; 2010, 159; 2014, 139) has consistently found that the majority of Aucklanders think that ethnic diversity makes their local area a ‘better’ or ‘much better’ place to live, although the percentage is gradually declining. The discourse of multiculturalism has a specific history and significance in Aotearoa New Zealand. It has been associated with radical social movements in the 1970s, reactionary voices speaking out against decolonial activism and, especially in Auckland, more recently as a de facto description of increasing cultural and ethnic diversity (Hill 2010). I want to explore the way in which many participants who were opposed to biculturalism would draw on the idea of multiculturalism as preferable, but first I will situate this preference within a post-racial discourse.

Sandra had come into contact with bicultural processes through her work with local government and was partly critical of aspects of state engagement with Māori culture because she saw them as exploitative. However, Sandra and her partner Tom’s main criticism of biculturalism drew on a post-racial discourse.

Sandra: ‘there is this recognition of treating one “race”, or giving them a level of preference over other ethnicities, and for me personally, culturally I don’t agree with it. I absolutely oppose it’

Tom: ‘it’s racist isn’t it? To be quite honest with you’

Sandra: ‘... we in Europe have been brought up to let bygones be bygones with the wars that we had, we’ve matured, we accept people from Germany and the other nations that our forefathers have fought against. We treat each other with respect and we deal with people in the here and now’.

Goldberg (2009, 10) has differentiated between anti-racism and anti-racialism, in which the latter involves ‘a stand ... against a concept, a name, a category, categorising’ but ‘does not itself involve standing (up) against (a set of) conditions of being or living’ (cited by Lentin and Tittley 2011, 70). As well as a post-racial discourse, as explored in chapter five, a notion of
maturity was attached to the UK, which, in this extract, is associated not only with having ‘more’ history but also with the ability to ‘forget’ (specific aspects of) the past.

A ‘shifting spectrum of old and new targets of racial stigmatisation’ has been tracked by Lentin and Titley (2011, 178) in their commentary on contemporary ‘post-racial’ imaginaries, which mobilise ‘not just conventional national insider/outsider distinctions’, but, in contrast to the idealised ‘rational, self-managing citizen-subject’, an aversion to ‘dependent, resource-heavy subjects’. This form of racialised stigmatisation can be delineated when Tom said,

‘I probably hold the same view as most European New Zealanders do in that the Māori realistically, in this day and age, they don’t really add a lot of value to the country any more. You’ve only got to look at certain statistics whether it be crime or, you know, negative statistics on certain aspects of society tend to be overly subscribed by certain groups of people’.

‘Negative statistics’, such as the unequal distribution of criminalisation, are reified and cut off, for instance, from a prejudicial justice system (Department of Corrections 2007). Instead, criminality is located within individuals and groups, without reference to colonial histories or ongoing systemic racism. As Brown (2006, 15) has argued, when a phenomenon is depoliticised, and abstracted from power and history, ‘an ontological naturalness or essentialism almost inevitably takes up residence in our understandings and explanations’.

Finally, Tom indicates how the adoption of a post-racial approach could be linked with a favouring of multiculturalism, over biculturalism,

‘I think we’re entering- we’re entering into a period globally where every country’s heavily multicultural and is it- is it fair for you to- for me as an English person in New Zealand to get preference over somebody else just based on my ethnicity? It’s nothing to do with merit or qualifications or anything like that - just because I’m English. I don’t think that’s fair. I don’t think it should be- I wouldn’t want it in England, if I lived in England and I was given preference over a Polish person who had made more effort than me to get qualified at a particular vocation’.

Veracini (2010, 48) includes ‘transfer’ by racialisation in his criticism of the denial of indigenous difference, in which indigeneity is framed as racial difference and its specificity flattened (p. 48). However, Tom and Sandra illustrate the way in which the ‘transfer’ of indigeneity to ethnicised or racialised difference could work in tandem with the adoption of a post-race perspective, such that biculturalism and its associated social policy aimed specifically at Māori peoples were viewed as not only unfairly privileging this group, but as discriminatory in acknowledging difference at all.
When I asked Douglas about his experience of biculturalism he retorted, ‘New Zealand is multicultural ... and I think it’s good for it. I like it like that I do’ in a response which held a definition of bi- and multiculturalism based on visible, lived experiences of ethnic diversity (Terruhn 2014, 59). He went on to list the range of restaurants nearby, ‘I can go to a Thai restaurant, south African restaurant, Indian restaurant, French restaurant, Japanese restaurant, uh, different Japanese, different Thai, all in Brown’s Bay. There are so many - I just can’t afford to do it all!’ Multiculturalism was often framed by those who preferred it to biculturalism as a fairer, more inclusive alternative. For instance, Charles told me,

‘I prefer multiculturalism. I haven’t taken to a bicultural New Zealand. When you think of the- in the big picture, you know, New Zealand was colonised by Polynesians probably only a thousand years ago, and where we came from it was colonised by humans maybe eight or ten thousand years ago ... it doesn’t resonate in my mind as- as, um, something that is that significant ... we all make a society, uh, and I- uhh, I guess I would be more for a- rather than a social engineering, sort of, provide an opportunity for everybody on equal footing. Not too keen on affirmative action’.

Charles draws on a sweeping historical scale and a questionable use of colonisation in order to flatten differences between Indigenous peoples and more recent arrivals, and in doing so established a moral equivalence between indigenous and settler arrivals, where both are viewed as now successfully indigenised (Veracini 2010, 43).

However, as already illustrated with Douglas, participants’ enthusiasm for multiculturalism, instead of biculturalism, as well as being couched in a language of greater inclusivity, was often expressed in relation to cultural (or culinary) associations with ethnic diversity. As Julia, Charles’ wife, said,

‘... the multicultural thing’s probably more apparent now than it was when we first arrived but I suppose we’ve grown to accept it like most New Zealanders have, because it’s a lot more- you’re more aware of the fact that there are many, many cultures here, yeah which- I mean there’s a lot of good things about that. There’s a lot more variety that’s been available. I mean let’s face it when we first arrived there wasn’t much choice to go to restaurants in the evening, and now you can just pick your culture and decide to find a restaurant that suits it’.

In these extracts, cultural diversity appears as a colourful backdrop against which to play out an ‘urban lifestyle’ (May 1996, 197). Charles, extending her point, further exemplified this perspective, when he said,

‘I mean when we first came to Auckland in 1980 it was a lot smaller, very much quieter, and not nearly as diverse. As Julia was saying, every year Auckland’s become a much more vibrant colourful, interesting, diverse place’
It is interesting to note that, in spite of their migrancy, their appreciation conveys a dynamic, described by Hage (1998, 139-40), of *having* rather than *being* diversity.

Kobayashi and de Leeuw (2010), in a commentary on ‘Eurocolonial settler’ discourses of multiculturalism, have noted these generally focus on the performativity of cultural traits, for instance, food, dances and artistic expressions, deemed authentic yet acceptable, and that multiculturalism can thus provide a framework where difference is recognised, but in non-threatening ways. In Aotearoa New Zealand specifically, Terruhn (2014, 68) has outlined how Pākehā perceptions of biculturalism as discordant and exclusive, and their investment in multiculturalism, which is alternately viewed as more inclusive and harmonious, could work as a future-oriented shedding of a troublesome colonial past. Following her argument, the aspiration among many participants for a time when indigenous difference was given less significance points to the need to consider future aspirations, as well as the influence of the past, when considering the ways in which whiteness recreates itself (Baldwin 2012). Discourses of multiculturalism, if they fail to engage with the *different* difference of indigeneity, have been criticised as an inclusive form of exclusion (Smith 2007, 73; Turner 2007). In this way, both aspirations for ‘one nation, one people’ and for multiculturalism were posited as universally inclusive, but both excluded indigenous political difference. Next, I examine the spatial and temporal patterning which emerged in participants’ understandings of settler colonialism as now over, and indigenous difference as only appropriate in specific spaces and forms of expression.

8.3 A historical break and the spacing of un/desirability

In settler colonial societies, Strakosch and Macoun (2012, 47) have argued that ‘[u]nssettling dominant understandings of time is as important as space’. As Morgensen (2011, 24) has noted, the centrality of processes of elimination and replacement, and teleologies of ‘modernity’ and ‘civilisation’, invite attention to notions of temporality in such contexts. As we saw in chapter five, temporal imaginaries of Aotearoa New Zealand as ‘young’ could erase longer Māori histories. I next examine a popular sense that settler colonisation was ‘over’ and that it was ‘time to move on’ among participants, which illustrated a historical chronology of linear progress and a definitive break from an awkward colonial past. Amy illustrated this understanding, as well as an attendant sense of exasperation at people who will not ‘get over’
colonialism, when she told me about a debate she had with her Pākehā partner in which she asked, ‘how long are the white population gonna continue to apologise?’ She explained,

’... being English sometimes you feel you have to apologise for everything that your forebears ever did anywhere in the world [laughs] having invaded all sorts of countries and taken their natural resources. Yeah, so it’s nice that they’re actually redressing it here. That fact that they’re actually going through that process, but, yeah, it’s like when’s enough, enough? And he, sort of, doesn’t get it, as to why I am actually quite passionate about that, but it comes from a long history of the English having to apologise for whatever they did back in Queen Elizabeth’s time, for goodness sake [laughs].’

Amy illustrates the way in which criticisms of British colonialism in Aotearoa New Zealand could be taken personally by participants. Ahmed (2010, 132) has suggested, ‘...the British nation has been rather good as defending itself against shame. It does so in part by the retrospective fantasy that such shame has become compulsory such that national happiness and pride are expressed as if they are minoritised feelings’ (see, for example: Brogan 2005). Ahmed (2010, 217) challenges the notion that those who will not ‘get over’ colonialism are melancholic, ‘as if they hold onto something that is already gone’. Instead, she argues that they are responding to ‘histories that are not finished’, and, what is more, their [u]nhappiness might offer a pedagogic lesson on the limits of the promise of happiness (ibid.). In chapter nine, I further examine the limits of dominant notions of ‘the good life’ in settler societies.

Although not all responses were so pointedly premised on being English, or alternately British, the crux for many participants appeared to be the idea that the past is now over and for the need to move on. A sense of frustration at continued claims by indigenous peoples who will not ‘get over it’, tracked among many participants who were opposed to colonial reparations, can be situated as part of broader circulations of sentiment in settler societies (Macoun and Strakosch 2013, 434). In Aotearoa New Zealand, Bell (2014, 171) has criticised this desire for finality in reparations as ‘the failure to grasp the reality that the entanglement of settler and indigenous lives means that a final settlement can never come’. Moreover, Abel and Mutu (2011) have noted this position reflects a monocultural discourse, which takes no account of the important role that history and the past plays in te ao Māori, the Māori world (p. 12). I have examined a common linear understanding of time among participants which saw colonialism as now over, and as a consequence colonial reparations as regressive. Next, I will address the centrality of space when considering the exclusion of Māori in settler societies.

The undesirability of an Other is not considered in the abstract but rather relates to a particular place (Cresswell 1996; Hage 1998). In their research with British migrants in South Australia, Schech and Haggis (2004, 185) tracked a typology which placed ‘authentic
Aboriginals’ in the Northern Territory and the Outback, while ‘inauthentic Aboriginals’ inhabit what are considered to be the incompatible spaces of small towns and cities (p. 187). Schech and Haggis relate this pattern to a broader trope separating modernity and indigeneity (see also: Bell 2014). I expand on their findings in the context of Auckland, through attention to the subtle ways in which notions of indigenous in/authenticity were spatialised.

Charles, along with several other participants, worked teaching international students. Charles was careful to stress his great respect for Māori telling me how much he enjoyed visiting marae, a ceremonial meeting house. However, during his time as a teacher in state schools he was uncomfortable about the bicultural ethos which shaped the school curriculum describing it as ‘social engineering’ and ‘missionary work’. He eventually moved to a private, international school where he felt,

‘...it enabled the teaching and learning to be much more focused. I've been involved now in international education where the Māori culture has quite a low status. We don’t really- we teach our international kids about the New Zealand culture and the importance of Māori culture but it’s- not to- .... we don’t spend too much time on it, so I’m out of the, uh, education as an instrument of cultural change, cultural engineering’.

For Charles, indigeneity is marked as particular, as opposed to the ‘universal values’ implied by what he later called ‘the pure joy of teaching and learning’ in a course on economics. In this way, Charles maintains ‘the stubborn myth that education can be fully objective, neutral, [and] apolitical’ (Boler and Zembylas 2003, 110), and denies the majority culture’s particularism. Charles preferred to stay out of what he called, ‘vociferous patches of biculturalism’. He now had a job which ‘left all the sort of cultural engineering out of it’ and described his suburb as ‘away from all that ... it’s not really part of our lives’. Charles ending our discussion of biculturalism by saying,

‘I know what I’m comfortable with and it’s not biculturalism, quite frankly, I just draw a line. I just don’t like it’.

Through his career and residential choices, Charles evidences a broader trend among participants, their frequent ability to choose whether to engage with biculturalism or te ao Māori, or not. A choice between culture worlds which has been framed as more unavoidable for many Māori (see, for example: MacLean 1996, 108, 109; Gagne 2013).

Martin was friends with some Māori and Pasifika colleagues at work, was keen to visit a marae explaining, ‘you can go to touristy ones ... but I don’t want to go to a, like, a set up one’, and had plans for an interlacing tattoo with a Māori-inspired design over his heart to symbolise his family. Despite his interest in aspects of indigenous cultural expression, when
the conversation shifted to language training in te reo and a prominent Māori politician he told me,

‘... any Māori that comes up to you and says he’s a Māori crock of shit basically. They’ll have Islander they’ll pretty much have anything in ‘em but not true blood Māori ... there is no genuine Māori. The last full blood Māori died in the seventies’.

Bell (2014, 48) has highlighted a tendency in settler societies to assert indigenous inauthenticity, at the same time as appropriating a disembodied indigenous cultural authenticity. As with Paul earlier, Martin adopts a colonial, ‘blood-quantum’ notion of indigenous in/authenticity (Poata-Smith 2013). The notion that the ‘racial essence’ of Māori has been increasingly eroded after two centuries of contact, and that there are now no ‘real’, as in ‘racially pure’, Māori left has been documented broadly in the public consciousness (Poata-Smith 2013, 41). As Poata-Smith (2013, 42) has pointed out, this perspective is a very convenient justification for ignoring indigenous grievances as ‘[i]f there are no “real Māori” then there is no need to confront the colonial atrocities of the past and the continued marginalisation of indigenous communities in the present’.

To return to the separation between cultural and political expressions of indigeneity David, finally, illustrates this sentiment succinctly. He told me, ‘I really enjoy watching their pōwhiri26 and their dancing on stage’, but when I asked about Treaty training at his work, which as mentioned in chapter six made him uncomfortable, he said, ‘I think it’s overdone that kind of stuff’. The undesirability of indigenous difference is spatially specific. It is uncomfortable in particular spaces, such as work or politics, and when ‘modernity’ is put to the service of indigenous, collective, communal interests (Bell 2014, 160). However, indigenous difference is desirable as part of aestheticised cultural expression. hooks has offered a powerful critique of the celebration, yet simultaneous containing, of difference in her chapter ‘Eating the Other’. She criticises the way in which ‘[w]ithin commodity culture, ethnicity becomes spice, seasoning that can liven up the dull dish that is mainstream white culture’ (1992, 21). While some difference was acceptable, such as indigenous design in a tattoo, this difference livens up the ordinary, rather than fundamentally challenging it (Ahmed 2000, 117).

Next, I consider the significant number of participants who were supportive of biculturalism.

26 Welcome ceremony
8.4 Bicultural modes of belonging

In a recent large survey, fifty-five per cent of New Zealanders saw the Treaty as ‘New Zealand’s founding document’ (UMR 2011). Some have argued that, despite the overall dominance of a white majority, this aspect of the national imaginary enables a broader repertoire of discursive resources in countering prejudice against indigenous peoples (Tuffin et al. 2004; Liu 2005; Kirkwood, Liu and Wetherall 2005). However, Kirkwood et al. (2005, 495) complicate this suggestion when they noted that,

‘it is relatively easy to talk about subject positions envisioning a partnership between Māori and Pākehā as part of the national identity, provided this does not involve categorical privileges to the minority in terms of resource allocation’ (emphasis in original).

Moreover, Veracini (2001, 213) has warned the Treaty can equally be drawn on as a ‘retrospective utopia’ which elides colonial violence (referencing Oliver 2001, see also: Bell 2006, 156-8). Around half of participants responded positively when I asked them about their experiences of biculturalism, and in the following section I want to explore some of the different expressions of their support.

A few participants could be described as supportive of what Fleras and Spoonley (1999) have called a ‘soft’ form of biculturalism, which considered indigeneity as another cultural variant in a benign mosaic of difference. For instance, learning about Māori culture and history was included as part of Lucy’s job as a primary school teacher. When I asked her about her experience of biculturalism, she told me,

‘I’ve really, really enjoyed that, learning about those different cultures, but for me to have been in the teaching environment it wasn’t really too different to take on those- that idea, because teaching in very multicultural schools in London you, sort of, have to, um, but it was just learning different culture- just another- a new one again’.

Lucy illustrates the way in which the inclusion of the Treaty and biculturalism in a participants’ discursive repertoire, although indicating support for the greater inclusion of Māori culture, might not extend to engagement with other, political aims of biculturalism nor with less celebratory aspects of Aotearoa New Zealand’s history of settler colonialism. As Lucy told me, ‘the, sort of, pioneers coming over to colonise New Zealand, in a way, [I] actually felt quite proud of the British for coming here and actually doing good’.

If you stay straight long enough on Scenic Drive heading west you will eventually reach the Tasman Sea and beaches of charcoal, bronze and copper sand which burn hot in the mid-
day sun. I get off the bus before that on the high street of Titirangi, a small village which marks the western end of Auckland’s suburban sprawl to meet Lorna. After an embarrassing experience on stage at an award ceremony where she struggled to read the national anthem in te reo, Lorna sought out a training day with work to learn about Māori tikanga, customs, and had taken a te reo course so that, as she put it, ‘at least I’m conscious of my incompetence now’. In another instance of ‘the bad migrant’ trope explored in chapter six, Lorna differentiated herself from compatriots who recreated their life in the UK,

‘... when I first moved I remember saying to people do you know I could just be in another village down the road, it’s no different, culturally there’s very little difference ... I suppose the more time I’m here too, and the more time I’m becoming aware of the bicultural issues there are obviously differences, but you could quite happily live a white, middle class existence here and ignore that. It’s only because I make the effort to try to understand the Māori context that I’m aware’.

As with Penny in chapter six, distance is drawn from ‘the bad migrant’ who is narrow-minded, but from this perspective integration is oriented towards a more expansive ‘host’ than Pākehā society. In this way, as well as a respectful engagement with another culture, the acquisition of bicultural know-how could be a way of accruing cultural capital in particular social circles.

The ability to pronounce and understand commonly used words of te reo marked people out as distinct from a newly arrived migrant struggling to orientate themselves or, alternately, from reactionary Pākehā who might purposefully anglicise pronunciation. Around half of those who were positively inclined towards biculturalism had taken te reo classes, which are accessible for free for permanent residents and citizens. They would often mention their desire to understand aspects of Māori culture they had come across at work, or language encountered in everyday life, such as the pronunciation of place names, as well as a sense of duty or curiosity as a ‘guest’ in the nation, in a different imaginary of their ‘host’ society from that explored in earlier chapters. In relation to the former, and reflecting a common experience, Grace told me,

‘... when I first came to New Zealand I found the place names really hard, now they just trip off the tongue, you know, ‘cos you have a sort of latent passive familiarity with the language even though you don’t have a fluency in it’.

Henry pointed to the distinction people would draw between themselves and anglicised pronunciation by some Pākehā.

‘I mean my parents-in-law and the people they know they deliberately mispronounce Māori names ... I find it very upsetting and offensive’.
Cassie was in her thirties and had arrived three years previously to Auckland from a small town in North Yorkshire, England with her English husband. In another example of participants differentiating themselves from anglicised pronunciation by Pākehā New Zealanders, she told me of an understated argument she had with a client at work about how to say Whangaparoa. They each pointedly emphasised their pronunciation as they talked about the suburb, hers the Māori pronunciation of ‘wh’ as ‘f’ and the client’s with a ‘w’, without mentioning it explicitly. In this way, greater knowledge of Māori culture differentiated participants not only from their compatriots who did not integrate, but also from Pākehā who were seen as narrow-minded because of their political conservatism.

Interestingly, despite her having migrated three years previously, Cassie was the only person I spoke to reticent to give an opinion on biculturalism because of her migrancy, telling me ‘I don’t feel like I can have an opinion on that ... I feel like I don’t really have a voice yet here, like, I don’t have a place. I don’t have a right yet’. Few other participants felt they were unable to comment on biculturalism because of their status as migrants. However, this trend has been documented among other migrant and/or ethnicised groups. For instance, Ip (2005, 2) spoke of a sense of ‘unease and timidity if an Asian person starts to join in a discussion about the Treaty’ where they might receive ‘strange glances, telling them that they were speaking out of order, as if there is no place for them to speak on the topic’. In another example, Dürr (2011, 512), drawing from her research with ‘Latin American migrants’ in Auckland, outlined one participant’s sense of unsettlement and exclusion in response to bicultural claims which they saw as only relating to Māori and the descendants of settlers. In chapter three, I engaged with some of the complexity of ethnic dynamics in settler societies, where all non-indigenous arrivals are complicit, but, as Snelgrove (in Snelgrove et al. 2014, 6) put it, ‘not all settlers are created equal’. For the most part, as explored in chapter seven, few participants felt excluded from dominant modes of national belonging, and, consequently, bicultural discourses.

Grace was enthusiastic about Auckland and what she perceived as an openness to difference, which she contrasted with the small towns where she had grown up in Northern Ireland. With regards to her experience of biculturalism, Grace described herself now as, ‘aware, appreciative but not terribly engaged’. When she first arrived, she had taken classes for a year in te reo and her previous work at a local publishing house had brought her into contact with numerous Māori scholars and contemporary discourses about indigenous political activism, but as her job and her relationships changed, biculturalism became less part of her everyday life. When Grace reflected on her previous experiences, she illustrated
some of the common sense of anxiety that participants expressed around taking part in Māori protocol, ‘I always felt a little bit nervous around that. I was always anxious not to put a foot wrong or do the wrong thing’. Rath’s (2009) narrative reflection of being an English and Welsh descent migrant in Aotearoa New Zealand illustrates this sense of unease at getting it wrong,

‘Sometimes Māoridom is present in ways that I did not expect before I came to Aotearoa New Zealand. I often feel uncomfortable. At pōwhiri (Māori welcoming ceremony) at the start of academic conferences I do not understand the mihi (speeches) I do not know the waiata (songs). I have to not quite mime, I murmur along; I walk in shuffling steps behind people who possess more knowledge’. (p. 156)

However, Grace also illustrated the ability to feel more comfortable over time, saying ‘if I am in a formal situation I know how to behave and I’m certainly more confident about that than I would have been in the eighties and nineties’; as well as the potential for deep emotional attachment, ‘I do, I really love it too ... when I hear or watch the haka27, it is spine chilling for me, it really touches me in an emotional way that I find very hard to describe’.

For Maggie, spending several years in areas which were predominantly Māori, her previous professional experience and a significant relationship, meant she felt more comfortable describing herself as Pākehā, rather than English. She told me,

‘I don’t see myself as a regular Pom ... I do feel Pākehā. It feels more comfortable to me because English is in England, but here we’re in a country that was Māori, that’s Māoridom, so it seems a bit odd to say if I feel part of here- which I do ‘cos it’s my home, then calling yourself English sounds odd doesn’t it? ... I think if I was a Pom who lived here and hadn’t really had much to do with Māori and stuff, just I’m English and I’ve emigrated to New Zealand, maybe it wouldn’t suit’. The ethnicised term ‘Pākehā’ for settler descendants, although widely adopted by academics and activists, can be contentious in everyday use. Indeed, Openshaw and Rata (2007, 409) have claimed its use was one of the most frequent reasons for complaints to the New Zealand Race Relations Office. Maggie’s identification as Pākehā, and she was one of only a minority who claimed this identity, marked her distancing herself from being English, as well as from a less integrated ‘Pom’. Maggie, as with several others, was critically reflective about her suburb, which she described as, ‘... probably the most Pākehā part of New Zealand, or Pākehā part of Auckland, definitely’. From having, ‘...lived in quite a bicultural world most of my time in New Zealand’, her new suburb, social circle and work, meant that aspect of her life now took on less centrality. Engagement with te ao Māori, the Māori world, and biculturalism was dynamic for participants, shifting over time. In the next

27 A type of dance
section, I want to explore two participants for whom engagement with te ao Māori were a consistent part of their everyday lives.

8.5 Unsettling relations?: alternative settler identities

‘Decolonisation is a ‘long-term process involving the bureaucratic, cultural, linguistic and psychological divesting of colonial power’ (Smith 1999, 98). In Bell’s (2014) book, ‘Relating indigenous and settler identities: beyond domination’, she calls for new settler subject positions and identities which allow for ‘unlearning’, surprise, and uncertainty, in cross-cultural encounter (p. 176). Following Leonard’s (2012, 73) suggestion, in her research with British migrants, that at the local level change can come from the practices of individuals who are trying to do things differently, in this final section, I focus on the stories of two participants for whom engagement with Māori was a part of their everyday lives.

I took a cycle route alongside the motorway from Point Chevalier to Te Atatu, across some of the inner harbour’s shallow tidal ways, to reach Merrick’s house. The land is very flat and low-lying with horizontal striations of colour – olive-green mangroves, gloopy mud and blue water. I found Merrick with his nephew, who identified as Māori, and his friend, from Northern Ireland. Merrick drew on a specific Welsh national identity and his socialist and sometimes somewhat anarchic politics to fuel his animosity to what he termed the, ‘English imperial superiority complex’. His politics translated into regular activism. For instance, Merrick was part of a highly successful group protesting the privatisation of water in Auckland which formed connections with the Cochabamba campaign and doused a Colombian dignitary’s house with red liquid in solidarity. His politics were also part of his parenting. One evening as we drove home through Auckland’s twisting highways he and his young daughter sang Welsh and te reo songs from heart in the backseat of the car. He sent his daughter, whose mother was Māori, to a te Kōhanga Reo, a Māori language immersion school,

‘... she is going to learn to speak fluent Māori and I think that is hugely important given my identity and the strong connection I have with that experience. It’s so important for me as a father to make sure that she is speaking her native language fluently, and hopefully she’ll speak a bit of Welsh as well [laughs]’.

The importance of his daughter speaking te reo was linked to Merrick’s nationality, and more specifically to his grandparent’s experience of being beaten when they spoke Welsh at school.
‘… one of my earliest experiences in New Zealand was speaking to a Māori woman who explained to me that she was beaten at school for speaking Māori, and it’s the same story as my grandparents who were also beaten for speaking Welsh’.

This particular story became a refrain in our encounters and illustrates the way Merrick positioned himself as Welsh not British, and as part of a national culture which was oppressed by the English.

Merrick strongly disassociated from Britain which, for him, mainly equated with the south-east of England, as well as from Pākehā New Zealanders and classed aspirations ‘for a house on the hill’ as he put it. Conversely, he told me,

‘… well immediately you talk to Māori there’s an unsaid thing; you know where they’re coming from, they know where you’re coming from’.

Although Māori have heterogeneous identifications, Merrick claimed such commonality through broader experiences of poverty, but more specifically because of the suppression of the Welsh language and ‘the sense of being disenfranchised, belittled, humiliated culturally by successive governments tracing back centuries’. In this way, Merrick did not inhabit the expected position of belonging generated by bicultural and multicultural discourses for a British migrant, outlined by Smith (2007, 69),

‘… as dependent upon a state of injury (where Māori are the victims of historical violence); as derived from a wilful forgetting of the past or as an economy of guilt and debt (the heirs of colonial settlement, Pākehā); or as a condition premised on the benevolence of the state (migrant subjects)’.

Rather than settler guilt, or wilful forgetting, examined earlier in the chapter, or the gratitude of a migrant subject, Merrick emphasised a sense of empathy with Māori because of a shared experience of oppression, by the English. In doing so, Merrick points to the way in which the ‘messy reality of relationality’ (Bell 2014, 200) complicates triangular models of ethnic difference introduced in chapter three (see, for example: Hage 1995; Veracini 2012).

Merrick drew on Welsh patriotism connected with ‘old left’ movements, language preservation, and a history of oppression by the English (Jones 1992, 334-5; Williams 1995; Williams 2005). In fact, when we first met, Merrick had told me, ‘the Welsh are the blacks of Britain!’ In a commentary on ‘race’ and racism in Wales, Williams (1995, 114) has noted that,

‘It is not uncommon to hear the expression “I’m not white, I’m Welsh”, which reflects a distancing from English imperialism and conveys a sense of alignment with other oppressed peoples ... [in] a kind of “common enemy theory”’.
Williams (1995) has usefully explored some of the affinities, but also the crucial divergences between the experiences of white and black and minority ethnic Welsh nationals. While Merrick’s national identity could be drawn on to resist settler imaginaries, it is also important to consider the value of claiming a position of victimhood in order to claim a place to speak from. As already discussed in chapter six, this position might distance the speaker from acknowledgement of the complexity of oppression and privilege. For instance, while racial identities are intersected by other axes of difference, Merrick is identifiable as white and, as Mills (1997, 6) put it, although not all white people are signatories to the ‘racial contract’ all benefit from it.

I turn, finally, to Penny who engaged with Māori culture through postgraduate study and then through her job in social work. She described her course as ‘life changing’. The concepts she was introduced to enabled her to re-frame her adoption which had meant, ‘I’d always felt disconnected to my lineage because that was kind of severed’ having grown up with little knowledge of her biological parents other than a Jamaican connection. The course also radically disrupted the understanding of history she had learned in school, which was one of Britain as triumphant and ‘going out and doing good work for the betterment of the people’. As with Amy earlier, her Britishness meant Penny felt a specific connection with Aotearoa New Zealand’s history. However, rather than frustration, Penny said learning about the consequences of colonialism had left her with a more critical perspective. Penny was acutely aware of her English accent in some of her work with Māori and Pasifika. She explained,

‘... it can feel uncomfortable. Sometimes I can feel apologetic, um, and embarrassed, um, and like I’m trying too hard. So- and then, yeah, I’m really self-conscious about it, ‘cos I’m just conscious of the history, and what someone like me can represent’.

In contrast with Merrick, Penny felt a sense of guilt through association because of her English- and Britishness. However, unlike in section three of this chapter, she illustrated a willingness to be uncomfortable in what could be described as a ‘pedagogy of discomfort’, and the way in which exploring this discomfort can provide ‘new windows on the world’ for those who are part of the dominant culture (Boler and Zembylas 2003, 108).

In Penny’s stories, and during the time I spent with her, she exhibited a willingness to negotiate te ao Māori. At work, she told me about feeling bad that she had not introduced herself properly when conducting a job interview with an interviewee, who was Māori, who had given a mihi, a greeting, so she apologised and asked to reciprocate with her own mihi at the end. Penny also purposefully practised Māori protocol at work, for
instance when conducting meetings with colleagues who told her ‘they didn’t do things like that’ in a bid to show that these were positive. In her personal life, she argued with her Pākehā mother-in-law about the value of Māori cultural practices. And when we visited an exhibition on Māori taonga, treasure, together she critically reflected on who was benefiting from it. As with Grace and others, as well as experiences of discomfort, Penny had also grown more comfortable as she learned more about Māori culture. She enjoyed taking part in ceremonies and felt proud that she knew the words to waiata, songs, when she and her daughter attended a pōwhiri, welcome ceremony, together.

As a result of her changed perspective, Penny expressed frustration, as we saw in chapter six, with British migrants who were not ‘interested in the country’ and who ‘come to be comfortable and they don’t pay any attention to what’s already here’. As she told me,

‘I don’t like that ‘cos I think when you come here you come by virtue of someone else’s generosity, particularly Māori generosity, and therefore you honour that … I see bicultural as Māori – other. Anyone that’s not Māori kind of fits into the other part of that, and I like that it’s bicultural because bicultural means valuing Māori as a distinct group … I’m happy to be part of the other’.

Due to her bicultural understanding of the country, Penny thought of herself as ‘a long term guest’ who tried to ‘tread gently’ in an ongoing process where she said, ‘I’m always checking. I’m very conscious’. Penny’s positioning of herself as a guest resonates with Mikaere’s (2004) model of belonging in which she suggests that Pākehā should ‘take a leap of faith’ to reconsider themselves as ‘guests’ and trust tangata whenua, indigenous peoples of the land, to act as ‘hosts’ of the nation (p. 20). Smith (2007, 81) has framed Mikaere’s intervention ‘as a performative and strategic interruption of orthodox knowledges and as an insertion of an alternative ontologico-epistemological system of thought into mainstream settler society’. For Smith (2007), this interpretation provides an invitation to think otherwise not as an ‘Other’ but in order to imagine the possibility of other ways of being and of thinking in this space that do not conform to predictable national orthodoxies.

It is difficult to differentiate ‘between acts of identification, acts of appropriation, acts of creation and acts of affiliation’ (Nolan and Dawson 2004, xiii). Bell (2014, 59) has noted that there is a long history of the adoption and adaption of indigenous culture in settler societies, which can mark respect and admiration, but she argues this is problematic when divorced from support for, or understanding of, the wider political issues of indigenous struggles for rights. Penny had worried about ‘trying to appropriate someone else’s culture’. When she reflected on this concern, particularly in relation to carrying out Māori protocol at work, she drew on a logic which centred the land, rather than her identity,
‘... some people had said it’s what the land wants, so it’s not necessarily about me it’s about, um, what this place Aotearoa wants when people are meeting, so it’s just doing what’s meant to be done ... so it’s not about me or my ethnicity or anyone else’s, this is what this guy was saying, it’s about what the land wants. This is what this country wants, is for people to meet in this way, so we do’.

Although Penny had been challenged a small number of times at work for her practices because of her being British, she reflected on how her appearance shaped her reception,

‘I probably get less of a hard time than others because I’m brown and so people let me off the hook. I was thinking you know like when I do- I do groups, a lot of people in the groups are Māori and they just get really excited about the fact that I have dreadlocks and so they really connect to that ... they really respond to my Jamaican ancestry, ‘cos, you know, everyone loves Bob Marley, or certainly men of low socioeconomic groups love Bob Marley so when they see, hear Jamaica, especially with the dreads, they get really excited about that ...’

Penny was aware of the paradoxes of her willingness to be ‘part of the other’ and her self-described relatively privileged status. However, her privilege was intersected by her racialisation. For instance, part of her appreciation of living in Aotearoa New Zealand was a desire to raise her daughter away from the specific racist climate of England and a fearful prior experience of living near a ‘Combat 18’ headquarters, a violent, white supremacist group in the UK. A more complex approach to difference in settler societies has to hold in tension that, as Moreton-Robinson (2003) argues, while all non-indigenous arrivals are implicated in settler colonialism, they are also differently situated in hierarchies of otherness and belonging.

Globalised spaces such as Auckland require thinking beyond a binary of indigenous and non-indigenous where the latter is cast as white; while, as so vividly evoked by Hall (1997), British identities reflect a meeting point of the global histories its expansion initiated.

Conclusion

‘...I consider ... settlement to be a dream, according to which the new country could be considered a frontier, or open space, rather than somebody else’s country... The dream, I would stress, hardly belongs to everyone (it’s not the dream of many Māori, I assume, and many others who cannot understand themselves in terms of the settler-1). But the dreamwork of settler media, extending from popular history to sport and advertising, is totalising in intent, if not effect, and as “real” and weighty as the numbers of dreamers themselves’. (Turner 2011, 116, 122)

This chapter sought to explore participants’ investment, or not, in ‘settler dreaming’, which I have understood, following Bell (2014), through the concept of ‘the settler imaginary’. 
Bell has argued the settler imaginary sought to ‘create a new world, not just find one’, and is an ongoing project, in which non-indigenous arrivals are all complicit (p. 14; see also: Wolfe 1999). This chapter has examined the complex ways in which British migrants navigate their identities and belonging in Aotearoa New Zealand in relation to biculturalism and Māori, in particular. The perspectives of these contemporary British migrants are important to investigate, not only as a significant migrant group in the settler society of Aotearoa New Zealand, but also in light of a recent poll which found that forty-four per cent of British people thought that the British Empire was more something to feel proud, than ashamed, of (Dahlgreen 2016).

First, I addressed the idea among participants’ that biculturalism unfairly privileged Māori, and, in particular, that the Treaty had become a ‘grievance industry’. I explored how, for several participants, this perception could be linked with a preference for a unified national identity. Secondly, I addressed the way in which many participants who considered biculturalism as unfair stated a preference for a meritocratic, seemingly universally inclusive, multiculturalism. I critically examined how their appreciation of ethnic diversity was often only expressed in terms of its cultural, or even culinary, aspects. I argued that both aspirations, whether for a monocultural unified national identity, or, alternately, a multicultural mosaic of ethnic difference, despite their claims to be universally inclusive, excluded indigenous political difference. As discussed in chapter seven, participants’ comments on the way in which Māori should behave, and indigenous difference should be included in the national space, indicated a governmental mode of belonging (Hage 1998). Thirdly, I addressed some of the temporal and spatial imaginaries that emerged in relation to these perspectives. A linear notion of past, present and future, in which colonisation was now ‘over’ could be traced for many participants. In addition, I tracked a distinction between appreciations of cultural expressions of indigeneity, but the way in which indigenous difference was deemed undesirable in particular spaces which were associated with ‘modernity’. Charles avoidance of ‘vociferous patches of biculturalism’ indicated the ability for participants ‘to construct spatial, temporal and psychological “limits”’ to their experience of ‘contact zones’ (Yeoh and Willis 2005, 282). Although as emphasised later in the chapter, participants’ experiences of ‘contact zones’ were dynamic and shifted over time.

There is an ongoing ambivalence in the relation between support for Māori and the forging of new relational identities among non-Indigenous peoples, and the capacity for a greater sense of belonging such engagement might confer without a divesting of ‘land or power or privilege’ (Tuck and Wang 2012, 10). In the fourth section of this chapter, I explored
the perspectives and experiences of participants who were positive about biculturalism. I outlined the way in which participants would distance themselves both from ‘the bad migrant’ and from ‘narrow-minded’ Pākehā because of their greater engagement with Māori culture. Bell (2014) has been criticised for ‘attributing a high degree of solidarity and consistency to the settler social imaginary’ such that ‘the strands of alternative thought within settler culture are inevitably downplayed’ (Lawn 2015, 269-70). In view of this criticism, finally, I explored two participants’ stories and everyday lives in greater detail as tentatively offered examples of alternative settler imaginaries and alternative ways of being-together-in-difference in ‘contemporary, globalised white settler colonial geographies’ (Kobayashi and de Leeuw 2010, 118).
Figure 9.1 Penny, the view out to the Waitakere Ranges
Chapter nine. Conclusion

Introduction

‘Though they seem to invoke an origin in a historical past with which they continue to correspond, actually identities are about questions of using the resources of history, language and culture in the process of becoming rather than being ... They relate to the invention of tradition as much as to tradition itself ... not the so-called return to roots but a coming-to-terms with our “routes”’. (Hall 1996b, 4)

Lucy: ‘... the roots of the history of New Zealand are British roots, um, so that’s quite cool and that does make you feel like as a British person coming here you actually do have a connection with New Zealand even though you’d never been here or you haven’t been brought up here. I think that’s- you come here and you’re reading all about British people. Everything that started here, other than the Māori, was British so, you know, all the towns and the cities were all built by British people, so I do think it gives you a connection and a reason to be here’.

Although she was unusual in offering such an unabashedly celebratory account, an imaginary of shared roots enabled a sense of connection to Aotearoa New Zealand for Lucy, a right to be ‘in place’ which could be tracked more broadly among participants. This thesis has argued that by referring to shared ‘roots’ and a sense of ‘connection’, Lucy does not so much as identify with an already existing phenomenon, but rather, reinvents it (Hall 1996b). The longer presence of ‘the British’ in Aotearoa New Zealand makes examining contemporary migrants’ experiences particularly interesting, and complex. Informed by literature on Britishness, notions of an Arcadian ‘good life’ in Aotearoa New Zealand and ethnic and cultural politics in settler societies, this thesis investigated the stories and lived experiences of forty-six contemporary British migrants living in Auckland, through thematically-oriented, in-depth interviews, photo-elicitation and participant observation. In these concluding remarks, I draw out and synthesise the key contributions from the substantive chapters and relate these to the research questions outlined in the introduction, as well as suggesting future avenues for research.

But before that, I want to emphasise that the stories of British migrants analysed in this thesis are Auckland stories. Participants’ patterns of residency, their encounters with sameness and difference and their experiences of a sub-tropical climate, with sudden, intense rain in winter and humid summers, as only three examples, reflect the particularity of lives in
the region. In distinction to previous relatively a-spatial research with contemporary British migrants in Aotearoa New Zealand, this thesis centres the specificity of Auckland in its analysis. Participants’ situated experiences, however, take place within and are influenced by a broader context of shifting representations of Britishness, Aotearoa New Zealand, ‘the good life’ and sameness and difference, and, I suggest, can shed light on broader British emigrant experiences in nations shaped by histories of British expansion and contemporary mobility (Wills and Darian-Smith 2004, 1), as well as on privileged postcolonial mobility more generally. However, a comparative project with British migrants in rural, or ethnically differently constituted parts of Aotearoa New Zealand, or between urban centres in other ex-British settler societies, would make for a fascinating development of this project, and an opportunity to unpack what is generalisable and what is specific to each site (Dunn 2008; see, for example: Walsh 2014).

9.1 The ‘British World’?

Pearson and Sedgwick (2010, 447) have suggested that ‘[s]ettler states like New Zealand formed far-flung nodal points of an empire and can still be placed within a recent increasingly debated postcolonial network emerging out of the British World’. The challenges within the last few decades to majoritarian national narratives in ‘the Antipodes’, with the decline of the British Empire, increasing ethnic and cultural diversity, radical economic restructuring and decolonial movements, makes a consideration of the changing status of British migrants particularly significant (Pearson 2008). This research aimed to contribute a nuanced analysis of British migrants’ experiences, through an examination of their reflections on their migrancy, and that of their compatriots, their lifestyle aspirations and perceptions of similarity with Pākehā, for cultural and social traces of a lingering ‘British World’. To paraphrase Buckner and Francis (2005, 19), rather than an affirmation, or approval of, this phenomenon, this focus means to understand, and problematise, how it still shapes the world we live in now.

9.1.1 Britishness, class, and the morality of integration

First, I want to explore ‘the bad migrant’ and the host this figure was imagined to have failed to integrate with. Ambivalence about overt performances of Britishness has
been tracked internationally for British emigrants, and this research supports such findings (see, for example: Coles and Walsh 2010; Oliver and O’Reilly 2010; Benson 2011; Hammerton 2011; Pearson 2014). Although varied, many participants preferred to display their nationness lightly in day-to-day life, as documented in chapter six. However, participants’ distancing of themselves from overt displays of nationality was often simultaneous with a continued national habitus (Edensor 2002) and, for several, pride through association with their perception of British global prominence, for instance, as seen in chapters five and six. Moreover, distancing from overt signs of patriotism was not absolute. Besides special occasions, such as the Royal visit or sports, ironic or folk displays of national culture were more acceptable. British and English national symbols were generally seen as more problematic than ‘Celtic’ national symbols, as I documented through the examples of two Welsh participants in chapter six. As well as a global trend documented in the romanticisation of Celtic cultures (Harvey et al. 2002), I connected this pattern with a locally inflected desire for a more ‘innocent’ ancestral heritage among some Pākehā, making Aotearoa New Zealand, and most likely other ex-British settler societies, a specific context of meaning for such national cultures. This observation, I suggest, makes a novel contribution to British emigration literature, in which the different experiences of Britain’s constituent nations have been underexplored.

Participants’ distancing of themselves from poor performances of Britishness or migrancy was a classed process, as has been well documented among British communities elsewhere (O’Reilly 2000; Oliver and O’Reilly 2010; Benson 2011). For many participants, particular recreations of cultural and social trappings of the UK, for instance, through regular use of British-themed commercial establishments or homophily, was associated with the stereotyped, and classed, figure of ‘the bad migrant’. The classed status of ‘the bad migrant’ was realised in complex ways. This figure was associated with both ‘fixed’ working class and ‘conservative’ middle class tastes. However, the negative characteristics of this figure found coherence through common associations of narrow-mindedness and parochialism. In this way, ‘the bad migrant’ functioned as an internal boundary for British migrants. This argument complements research on the classed aspect of British migrants’ relations with compatriots in other contexts, and extends this research to the new site of Aotearoa New Zealand.

Following the insights of Benson (2011, 126), attention to the stereotypical, and often seemingly apocryphal, figure of ‘the bad migrant’ illuminated the speakers’ aspirations for their own migration. Prime importance was given to open-mindedness and adaptation to their host community, which followed the familiar logic of ‘when-in-Rome’, and frequently took on a
moral tone. However, for many participants, that host was narrowly understood to equate with Pākehā society. This understanding often framed the notion of ‘too many’ migrants, documented in chapter seven, and the suggestion that some Māori were unnecessarily divisive, explored in chapter eight. However, there were also participants who were positive about ethnic and cultural difference in Aotearoa New Zealand, as I will explore further later in this chapter.

9.1.2 In pursuit of an arcadian ‘good life’ in a familiar ‘exotic’

Secondly, I want to address participants’ spatial and temporal imaginaries of Aotearoa New Zealand and the lifestyles available to them there. Benson and Osbaldiston (2014, 12) have argued that there is a sparsity of literature which centralises (post)colonial (dis)continuities in lifestyle migration research (for several exceptions see: Knowles and Harper 2009; Korpela 2009; Benson 2013). Following Benson’s (2013, 316) call for lifestyle migration research to better interrogate ‘how imaginings of destinations and understandings of migration contain colonial traces’, chapter five tracked spatial and temporal imaginaries of Aotearoa New Zealand as ‘isolated’ and ‘young’, which emerged as dominant themes associated with notions of ‘the good life’ among participants. I argued that these reflected colonial continuities and worked to elide alternative imaginaries of place and temporality, and more productive affinities with other proximate and/or long-present cultures. This analysis critically developed Pearson’s (2012, 164) argument that the pursuit of improved lifestyles in better climes connected the experience of colonial and contemporary cohorts of English migrants. Through adopting a historically-informed lens, adapted to the specificity of a settler society, in order to analyse British migrants’ lives, this thesis contributes a postcolonial analysis to lifestyle migration literature.

In a paper on collective memory in places transformed by settlement, Turner (2001, 117) has drawn a distinction between migrant and settlers’ aspirations for life in a new place. He argued that, ‘[i]f migrants dream in the sense that they hope for a better life in a new land, “settlers” take this land to be their own’. As Pearson (2012, 159) has argued, British migrants no longer travel to what they see as an extension of their homeland, and there are important differences in the experiences and intentions of earlier and more recent British arrivals to Aotearoa New Zealand. However, it is worth questioning ‘the good life’ as it emerges in such contexts. Feminist scholars Ahmed (2010, 54) and Berlant (2011, 53) have drawn attention to the way in which collective modes of ‘the good life’ and understandings of how ‘proper’ people
act can be exclusionary and harmful, at the same time as they offer comfort for those who invest in them. Participants often imagined aspects of Pākehā lifestyles favourably, associating it with a relaxed pace of life, informality, outdoor leisure and a better work-life balance, for instance, as was documented in chapter five. However, in the context of Aotearoa New Zealand, Turner (2011, 119) has criticised, ‘[t]he official pause of pub, beach and barbeque [as] the communal rest and recreation that mark the good life of settlement’ for its erasure of inequality, Māori presence and more diverse claims to the national space. Most of the participants in this project were brought to Aotearoa New Zealand with dreams of a better life. Historicising and problematising what may be excluded from dreams of ‘the good life’ for lifestyle migrants to settler societies is especially significant for future research.

9.1.3 ‘Cultures of relatedness’ with Pākehā

To conclude this exploration of the affective, cultural, and social resonances of a now post ‘British World’ for British migrants, thirdly, I want to examine popular notions of shared ancestry and cultural affinities with Pākehā. The assumption of a smooth transition into majority ethnic groups for British migrants in the ex-British settler societies of Australia and Aotearoa New Zealand has been widely criticised, as discussed in chapter three (see, for example: Hutching 1999; Wills and Darian-Smith 2003; Hammerton 2011; Pearson 2014). Despite their relative privilege, belonging for this group is not fait accompli but a ‘project-in-progress’ (Benson 2016, 11). I have sought to include experiences of social and cultural friction for participants, such as their avoidance of being seen as a ‘whingeing Pom’ in chapter six, and the difficulties associated with distance from loved ones in chapter five.

However, chapter seven took the relatively unexplored, and awkward, focus of perceptions of shared ancestry and cultural affinity with certain Pākehā among British migrants. In doing so, I aimed to problematise assumptions of a natural legacy or passive inheritance with regards to Britishness in ex-British settler societies (Barnes 2012, 5). The insight that essentialising notions are predicated on essentialising practices calls for attention to the everyday reproduction and maintenance of social worlds, and the way these are internalised by social actors (Fenton 2010). Following Fenton’s insight that ‘[p]eople or places do not just possess cultures of shared ancestry; they elaborate these into the idea of a community founded upon these attributes’ (2002, 3, emphasis in original) and building on Lester’s (2012, 5) argument that, in the contemporary period, ‘…colonial ideas of racial difference [and sameness] are continuously re-worked rather than simply inherited’, this thesis
argued that notions of shared ancestry among participants marked the iterative, active and repetitive reworking of the past in the present, and, although uncomfortable, needs to be critically examined, rather than dismissed or ignored.

National belonging and the comfort of ‘sinking in’ to public spaces is unequally distributed in Aotearoa New Zealand (Hage 1998; Ahmed 2007). Certain bodies tend to ‘fit in’ more than others. As argued in chapter two, the dominant mode of national belonging in Aotearoa New Zealand tends to be organised around whiteness (Rocha 2012; Gray et al. 2013). Ahmed (2007, 129) has argued that whiteness can be understood as ‘a social and bodily orientation that extends what is within reach’. She goes on to suggest ‘that the world extends the form of some bodies more than others, and such bodies in turn feel at home in this world’ (ibid). The ‘British World’ as a colonial entity is now (mostly) gone. However, following the argument that the past is brought into the present through ‘the active performance of routine, rhythm and repetition’ (Lester 2012, 1), it can be argued that a post ‘British World’ is still visible in shifting, nebulous and subtle forms, for instance, through participants’ sense of Aotearoa New Zealand as familiar and exotic, through their participation in cultures of relatedness with Pākehā and the comfort of feeling like an ‘ordinary’ presence in the national space.

The consequences of the diminishing place of Britishness in Aotearoa New Zealand for the national identities and everyday lives of Pākehā New Zealanders remains relatively underexplored (Pearson and Sedgwick 2010, 448; for an exception, see: Bell 2006). As explained in chapter four, I limited attention to first-generation British migrants, rather than focus on Pākehā or other nationalities who participated in traditionally ‘British’ forms of cultural expression, such as Morris dancing or the Celtic Summer School. Although relatively niche, research exploring the identities and collectivities to emerge from such communities of practice would provide a fascinating future avenue to further explore and problematise Britishness, notions of shared ancestry and shifting national identities in Aotearoa New Zealand. Moreover, this thesis was also limited to a commentary on the privileges of white Britishness, due to the shared national identities of all of the participants who took part. Alternately, a project which researched more broadly with migrants of various nationalities who could be identified as white, could examine what was particular to the forms of white Britishness recorded in this study, especially with regards to notions of shared ancestry and the apparent normalcy of British accents, and what related more generally to racialised privileges.
9.2 Cultural and ethnic politics in ex-British settler societies

As Smith (2007, 69) has argued, ‘[t]he contemporary context of Aotearoa/New Zealand exemplifies the vexed question of a settler-native-migrant politics of culture’. In a ‘multiracial, transnational white settler society’ such as Auckland, the ‘contact zone’ extends beyond indigenous-settler relations (Morgensen 2011, 22). In addition to relations with compatriots and Pākehā, this thesis investigated British migrants’ perceptions of indigenous peoples and what Snelgrove et al. (2013) have called ‘other Others’, and Veracini (2012) ‘exogenous “Others”’. Triangular models of ethnic difference, such as Hage’s (1995) ‘Anglo-Ethnic-Aboriginal’ and Veracini’s (2012) more recent ‘native-settler-migrant’, were both posited to overcome the frequently siloed approaches of ‘whiteness studies’, ‘indigenous studies’ and ‘ethnic and racial studies’ (Anderson 2000, 381). However, as discussed in chapter three, British migrants fit awkwardly into such models of ethnic difference, as both ‘ambiguous immigrants’ (Wellings 2011, 251) and an ‘intimate other’ (Pearson 2000, 98). Thus far, only Schech and Haggis (2000; 2004) have addressed British migrants’ relations with both indigenous and exogenous difference, in the context of Australia. In Aotearoa New Zealand, Hutching (1999, 157) provided a post-war commentary on perceptions of Māori for British migrants, but relationships across indigenous and/or exogenous difference have yet to be examined for contemporary British arrivals in Aotearoa New Zealand. Through examining the heterogeneity of participants’ relations with both indigenous and other migrant/ethnicised groups in Auckland more closely, this thesis aimed to bring further detail to understandings of national belonging, settler imaginaries and ethnic dynamics in ‘contemporary, globalised white settler colonial geographies’ (Kobayashi and de Leeuw 2010, 118). In the next section, I analyse the responses of participants whose vision of society fit into a pattern, described memorably by Hage (1998, 233), of ‘White worriers’ and ‘Third-World-looking problems’.

9.2.1 ‘Too many’ migrants and biculturalism as ‘unfair’

A minority of participants thought that there were ‘too many’ migrants from countries in East Asia, and a more substantial group were opposed to the way in which biculturalism ‘unfairly privileged’ Māori. I argue that these sets of discourses can be productively analysed
together as the construction of a specific Anglo-centric ‘spatial-affective-aspiration’ for Aotearoa New Zealand (Hage 1998).

As discussed earlier, criticism of characteristics of ‘the bad migrant’ was a way for participants to distance themselves from supposedly narrow-minded compatriots who perform Britishness or migrancy poorly. Through recognising ‘the bad migrant’ and distancing themselves from such practices, the speaker could claim to be different. In chapter seven, I investigated how the figure of ‘the bad migrant’ who does not integrate emerged in the way a minority of participants discussed peoples who appeared to have heritage from East Asia. Few participants who took this perspective considered that the ability to integrate might be unequally accessible. The entitlement evidenced by this minority of participants to decide who does, or does not, ‘fit’ in the nation, displayed a governmental mode of belonging (Hage 1998), a position also traceable among the participants who understood Māori as unfairly privileged.

Chapter eight turned to participants’ reflections on Māori, bi- and multiculturalism. For a significant number of participants, a perception that either a singular national identity or, alternately, multiculturalism was more inclusive, and an understanding of settler colonialism as over, meant that they considered biculturalism and colonial reparations for Māori as unfair. In addition, I tracked a separation posited between supposedly neutral spaces associated with ‘modernity’, such as the workplace or education, and the supposed particularity of indigeneity.

In Hartigan’s (1999, 208) conclusion on whiteness and class in the US he suggested that ‘race includes the subtle, dense fusion of … desires, interests and anxieties, expressed variously through the sensations of “comfort” and “uneasiness”’. Dis/comfort was a central aspect of participants’ encounters with both sameness and difference. For instance, contrast Charles’ enthusiasm for Devonport, where he could ‘blend easily’ and his telling me ‘I know what I’m comfortable with and it’s not biculturalism’ and avoidance of ‘vociferous patches of biculturalism’, explored in chapters seven and eight. Or in another example, consider Ivan’s preference not to go ‘across the water’ from the North Shore to the CBD, and his response when I asked him what he liked about his neighbourhood, ‘I don’t know it’s just I feel comfortable in it’. These examples illustrate the way that participants could choose to have little involvement with te ao Māori, the Māori world, or other ethnicised groups, because their suburbs, leisure practices, profession, cultural consumption, politics and social circles meant that, as Charles put it, it was ‘not really part of our lives’. ‘Contact zones’ are experienced unequally, ‘their breadth and depth, and degree of transience and permanence … as they develop in the urban landscape’ is conditioned by the ability of relatively privileged social
actors to draw on their resources ‘to construct spatial, temporal and psychological “limits” to manage these contact zones’ (Yeoh and Willis 2005, 282).

Through analyses of the othering of both indigenous and exogenous peoples in the same frame, the concept of ‘the settler imaginary’ (Bell 2014) can be expanded beyond a focus on settler-indigenous relations (Terruhn 2015, 207). Concern about ‘too many’ migrants who had seemingly arrived ‘too recently’ to make claims on the national space, or the suggestion that indigenous peoples were ‘too late’ to make claims premised on the injustices of settler colonialism (Veracini 2012, 190), are both part of the ways in which participants maintained and reproduced the settler imaginary.

9.2.2 Appreciations of indigenous and exogenous difference

For many participants, increasing ethnic and cultural diversity in Auckland related to changing migration streams was seen positively and associated with greater consumer choice, more excitement, and, perhaps, a maturation of the city. Their understanding of multiculturalism was often based on their lived experience of cultural diversity, and several reflected on the way in which it was ordinary to them because of previous experiences in the UK. In addition, a sizeable group were supportive of biculturalism and, to varying extents, the greater inclusion of Māori interests it was associated with. To continue the analysis of relations with both indigenous and exogenous peoples together, I next examine both of these positions.

Popular enthusiasm for cultural and ethnic diversity in Auckland among participants, and more broadly among the public, tells a compelling story in comparison with a generally far less accommodating public in Europe, for instance (Lentin and Titley 2011). A significant number of participants could be said to have adopted a mode of what Brett and Moran (2011) have called ‘cosmopolitan nationalism’. This concept describes the way in which cultural diversity may become an attribute of the nation and one of the things nationals value about their country. To return to the example of Charles, it could be argued that his statement ‘we all make a society’ could point towards a genuinely inclusive sentiment about who belongs in the nation. However, it is interesting to note that the expression of participants’ appreciation of difference often constructed a gap between the speaker, who appreciates, and that which is appreciated. In this respect, in spite of their migrancy, in their accounts of the benefits of ethnic and cultural diversity in Auckland, participants would usually adopt the position of having rather than being diversity (Hage 1998, 139-140). This pattern can be related to a
criticism of the notion of diversity because of its implicit assumption that there is also that which is not diverse (Lentin and Titley 2011). Furthermore, for several participants, their appreciation of multiculturalism was partly because it was seen as a fairer alternative to biculturalism. I criticised the way this position resulted in the inclusive exclusion of Māori and the ‘transfer out of existence’ of their status as indigenous peoples (Veracini 2010). What is more, this perspective was often associated with a rejection of collective, redistributive politics, for a more culturally driven, individualised inclusion of diversity.

The widely available imaginary of Aotearoa New Zealand as a bicultural nation in which Pākehā and Māori are the two founding peoples, and the prominence of the Treaty, have been argued to provide place-specific alternative discourses for post-settler futures and indigenous-settler relations (Tuffin et al. 2004; Kirkwood et al. 2005; Liu 2005). A significant number of participants were supportive of biculturalism and made an effort to acquaint themselves with Māori culture, for instance, many took short courses in te reo. In fact, several participants were critical of their compatriots who were not respectful or interested in te ao Māori, and portrayed this group as narrow-minded in a variant of the figure of ‘the bad migrant’ who does not adapt to their host society. In this respect, as much as this position may have reflected a respectful stance, there was also a kind of cultural capital available through greater engagement with Māoridom for this group.

However, whether such support for biculturalism extended beyond ‘soft’ forms of greater cultural inclusion of Māori to ‘hard’ forms such as more radical claims of tino rangatiratanga, Māori sovereignty, was another matter. Albeit preferable to alternative scenarios, biculturalism in Aotearoa New Zealand has been criticised as a process of reconciliation, which ultimately continues settler processes through an erasure of incommensurable indigenous alterity and a legitimisation of settler presence (Bell 2006, 257-8; Veracini 2010, 50). Moreover, although widely available as a discourse, Bell (2006, 260) has problematised the depth of understanding of biculturalism among the general public, and more recently tracked a backlash against such understandings at all (Bell 2008). There is a marked distance between the relatively mainstream support for greater cultural inclusion of Māori and resistance to the redistribution of resources (Sibley and Liu 2004; Kirkwood et al. 2005, 495). ‘[S]ettler moves to innocence’, as argued by Tuck and Wang (2012, 10), ‘describe those strategies or positionings that attempt to relieve the settler of feelings of guilt or responsibility without giving up land or power or privilege, without having to change much at all’. In settler societies, the embrace of cultural indigenous difference without support for the redistribution of resources has been criticised as a way of securing post-settler futures without
radically altering settler-indigenous power dynamics (Tuck and Wang 2012, 1; Terruhn 2015, 205).

The support of biculturalism and multiculturalism among participants, although not necessarily held simultaneously, can be critically connected because of their frequent association with reconcilable difference. Alternately, in Aotearoa New Zealand, Smith (2007, 76) has called to, ‘[r]eplace the dream of oneness with a mode of cultural identity radically open-ended and in a state of continual flux’. In a complementary argument for valuing difference for itself rather than for the nation, Turner (2007) has argued,

‘The different ways in which peoples of New Zealand inhabit the place, and relate to it, constitute its real wealth ... I am suggesting a different conception of the “wealth” of the nation that is based in the actual richness, variety, abundance of its internal differences, histories, [and] peoples’. (p. 96)

As Wills (2005, 94) has argued in the context of Australia, ‘British migrants display heterogeneous constructions and negotiations of identity that may reflect new departures’. I next explore some of this heterogeneity and the possibility of alternative settler imaginaries.

### 9.2.3 Alternative settler identities

The field of settler colonial studies has been criticised for a tone of inevitability and defeatism (see, for example: Strakosch and Macoun 2012, 52; Rowse 2014, 300; Snelgrove et al. 2014, 26; Svirsky 2014, 328). In the introduction to an edited collection which addressed the permeability of settler colonialism, Svirsky (2014, 331) has argued that rather than remaining confined to forms of ethnicity and nationalism, in addition to other streams of activism and research, anti-settlerist struggle could more productively focus on ways of life and subjectivities (p. 331). In a similar vein, in reference to the triangular models of ethnic difference in settler societies introduced in chapter three, Smith (2007, 69) has problematised the limits of the concepts and rhetoric surrounding the terms ‘Pākehā’, ‘Māori’ and ‘migrant’ and calls for attention to ‘simultaneous identity positions’ across categories which engage with ‘the constantly shifting parameters of identification characterising the everyday’ and with ‘other economies of belonging and other modes of knowing that throw into question the basis of one’s cultural identity and social power’ (p. 76). As argued in chapter three, several scholars have stressed that indigenous subjectivities and identities should be approached sensitively when engaging in such deconstructive analyses. As Bell (2014, 20) has argued,
‘...a more radical step towards decolonising indigenous-settler identities and relations must be a settler acceptance of the autonomy of indigenous identities, an acceptance that they do not arise from within the Western philosophical traditions of identity but draw on an indigenous “outside”’.

Bell (2014, 14) stresses that her argument does not imply a romanticised/exoticised difference, but rather means to support the radical contemporaneity of multiple worlds (see also: Smith 2007, 78; Cram 2011, 262; Salmond 2012, 119).

In chapter eight, I examined Merrick and Penny’s experiences who, following Smith (2007, 83), might be said to inhabit ‘the shadows cast by the identitarian discourses of biculturalism and multiculturalism’. Through unpacking their subject positions, this thesis revealed some of the intersecting, contested, heterogeneity of ‘British’ identities, as well as instances of continuous, everyday efforts by participants’ to engage with te ao Māori. In this way, their experiences were tenuously explored as illustrating alternative settler imaginaries.

The everyday ways in which worlds are reproduced, through notions of ‘the good life’, geographical and historical imaginaries, encounters with sameness and difference and understandings of who has the right to belong in the national space, offer an important route for future research to plot the concrete ways in which the past relates to the present. They also mark important sites of intervention for a more capacious engagement with the multiple worlds which make up Aotearoa New Zealand, and in settler societies more generally.
Figure 10.1 Tom, cat in the garden
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Appendix A

British Migrants in Aotearoa New Zealand: identity, use of space and everyday life.

You’re being invited to take part in a research study. Before you decide whether or not to take part, it’s important for you to understand why the research is being done and what it will involve. It’s up to you to decide whether or not to take part. If you do decide to take part, you will be given this information sheet to keep and be asked to sign a consent form. If you decide to take part, you are still free to withdraw at any time and without giving a reason.

What is the purpose of the study?

This study is focusing on British migrants in Aotearoa New Zealand and will last for 12 months. I’m interested in British migrants’ sense of identity, use of space and everyday life. I wish to ground stories of migration within lived experience, appreciating how emotion and the body are integral to this and situating this within a view of the present which is aware of the past. I will carry out interviews, ask people to take photographs of their everyday life and interview them about these and spend time more informally with willing participants in their usual routines and lives.

Why have I been invited to participate?

There will be up to forty people taking part in the study. People will be chosen who self identify as British and have migrated to Aotearoa New Zealand. There will be no other requirements.

What will happen to me if I take part?

Taking part will involve a biographical interview which will be recorded and transcribed to aid my memory; taking photographs of your everyday life over a period of a week and an interview discussing these photographs with me; and if you wish spending some time informally together in your everyday life.

Will my information in this study be kept confidential?

All information collected about you will be kept strictly confidential. Names will be changed to a pseudonym chosen by you and personal information which would lead to your identification will be subtly changed. Confidentiality, privacy and anonymity will be ensured in the collection, storage and publication of research material.
What should I do if I want to take part?

If you’d like to take part, please do get in touch by either sending me an email on: kaw25@sussex.ac.uk or calling me on: 02102415766.

What will happen to the results of the research study?

The results and photographs from the research will be used in my Geography PhD thesis. They may be used in future publications. They will always be anonymised. If you wish to obtain a copy of the thesis I’ll provide this for you.

Who is organising and funding the research?

I’m conducting the research as a PhD student at the University of Sussex as part of the Global Studies school based in the Geography Department. The Economic and Social Research Council is funding the research.

Who has approved this study?

The research has been approved by the Social Sciences Cross-Schools Research Ethics Committee (C-REC).

Contact for Further Information

Should you wish any further information or if you have any concerns about the way the research is being conducted please contact the supervisors of this project, either Katie Walsh <katie.Walsh@sussex.ac.uk> or Alan Lester <a.j.lester@sussex.ac.uk>.

Thank you

Thank you for taking the time to read this.

Date
Appendix B

CONSENT FORM

British Migrants in Aotearoa New Zealand: identity, use of space and everyday life

I agree to take part in the above University of Sussex research project. I have had the project explained to me and I have read and understood the Information Sheet, which I may keep for records. I understand that agreeing to take part means that I am willing to:

- Be interviewed by the researcher
- Allow the interview to be audio recorded
- Make myself available for a further interview should that be required
- Take photographs over a period of a week of my everyday life
- If I feel willing, be shadowed in my everyday life

I understand that any information I provide is confidential, I will be given a pseudonym to avoid identification and any identifying features will be changed to prevent my identity from being made public.

I understand that my participation is voluntary, that I can choose not to participate in part or all of the project, and that I can withdraw at any stage of the project without being penalised or disadvantaged in any way.

I consent to the processing of my personal information for the purposes of this research study. I understand that such information will be treated as strictly confidential and handled in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998.

Name: ____________________________________________

Signature: __________________________________________

Date: ____________________________________________