Memory Connection
Volume 1 Number 1
© 2011 The Memory Waka

Settler Dreaming

Stephen Turner

Memory Connection
Volume 1 Number 1
© 2011 The Memory Waka

Settler Dreaming

Stephen Turner

Abstract

This article focuses on collective memory in a place that has been radically transformed by settlement and where memory itself is part and parcel of the make-over. Remembering isn't passive or received but active, and forms a process of settlement too. For visitors, says Walter Benjamin, a new country is exotic, and the object of an exoticising gaze, whilst for natives the place is perceived through layers of collective memory. The problem for settlers is that the place they come to consider their own is originally exotic to them. They now have a memory of a place made-over in their own exotic image of it—at first a picturesque landscape occupied by a disappearing indigenous people. Just how an exoticised experience of landscape and its indigenous inhabitants became "us" New Zealanders is forgotten today in declaring settler nature—"our" identity and character—to be of nature, now primordial and pure, and quite organic. Benjamin's formulation suggests a corrective to cultural organicism and the constructed public memory of popular national identity.

The exotic place of settlers' perception, even when familiarised and domesticated, is the lens though which settlers view history. Their collective remembering makes-over the place in terms of the experience of its difference to them, not in terms of Māori experience of European difference to Māori. The gap in perception is foreclosed by the make-over, which itself constitutes national popular memory. The remembering activity of settler culture makes all the more real a made-over place while occluding its making over. An industry of historians, or memory machinery, is needed to support settler place-making, working to shape and contain memory, and to secure it against real knowledge of the making over of place. I will explore how it does so by explaining three components of national popular memory: re-enactment, remediation, and cultural plagiarism.

Keywords: dreaming, settlement, memory, frontier, re-enactment

Aotearoa New Zealand would appear to be a post-settler nation and post-colonial society. The legacy of settlement remains, however, because the assumption that "colonisation" has ended cannot be definitive, or empirically dated. So it is that settlers remain in thrall to the prospective place of those first Europeans who decided that their future lay in the "new" country rather than their countries of origin. These second settlers, due to their numbers, remain colonisers in a way that first settlers, or first peoples, are not. The "logic" of colonisation is a matter of supernumeracy, or weight of settler numbers, in the light of which settlement is constantly rationalised. Rather than reflecting on the civilising mission that made settlement seem both necessary and inevitable, I consider the "prospect" of settlement to be a dream, according to the terms of which the new country could be considered a frontier, or open space, rather than somebody else's country. In his recent book, Lorenzo Veracini outlines the numerous "transfers" by which settlers removed in their own minds the indigenous peoples from the prospective place of their settlement, but Māori remain very much present to non-Māori in Aotearoa New Zealand (as this more recent denomination would indicate).[1] This ensures that second settlement remains highly contentious, in both cultural and political terms, which makes post-settlement and post-colonialism today a dream of being at home—having a homeland one can take as given. First peoples (Māori) are not then "removed" but rather co-opted by this dream, whose aim is to make us all (New Zealanders or Kiwi) people of different kinds but, crucially, people with the same origin.

If migrants dream in the sense that they hope for a better life in a new land, "settlers" take this land to be their own. In so doing a more natural human hope is inhibited by the dreamscape of New Zealand itself, which, beyond "bush and beach", must be the place of one people and one country.[2] When the Victorian certainties of earlier settlers fall away—entwined beliefs and values of progress, industry, and Christian virtue—the dream element assumes full force, and its compulsory character is asserted along with attendant anxiety and dread. Subject to the dream-drive, the original hope of settlement may today be contrasted with dreaming as abandonment. This happens when the dreamer isn't really hoping any longer but rather suffering from a collectively enforced dream. "I" still want to hope but can't because the hoping is forced, an imperative (hope for your country!) that doesn't even appear to be my own. Having to dream the good life I must now be enjoying in my own country is then experienced as self-abandonment, as what I am dreaming bears little or no relation to my desire, much less to my experience. So I abandon the "self" (the settler-I) of that dreaming, although "I" cannot but dream. If states of settler abandonment are predicated on settler dreaming in this sense, it is worth asking how and why such dreaming is enforced.

My emphasis on forced hope, rather than a delusion of hope, means that settler "dreaming" in Aotearoa New Zealand is not a case of being mistaken ("you must be dreaming") or a case of something having been forgotten that makes settler consciousness "false".[3] In that case there would be an unconscious

and "real" substructure to the dream. While the settler memory—the act of remembering settlement—is certainly a matter of hoping, it is not a matter of repression or repressed content. The specific repression of a prior Māori presence might be an obvious and simple case of wishful forgetting, but it is plain enough today what must have taken place and plenty of evidence for it (a migrant invasion, appropriation of land, cultural colonisation, New Zealandisation, etc). More than the migrant dream of a better life in a new country, it is the idea of making it one's own that structures settler consciousness, and constitutes "New Zealand" as the dream's reality. "Settler dreaming" is the problem that this reality can only turn out to be true—as real as anything can be.

The necessity of the settler homeland—the settler being at home—requires a national memory infrastructure to secure it. As Claudia Orange remarked in a keynote address to the Contained Memory conference, a nation must have a memory if it is to have a future. There must be a past to support it—a collective public memory, something to be "captured" and "presented" as "our" own history.[4] In place of latent content or an unconscious I will argue that there is a collective structural intention, which is the desire-drive of settler dreaming, unfolded as the lived dreamscape of New Zealand—the reward of existential investment in the idea of a new country. It is important that the promise of place also appears to settlers to be a promised place, in the sense of a set of expectations which, when thwarted, creates anger.

Importantly, that future never quite arrives. For Francis Pound, the promised place of settler dreaming is always coming but never arrives.[5] This forms part of his critique in *The Invention of New Zealand Art and National Identity 1930-1970*. He might have added that the fact that "New Zealand" never quite comes is actually constitutive of this new country. Historically speaking, its delay or deferral maintains the desire-drive of settlement, encouraging immigration and discouraging emigration. There is always work to do, and settlers are urged to get on with it. The ambiguity for Pound's New Zealand-based artists, which is whether this country has been "invented" or "discovered", is key to the settler-deception. Whether the collective public memory of the "nation"—at first largely imaginary and projected—has been invented or discovered by historians is equally moot. A public archive, as much as an artistic one, must today support a settler self and nation whose collective memory and sense of place it supplies.[6] Archiving becomes "our" dreaming. So memory is both produced and contained by a national infrastructure constructed for this purpose.

The mobile home of settler memory

Being at home for settlers involves more than having a house or property in a new land. The new place must be made into a "homeland", which requires a history to support it. The memory of home suggests a particular problem for settlers, where home, in the sense of identity and belonging, is not given but made. Collective

memory of settlement is not passive or received but active—an activity and a process of settlement. It is a constant processing of settlement in the sense of an intentional, purposeful, needful remembering.

Settlers have a memory of a place as visitors to it, a place made-over in their own exotic imagination of a picturesque and largely empty land with friendly native peoples, whatever the reality, which serves as a drawcard to greater numbers of themselves. A collective memory of an exotic place that over time becomes familiarised works to construct a place in terms of settlers' experience of its difference to themselves. It does not express Māori experience of the would-be settler's difference to Māori in the Māori view of the newcomers. Rather, the place and its existing peoples must be ceaselessly made-over for the "nation" to come into being. For the perceptual gap to be bridged, the ceaseless making-over of the nation is necessary, but also means it will never be fully made-over. For the gap underpins the majority memory of settlement, and motivates the make-over culture of settlers. The memory, or action of remembering, makes-over again, and thereby makes real, through its own re-enactment, what is remembered. What drives memory is an idea of place in which one must find oneself at home. This is the "reality" of settler dreaming that structures local consciousness.

I have said that collective memory of settlement is a matter of the structural intent, and not latent content, of the dream of home. This collectively intentional memory is productive and projective, driving the make-over of place, including the make-over of the memory of settlement itself which changes, along with everything else, so that settlers will always find themselves at home (for they must do so). The home of mobile settler memory is variously (Mother) England, a better Britain, New Zealand and, most recently, Aotearoa New Zealand. Settlers must remember a place that is always already, in whatever sense of it, their own (they cannot "remember" a place that has nothing to do with them). Continuing threats to this dream, whether by Māori or more recent migrants, require that settler remembering must be made-over for the mobile home to be maintained. A national memory infrastructure is needed to manage the threat, and contain memory, so that the past doesn't leak.

Settler dreaming is a desire, or desiring, something settlers do—"our" core being—that is a condition of the possibility of remembering, and actually constitutive of collective memory. Settlement is a specific desire-drive (for land, prosperity, freedom and belonging). Settler dreaming then manifests the desire-drive of an "intentional" memory, properly a structural intent that operates according to the logic of the weight of settler numbers. Living the dream—actively, productively, unself-consciously—makes the place that dream's reality.

States of anxiety and abandonment

Settler anxiety or dread registers awareness of the dream's imprisonment: I am stuck in a dream, stuck dreaming, and cannot wake up. Strictly speaking, setter

anxiety is the affect of pausing or stopping, perhaps stopping to think, thereby interrupting the economistic desire-drive of settlement—the need to "get on" in order to improve the place that is the forward movement of unfolding settlement, and momentum of colonisation. The official pause of pub, beach and barbeque—the communal rest and recreation that mark the good life of settlement —masks an unofficial anxiety of boredom and oblivion (binge drinking, random violence, depression, and suicide). What we are "getting on" for is a question that might well be felt but is never asked. It prompts a sense of oblivion in which the settler dream, or more specifically the "settler-I" of the dreaming, has been abandoned; such states of abandonment most deeply express the felt emptiness of a purely economistic desire-drive, and not being able to wake up from the dream it projects.

My thinking here is not dialectical and Benjaminian: we are not to be blasted out of history, awakened from our settler slumber into a messianic, crystalline constellation of memory.[7] The dream is rather disturbed by abandoned individuals, peoples, and places, which give us pause to stop and think. These rupture the dreamscape of settlement, and mark an aperture, or opening, through which the memory-function of settlement and the infrastructure of its operation can be perceived as such. States of abandonment or dissolution include: the self-abandonment of heavy drinking, depression, and suicide; abandoned people, whether children, the long-term unemployed, or homeless; and historically abandoned places, where settler dreaming is exposed as failed settlements, wasted labour, and ruined lives.[8] In a more obviously political sense, such states also include: historically abandoned peoples, such as Tūhoe, assaulted rather than protected by paramilitary police given the "threat" they have long posed to the government's indivisible sovereignty; and, similarly, abandoned individuals, such as the refugee, Ahmed Zaoui, placed in legal limbo for the avowed purposes of national security.[9]

I will concentrate on political abandonment, with a nod to the influential work of Italian theorist Giorgio Agamben, because the absence of an originary political settlement in New Zealand is foundational to the promised place of settler dreaming, and to the public memory that tells us that the dream is real.[10] The Treaty of Waitangi is widely believed to be that foundational document, and numerous references to its "principles" in government legislation give credence to the lie. But the ability of Parliament, at least in theory, to remove all such references tomorrow tells us that it is a constitutional document in name only. Indeed, it is a quasi-constitutional device, a popular rhetorical fiction, which enables the abandonment of peoples by not fully admitting the other party to a decision-making body it is itself supposed to ground.

The government-sponsored constitutional review, currently underway in 2011, might well resolve the matter, but can hardly do what it is supposed to do if the process remains government-controlled, like the Treaty of Waitangi process for the reparation of historical grievances. Similarly, the real value of historical revision arising from the Waitangi Tribunal's deliberations will not address the deficit created by non-Māori settlement so long as such work is corralled for

the nation's sake. "Long history", which refers to the local inhabitation of first peoples, encompasses but extends beyond the "short history" of non-Māori settlement, hence producing a deficit. If the deficit of short settlement, at once constitutional, historiographical, and existential, is to be adequately addressed then it is the nation, and the idea that what must be done is to be done for its sake, that must for the moment be abandoned. The originary political relation that underpins that nation, or rather the lack of such a relation, is after all what is at issue.

Anger and the fear of unfulfilment

The lack of a proper political settlement, I suggest, is filled in by settler dreaming. A treaty happily entered into and concluded by both parties must be the basis of the authority of the state (technically the New Zealand Crown-in-Parliament).[11] Its actual unenforceability, should you try to appeal to an article of the Treaty directly in a New Zealand Court, is the condition of abandonment or disappearance of local history, places, and peoples. One cannot "appear" in Court as a party to the Treaty. In any event, the remedy cannot be simply political, or a political solution cannot quite be trusted, given the dream-drive that the Parliamentary body itself incarnates and the dream-content of the promised place that its legislation expresses. Rather, an awareness of the dreaming in the light of abandoned peoples and places is a prerequisite.

Reflecting on abandonment makes critical thinking itself a kind of purgatory —a local limbo—in which one attends to states of anxiety and dread. To be critical of public memory in New Zealand is to enter with full self-consciousness into a permanent internal exile, a forced arrest and condition of waiting whose Māori counterpart, Ranganui Walker, calls ka whawhai tonu matou / struggle without end. This is because the end of the struggle would require a majority of the people to reconceive themselves in the view of a minority, a prior peoples whose longer history disturbs the slumber of a second people's dreaming. Such critics are naturally fretful and disturbed sleepers.[12] Meanwhile, the desire inherent to that waiting—to consider oblivion bliss and to love limbo—is only apparently negative: it is really a desire for full life, a full experience of place, which settlement denies Pākehā by refusing the long history of Māori inhabitation (a refusal that is "constitutional" in the most embodied sense, connecting who you are and how well you are). Being aware that one is dreaming—that short Pākehā history is also a constructed memory-operation of settlement—makes settler dreaming lucid. It is human to dream, in the sense of having hope, but forced dreaming deprives dreamers of the agency of hope. My hope against collective hope is that what I might wish for isn't already determined.

A full experience of place for all will ultimately depend on Māori flourishing. By any standard the vital statistics of Māori life in this country suggest that that is not the case.[13] Yet the more immediate response to anything that might alleviate Māori lack of well-being is anger at apparent positive discrimination. The anger

is fuelled by the settler anxiety of unfulfilment, which is that the promised place might not eventuate, or somehow hasn't. Since early settlement, Māori flourishing and that promised place have been inimicable, because land, prosperity, freedom, and belonging have for settlers required Māori dispossession. But having admitted as much, if Māori collectives today (taking in whanau, hapu, iwi, and pan- or cross-Māori urban collectives) aren't free to flourish in Māori terms of flourishing, then no one is. We are all instead beholden to the terms of another's circumscribed life (the circumscribed life of that hapu).[14] One is always beholden to terms that are imposed, which is to say, to having imposed terms. Anger and fear of unfulfilment, as a result, will be the future of non-Māori, too. The place of that freedom and flourishing is not a place to come, not some promised land, because it doesn't belong to the progressive and homogenous time of the settler nation: it is already here, albeit contained by public collective memory.

Logic of the settler memory machine

It is not just that one remembers some *thing*, an event or experience, but that one needs to remember *with* something: one needs some means or tools of remembering. Consider that the shape and pattern of what one does remember will be remembered by close kin in like forms, if not as the same things. No doubt memory-function has serious cultural wiring. For settlers, however, whose short history of collective memory is under-informed, relative to Māori, the wiring must be engineered if their memory is to be that of New Zealanders. The mechanical production of public memory involves a settler apparatus or memory machine. This apparatus is what Claudia Orange explicitly calls "memory banks" or "memory stimulators", which stimulate collective memory and constitute a political operation of memory, or memorialising.[15] Settlement is a programme, or programming of settlers, so that the place they inhabit is one they can in time imagine is their own. It unfolds a triadic logic of settler dreaming which involves re-enactment, remediation, and what I call cultural plagiarism.

(1) Re-enactment tells the story of New Zealand as if the place, so-called, always already existed as such, enclosing the long history of Māori inhabitation in the short history of non-Māori occupation. In the first instance "I", the would-be settler (I-settler), step ashore in someone else's country; in the second instance, which is when I recall or remember stepping ashore, it is my own country. This is the logic of re-enactment, apparent in New Zealand popular national historiography. In the television documentary *Frontier of Dreams* (2005), Dutch explorer Abel Tasman is said to have "brought Europe to our shores", Captain Cook influenced "Europe's view of us", "our islands would be brought to the attention of old Europe", and so on.[16] Embedding a memory of "ourselves" as already here requires a national historians' complex, an institution whose mandate, mindset, and methodology is to construct and maintain cultural memory. *Frontier of Dreams*, which is the most expensive documentary made in New

Zealand, with a large book of essays to match by leading local historians, suggests an always inaugurating act of cultural construction and settler inception.[17]

(2) Remediation refers to the technologies and infrastructure of settlement through which history and collective memory are mediated, namely universities and historians, the Ministry of Culture and Heritage, Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa, and the numerous local museums and vistor centres.[18] More specifically it refers to the technological mediation or means of re-enactment, the sense of always having seen something before. Thus *Frontier of Dreams*, for instance, is shot through with TV and film clips of earlier re-enactments of settlement. The origin of settlement is not actual encounter, when of course the New Zealand of settlers could not be said to exist, but in the re-enactment of the moment as if it (New Zealand) already did exist.

(3) Cultural plagiarism refers to the "uniqueness" of Māori that Pākehā appropriate to disguise their otherwise unexceptional settlement. I draw on Miles Fairburn's thesis of New Zealand's "exceptionally unexceptional" settlement.[19] For Fairburn there isn't anything about the settlement of New Zealand that couldn't be said about other Anglophone settler societies. Furthermore, he argues that New Zealand's public culture is, to a greater extent than these like-countries, made up of materials from elsewhere. One draws the conclusion that New Zealand has been "settled" by other settler societies as much as by the home countries of settlers' origin. The "exception deficit" is made up for by Māori, who labour for the sake of all New Zealand citizens to produce both a place of origin and an original culture. For settlers the two go hand in hand, requiring co-option and co-ordination. Whether or not the widespread use of Māori insignia to identify New Zealandness is a matter of fruitful borrowing or appropriation, cultural plagiarism makes Māori culture integral to settler identity in a way that settler culture is not integral to Māori identity.

Structural intent of settler dreaming

I have said that the "intent" of the settler dream is structural, and is the basis of a settler apparatus or memory-machinery. Structural intent in this instance refers to the settler economism that determines the structure of the dream and containment of dream content.[20,21] 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-I). 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. These dreamers, or those who have internalised the promise of place to follow hard upon their settlement of it, express the purposeful drive of settler economism. The place-to-come is then a reality we are already living, or dreaming, an experience of a place that is, and indeed always was, already here.

Again, the object or "it" of this dream is a pure intent that is structural and economistic, and not any single person's intent. The intentional memory I am describing is collective, public and shared, which is to say it is everybody's intent (the conglomerate intent of everybody's settlement here). Its object, historically speaking, is the place-to-come and person-to-be of the new country—the very personification of settler investment in it. Those who were already here (Māori) or more recently arrived (more recent migrants) must labour to maintain this settler-I, which I elsewhere call compulsory nationalism, for all our sakes.[22]

There is of course another kind of intent at work, which refers to the perceptual gap, already mentioned, between Māori difference to Pākehā, as Pākehā see it, and Pākehā difference to Māori, as Māori see it. This is the intentional presence and counter-memory of long history. Here the settler-I and Māori-you, that foundational relation, is reversed. The question of what "you" are or who you are, if Pākehā, becomes "who are you" to Māori (the I-settler is now you to the Māori-I, second to Māori firstness).[23] The place is not, after all, "exotic" to Māori, but experienced through layers of collective memory, organised by whakapapa. The settler-I, understood in another's terms, is also intersubjective and relational, and not simply economistic, when it is considered you-to-Māori, and not Māori-to-me. Beyond the cultural plagiarism of all things Māori for the nation's sake, short history opens out to long history, which encompasses it, and the dream is interrupted by a real encounter and exchange beyond settler knowledge of place. Setter dreaming might here include Māori hope—the hope of hapu—and not just the collective hope of "all" New Zealanders.

More positively interrupted, as opposed to the negative interruption by states of abandonment, the dream content appears open rather than closed to a past that is the real basis of the ongoing construction of place. Aware that remembering, too, is a part of the make-over of place, one is dis-burdened of anxiety, anger and dread: the anxiety and settler refrain of being "nowhere", anger at Māori advancement, and the dread of Māori initiatives for Māori sake. Settler dreaming actually produces a sense of nowhere by making it all the harder to know where one actually is, or more specifically whose place it might actually be, as well as producing a dread of Māori difference as a subtraction, and hence contraction, of national being. The greater "we" are diminished by the loss of territory and numbers. Tūhoe, for instance, must remain part of New Zealand, and Tūhoe must be New Zealanders, for all our sakes. But it is not just Tūhoe who are beholden to the circumscribed life of settler dreaming.

Throughout this article I am indebted to Soong Phoon, whose brainchild it is.

Endnotes

[1]See Lorenzo Veracini, *Settler Colonialism: A Theoretical Overview* (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010).

[2]In *The Settler's Plot: How Stories Take Place in New Zealand* (Auckland: Auckland University Press, 2011), 3. Alex Calder's reflection on bush and beach opens out a rich discussion of "Pākehā turangawaewae [standing place of Non-Māori New Zealanders]: Not only are we a predominantly suburban people, only intermittently in contact with dreamscapes of bush and beach, but nature itself isn't what it used to be. These days nature is as likely to be virtual as actual, managed rather than wild, and has come to seem more and more something that culture produces than a realm beyond the ideas and frameworks we have of it."

[3]In *Against Paranoid Nationalism; Searching for Hope in a Shrinking Society* (Annandale, NSW: Pluto Press; London; Merlin, 2003), to which I am much indebted, Ghassan Hage discusses negative and positive moral evaluations of hope (11-12), but not settlement itself, rather than migrancy, as a pathology of hope.

[4]Claudia Orange, "The Memory of a Nation," paper presented at the Contained Memory conference, Pupuri Pohewa, Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa, Wellington, December 9-11, 2010.

[5]Francis Pound, *The Invention of New Zealand: Art and National Identity 1930-1970* (Auckland: Auckland University Press, 2009).

[6]See Manatū Taonga / Ministry for Culture and Heritage, accessed October 7, 2011, http://www.mch.govt.nz/

[7]Walter Benjamin, "Theses on the Philosophy of History," trans. Harry Zohn, *Illuminations* (New York: Schocken Books, 1968), 257-58.

[8]See child poverty statistics, accessed October 7, 2011, http://www.occ.org.nz/home/childpoverty/about_child_poverty,

[9]Laurence Simmons, "Rogue Pākehā," *Arena* 28 (2007): 45-64.

[10]See Giorgio Agamben, *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life* (*Potere sovrano e la nuda vita*), trans. Daniel Heller-Roazen (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998).

[11]F.M. Brookfield points this out in *Waitangi and Indigenous Rights: Revolution, Law and Legitimation* (Auckland: Auckland University Press, 1999).

[12]Bill Pearson, "Fretful Sleepers," *Fretful Sleepers and Other Essays* (Auckland: Heinemann Education Books, 1974 – Revised edn. 1952).

[13]See the factsheets relating to Māori health, education, unemployment and personal income on the website for the government ministry Te Puni Kokori, accessed October 7, 2011, http://www.tpk.govt.nz/en/in-print/our-publications/fact-sheets/

[14]Māori collectives are typically described in terms of their extent, whether the extended family grouping (whanau), the interrelated families of a subtribe (hapu), or the genealogically interrelated families of a tribal confederation (iwi).

[15]Conference programme notes for Orange, "The Memory of a Nation".

[16]See my own article, "Reenacting Aotearoa, New Zealand," in *Settler and Creole Reanactment,* eds. Jonathan Lamb and Vanessa Agnew (Basingstoke; New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), 245-257.

[17]Bronwyn Dalley and Gavin Mclean, eds. *Frontier of Dreams: The Story of New Zealand* (Auckland: Hodder Moa Beckett, 2005).

[18]See Anna Boswell's excellent study of museums in Northland, "'Shakey Notions': Settlement History on Display" (PhD diss., University of Auckland, 2011).
[19]Miles Fairburn, "Is There a Good Case for New Zealand Exceptionalism?" in eds. Tony Ballantyne and Brian Moloughney, *Disputed Histories: Imagining New Zealand's Pasts* (Dunedin: Otago University Press, 2006), 143-68.
[20]"Economism" is privileged as a primary structuring factor of settler dreaming because the identity of the new country is at once necessary to furthering an economic enterprise—to attracting new settlers and capital investment—and can itself be considered an existential return, or reward, for personal investment in the new country. See Stephen Turner, "Compulsory Nationalism," *Moving Worlds* 8(2), (2008): 7-26.
[21]A structural intent, or settler function, stands in place of an unconscious or latent content. The entwined logic of re-enactment, remediation and cultural plagiarism stands in place of mechanisms of condensation and displacement (so there is strictly speaking no Freudian unconscious or Lacanian Real). The "unconscious" for me is rather settler functioning, which is the systematic unfolding of the dream—dreamscape and dreamland—of second settlers.
[22]Turner, "Compulsory Nationalism," 7-26.
[23]Jo Smith provides a version of this reversal in "Post-Cultural Hospitality: Settler-Native-Migrant Encounters," *Arena* 28 (2007), 65-86, where she argues that the "vexed politics of culture" in Aotearoa New Zealand must be reconceived in terms of an originary host-guest (tangata whenua-munuhiri) relation. Without such a leap of faith, or trust in Māori reciprocity, the Pākehā will remain truly a vagrant, thief, and usurper.

Bibliography

Agamben, Giorgio, *Homo Sacer; Sovereign Power and Bare Life* (*Potere sovrano e la nuda vita*), trans. Daniel Heller-Roazen (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998).

Ballantyne, Tony and Moloughney, Brian, *Disputed Histories: Imagining New Zealand's Pasts* (Dunedin: Otago University Press, 2006).

Benjamin, Walter, "Theses on the Philosophy of History," in trans. Harry Zohn, *Illuminations* (New York: Schocken Books, 1968).

Boswell, Anna, "'Shakey Notions': Settlement History on Display," (PhD diss., University of Auckland, 2011).

Brookfield, F.M., *Waitangi and Indigenous Rights: Revolution, Law and Legitimation* (Auckland: Auckland University Press, 1999).

Calder, Alex, *The Settler's Plot: How Stories Take Place in New Zealand* (Auckland: Auckland University Press, 2011).

Fairburn, Miles, "Is There a Good Case for New Zealand Exceptionalism?" in eds. Tony Ballantyne and Brian Moloughney, *Disputed Histories: Imagining New Zealand's Pasts* (Dunedin: Otago University Press, 2006).

Disputed Histories: Imagining New Zealand's Pasts edited by Tony Ballantyne and Brian Hage, Ghassan, *Against Paranoid Nationalism: Searching for Hope in a Shrinking Society* (London: Pluto Press, 2003).

Orange, Claudia, "The Memory of a Nation," paper presented at the Contained Memory conference, Pupuri Pohewa, Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa, Wellington, December 9-11, 2010.

Pound, Francis, *The Invention of New Zealand: Art and National Identity 1930-1970* (Auckland: Auckland University Press, 2009).

Simmons, Laurence, "Rogue Pākehā," *Arena* 28 (2007): 45-64.

Smith, Jo, "Post-Cultural Hospitality: Settler-Native-Migrant Encounters," *Arena* 28 (Spring 2007): 65-86.

Turner, Stephen, "Make-Over Culture and the New Zealand Dream of Home," *Landfall* 214 (2007): 85-90.

Turner, Stephen, "Compulsory Nationalism," *Moving Worlds* 8(2), (2008): 7-26.

Veracini, Lorenzo, *Settler Colonialism: A Theoretical Overview* (Basingstoke and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010).

Biographical note

Stephen Turner teaches in the English Department at the University of Auckland, New Zealand and also contributes to courses in the Department of Film, Television and Media Studies. His research interests take in post-colonial and writing studies. He has published articles on settlement and indigeneity in a variety of domestic and international journals and anthologies, and worked with photographer-artist, Ann Shelton, on a text-image exhibition of her recent work. He is currently revising a book for publication on settler-colonialism which addresses issues of law, property and history, and working separately with Sean Sturm on a book about teaching writing. His interests are more broadly united by a concern with pedagogy, whether the performance of the classroom or the education of a national citizen.

Email: sf.turner@auckland.ac.nz