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ABSTRACT

This PhD dissertation focuses on ways in which Māori have embraced the city as a place of opportunity and have developed uniquely Māori urbanisms that are based in whakamanatanga (empowerment) rather than crisis or resistance. These whakamanatanga-based Māori urbanisms are connected to what I refer to as Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga. These geographies are characterized by Māori, living and working in Aotearoa New Zealand cities, who are creating urban geographies that foster, maintain and reproduce positive Māori urban identities and ways of life.

These geographies are framed within a theoretical approach that views both space and place as interdependent concepts. I argue that the development of space and place has reached a critical moment whereby these two concepts can no longer be viewed as separate in any theoretically meaningful way. Instead, I propose a space/place conceptual framework that treats space/place as mutually constitutive. I further argue that the insertion of indigenous perspectives into this space/place framework is necessary when applying this theory to research involving indigenous related issues.

This framework is then applied to the development of Māori urbanisms in Aotearoa New Zealand. These urbanisms are, it is argued, a product of both the challenges and opportunities cities have afforded Māori. Their responses to these urban challenges/opportunities have lead to multiple ways in which Māori, individually and in groups, have responded to life in cities. The main focus of this research is forms of Māori urbanisms grounded in
whakamanatanga, and in particular the geographic manifestations of these urbanisms.

The final chapters of this dissertation draw on empirical research undertaken in Aotearoa New Zealand over the course of six months in 2007 and 2008. This research shows how Māori, across a broad range of professions and in one specific place, are creating historically, socially and materially these urban geographies of whakamanatanga in the context of everyday life. A more specific focus on a place called Mana Moko-Te Karanga (Kfm) demonstrates how these geographies are simultaneously locally informed and globally connected. Kfm also demonstrates one possible socio-geographic formation whereby Māori can engage forces of globalization without cultural compromise.
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NOTE ON ORTHOGRAPHY AND PRONUNCIATION

Māori is written using the Latin alphabet and as a result only a few special features must be noted in order to make it clear to non-Māori speakers. Consonants in Māori are pronounced as they are in English with the exception of the diagraphs /ng/ and /wh/. The /ng/ form is used often in Māori and comes closest to the way it is used in the English word “ringer” as opposed to the way it is used in “finger”. The /wh/ form is pronounced like the English /f/. Both the /ng/ and /wh/ forms can be found at the beginnings and in the middle of Māori words, but never at the end. The Māori language has five vowels (a, e, i, o and u) and they are pronounced similar to the way they are in Italian. Some Māori vowels are marked with a macron or tohuto (e.g., “ā”) in order to designate an elongation of that vowel when speaking. On occasion, and especially in older texts, this elongation is marked by doubling the vowel (e.g., “aa”) and will sometimes be seen in this dissertation when quoting older publications.

Throughout this dissertation many Māori words are used regularly both in my own discussions and by the Māori interviewed and quoted. The first time a Māori word is used it is italicized, and thereafter it is written in normal font. A definition (or definitions where appropriate) is given the first time a Māori word is used (usually in a footnote), and occasionally the meaning is given parenthetically when far removed from the page where the definition was first given. A glossary of the Māori words used regularly is included at the back of this dissertation.
1. Whakamanatanga-Based Māori Urbanisms: A New Perspective

The research undertaken in this dissertation involves ways in which Māori have embraced the city as a place of opportunity and have developed uniquely Māori urbanisms that are fundamentally based in whakamanatanga (empowerment) rather than in crisis or resistance. This phenomenon, what I refer to throughout this dissertation as Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga, focuses attention on ways in which Māori living and working in Auckland are transforming both urban space/place and the urban experience to meet their cultural and identity needs. Ultimately, what emerges from this argument is a theory about formations of Māori urbanisms that are at once positive and progressive (see Figure 1 and 2).

A theory of Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga involves the introduction of new ways of expressing the relationship between Māori values, Māori forms of knowledge and urban space/place. In developing a theory of whakamanatanga-based Māori urbanisms a new vocabulary is demanded that inserts key Māori concepts into a discussion about the relationship between
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1 Whakamanatanga is roughly translated as empowerment in English. Throughout this dissertation, wherever possible and appropriate, key concepts will be presented using Māori words that are then translated into English. All translations throughout this dissertation are either given to me from Māori language experts through personal correspondence or from four secondary sources: Ngata (1996), Ryan (NEED DATE), Tauroa (1990), Williams (2002), Barlow (1991). As is noted in the section titled “Orthography and Notes On Pronunciation,” the first time a Māori word is used it is italicized.
Māori and urban space/place in Aotearoa New Zealand. The development of this theory is based on the perspectives and thoughts expressed to me by the many Māori I spoke with during my field research; these individuals are practicing and embodying these whakamanatanga-based Māori urban geographies and it is from their voices that my arguments are derived.

Figure 1: Geographic Location of Aotearoa New Zealand: Aotearoa New Zealand is made up of two primary islands and is located in the southwestern corner of the Pacific Ocean. Its people, the Māori, represent the furthest south western migration of the macro cultural group known as Polynesians. Aotearoa New Zealand is one “point” in the Polynesian Triangle, an area of Polynesian culture stretching between the three points of Aotearoa New Zealand (southwest Pacific), Hawai’i (north central Pacific) and Rapanui (Easter Island; southeast Pacific) (source: Google Maps).

In the course of developing these ideas it became apparent to me that, while many Māori are living these new whakamanatanga-based urban geographies, few have explicitly recognized them as part of a broad phenomenon unfolding in Aotearoa New Zealand cities. Thus, this research introduces a new way of viewing the development of Māori society through a
whakamanatanga lens, and as such introduces a way of studying the relationship between Māori knowledge, Māori identities and urban processes. This new way of theorizing this relationship will have, I argue, profound and important connections to parallel forms of indigenized urbanisms that are developing in other cities around the world where indigenous peoples have urbanized.

Figure 2: Geographic Location of North Island: the North Island of Aotearoa New Zealand with the location of Auckland indicated by the letter “A”. All research undertaken for this dissertation was conducted on the North Island, with Auckland being the place of primary urban research focus. Research was also conducted in Hamilton and Gisborne (source: Google Maps).

While on the one hand this progressive approach to Māori urban research is a significant and timely one, it is simultaneously important to state from the outset that this dissertation is in no way a denial or refutation of the socio-cultural and socio-economic problems that are the reality for many Māori living in cities. Throughout Aotearoa New Zealand society Māori are over-represented in categories such as poverty, drug abuse, rates of imprisonment and recidivism,
broken families, health statistics, and educational performance and achievement, and like many societies around the world there is at least the perception that these negative characteristics are concentrated in cities. Nor is it a refutation of the need for a continued focus on these problems. However, what is being argued here is that other perspectives on Māori urbanisms need to be recognized in order to more fully comprehend the relationship between Māori society and cities. There is, in other words, another story to be told, and it is an important story that opens doors to progressive ways of understanding how Māori have negotiated modernity and the critical role cities have played in this negotiation. Moreover, it seems logical to at least entertain the possibility that embedded in these success stories of Māori urbanisms are possible strategies and models for helping Māori that have not been so successful at creating positive urban experiences.

What this line of reasoning seems to suggest is that Māori are constructing new ways of being Māori in cities that move beyond merely adapting to the forces of change that have been particularly intense since the coming of Europeans, and have partially been exacerbated by Māori urbanization. Instead, Māori are creating ways of being Māori in cities that are, quite frankly, difficult to label simply because they represent aspects of Māori society that have as yet not been fully understood and/or analyzed. Attempts on my part to academically “label” this new form of Māori urbanisms were initially deeply
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2 The main source I have used to indicate the fact that Māori as a society still suffer from the legacy of colonialism is: Harris R. & Robson B, (nd) eds. Hauora: Māori Standards of Health IV. A study of the years 2000–2005. Wellington: Te Rōpū Rangahau Hauora a Eru Pōmare.

3 For some examples of at least partial recognition of this phenomenon see: Barcham (1998), Rosenblatt (2002), Rosenblatt (2003), Borrell (2005), McIntosh (2005).
unsatisfactory and resulted in terms that did not fully or properly encapsulate the meaning I intended. Some of these less-than-adequate terms that first came to mind were: post-resistance, post-marginality, post-colonial, and avant-garde forms of Māori urbanisms. All of these represent attempts to capture the idea that somehow Māori, through all their struggles, are beginning to produce urban ways of being that are moving beyond marginalized identities and ways of life forged as part of the legacy of colonialism. In doing this they are producing something progressive, uniquely informed by Māori worldviews, unapologetically modern, and deeply committed to making the urban context work for Māori society and culture.

Ultimately, this line of thinking suggests a basic but critical series of questions. At what point is it possible for an indigenous urban culture such as the Māori to recognize that all their efforts to overcome the impact of colonialism have actually begun to work? At what point can there be recognition that, at least for some Māori living in cities, a moment has arrived when resistance to forces of colonialism have resulted in the production of urban identities that can move beyond resistance? And what comes after resistance? When does that moment occur when Māori can begin to focus greater amounts of time and energy into creatively and productively inserting Māori values and worldviews into the urban society that they are a part of, rather than put most of their energy into saving or rebuilding their culture? Moreover, what role has urbanization and the resulting Māori urbanisms that have formed played in this process of moving beyond resistance and cultural reconstruction, and in what way has this process been grounded in space, place and the built environment?
These are important questions that have informed much of the research that is discussed in this chapter and those that follow. This dissertation begins to answer these questions, although in no way does it claim to fully answer them, and in fact concentrates primarily on the last of these questions. The argument being made here is that this moment of moving beyond resistance has arrived for some Māori in cities and one way that it can be conceptually encompassed is through the concept Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga. The usefulness and appropriateness of this concept is based on its ability to emphasize the confluence of urbanisms, the geographic components of urbanisms, and the link between these two and Māori ways of interpreting and translating these processes. Urbanisms refer to the formation of unique ways of life that are a result of people growing up within, or from moving to, cities. The geographic components of Māori urbanisms encompass ways in which Māori have inserted/asserted Māori built environments, cultural landscapes and symbols into the urban context. Whakamanatanga-based Māori urbanisms are those that create a sense of well being for Māori, and create an urban context that fosters, maintains and reproduces their Māori identity in culturally productive and creative ways. It is the confluence of Māori urbanisms, Māori urban geographies and whakamanatanga that informs the main focus throughout this dissertation. In the chapters that follow this confluence will be introduced, but it is important to note from the outset that it is not being argued here that Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga represent a possible Aotearoa New
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| 4 Throughout this dissertation many examples of these types of Māori urban geographies are discussed. These include such diverse examples as Māori immersion language schools, Māori sacred spaces known as marae, Māori owned and operated businesses and Māori urban land claims. |
Zealand urban future, but rather that these urban geographies are being created in the present.

In the remainder of this chapter several key concepts will be explored as a framework for the remaining chapters. The first concept addressed below is the idea of whakamanatanga and the related Māori concept ka tau puawai. These concepts introduce the critical idea of empowerment from a Māori perspective. A discussion of indigenized urbanisms and the particularly Māori form of whakamanatanga-based indigenized urbanisms that is the focus of this research is then briefly engaged. Within this discussion the importance of the city as a critical context for the development of Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga is also introduced. This is followed by an introduction to the geographic theory that underlies this research, followed by a discussion of the methodologies applied to this research.

1.1 Māori Understandings of Empowerment: Whakamanatanga and Ka tau puawai

Given the inadequacies of existing academic terminology to “capture” this new phase of Māori urbanisms, it is logical and appropriate to turn to Māori concepts in order to make sense of the notion of positive engagements between Māori and cities. Two concepts are introduced here—whakamanatanga and ka tau puawai—each of which helps to understand what empowerment means from a Māori perspective.
1.1.1 Whakamanatanga: a Māori way of defining empowerment

Whakamanatanga is a word created for this dissertation in an attempt to consider and reference Māori ideas about empowerment. It was pointed out to me early in my research that the use of the English word, “empowerment,” was inherently problematic because of its connotations of a non-indigenous understanding of this concept. However, the fact remains that this is not a Māori word commonly or, possibly, ever used in everyday Māori conversations. Nevertheless, I have chosen to take the bold step of creating a Māori word in order to maintain a strong sense that it is Māori conceptions of empowerment that are informing the ideas and concepts being put forth in this dissertation.

Whakamanatanga is made up of three root words: “whaka,” “mana” and “tanga.” According to Dr. Rapata Wiri, Māori language expert, “whaka” is a causative prefix meaning “to make” or “to cause to.” “Tanga,” on the other hand, is a suffix that makes the word whakamana (empower) into a derived noun; i.e., “empower” becomes “empowerment.” However, the base word in whakamanatanga is “mana,” and as such its meaning is primarily derived from this central Māori concept. According to the Auckland University of Technology online Māori dictionary “mana” has the following definition:

**(noun)** prestige, authority, control, power, influence, status, spiritual power, charisma - mana is a supernatural force in a person, place or object. Mana goes hand in hand with tapu, one affecting the other. The more prestigious the event, person or object, the more it is surrounded by tapu and mana. Mana is the enduring, indestructible power of the atua and is inherited at birth, the more senior the descent, the greater the mana. The authority of mana and tapu is inherited and delegated through the senior line from the atua as their human agent to act on revealed will. Since authority is a spiritual gift delegated by the atua, man remains the agent, never the source of mana. This divine choice is confirmed by the
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5 In point of fact no Māori dictionary (hard copy or online) has this word in it.
6 [http://www.maoridictionary.co.nz/index.cfm](http://www.maoridictionary.co.nz/index.cfm)
elders, initiated by the tohunga under traditional consecratory rites (tohi). Mana gives a person the authority to lead, organise and regulate communal expeditions and activities, to make decisions regarding social and political matters. A person or tribe’s mana can increase from successful ventures or decrease through the lack of success. The tribe give mana to their chief and empower him/her and in turn the mana of an ariki or rangatira spreads to his/her people and their land. Almost every activity has a link with the maintenance and enhancement of mana and tapu. Animate and inanimate objects can also have mana as they also derive from the atua and because of their own association with people imbued with mana or because they are used in significant events.7

My experiences with both Hawaiian and Māori culture over the course of twenty years has demonstrated to me that “mana” is one of the most complex and profound concepts in Polynesia. It has links to both the most utilitarian aspects of everyday life as well as to the most abstract and esoteric aspects of the human condition. Mana goes beyond the daily lives of people to include, as noted above, all animate and inanimate objects, and as such this concept seems to infuse all aspects of a Māori worldview.

As an outsider to Polynesian culture and, more specifically, Māori culture I claim no expertise regarding the deepest and most profound meanings of “mana.” As such the best way to attempt to understand how mana plays a role in defining whakamanatanga is to ask Māori to explain how they define empowerment. These explanations can then collectively inform the meaning of whakamanatanga as it is being used throughout this dissertation. Like most complex cultural concepts, however, it turns out that there is some variation in how Māori conceive empowerment.

To begin with, there are significant differences between how Māori understand whakamanatanga compared to Western understandings of
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7 See the “Glossary of Māori Terms” at the end of this dissertation for definitions of “tapu,” “ariki,” “rangatira” and “atua.”
empowerment. On the one hand, I argue that no group—culture, society, ethnic group, identity group, etc—can claim empowerment as unique to their worldview; empowerment, in other words, represents a universal human potential. But I would further argue that how individuals or groups achieve this potential and even what aspects of human potential are perceived to be most valuable to achieving empowerment will vary depending on socio-cultural and historical context. In this sense then whakamanatanga can be translated as empowerment in English but this translation can only ever be an approximate one that is burdened by differing understandings of this concept that have developed in two very different socio-cultural contexts.⁸

Collins (2004) argues that the application of Western understandings of empowerment to Māori issues in Aotearoa New Zealand have not served to actually empower Māori in any meaningful way. She asserts that the Western “rationale that everybody can be empowered should be abandoned as a liberal utopian dream” (2004: 12). Unless fundamental inequalities are addressed—which for Collins’ are primarily a product of capitalism—empowerment just becomes a smoke screen for avoiding systemic inequalities embedded in systems based on profit. Collins’ makes a compelling argument that the way empowerment has been defined and applied in the context of Māori development in Aotearoa New Zealand has not succeeded in actually empowering many Māori, and that the core reason for this is that “real problems of social exclusion” exist that are not addressed by the “solutions” that are grounded in a Western definition of empowerment.

---

⁸ This argument can be extended to all Māori-to-English translations that are used throughout this dissertation.
Collins’ suggestion, however, to “jettison” (2004: 12) the term empowerment altogether seems too extreme. It may be true that the application of empowerment principles based on a Western definition have not worked for some (or even many) Māori, and in fact may have contributed to furthering inequalities as Collins argues. However, by rejecting this term altogether she is not giving Māori an opportunity to define this concept from their cultural perspectives. Māori have a very different sense of this concept and, as a result, may have ways of applying it that actually do address some of these fundamental inequalities, whether a product of capitalism or otherwise.

When I asked the various Māori I worked with throughout my research the question “how would you define empowerment from a Māori perspective” I got a range of answers. For example, Dr. Rapata Wiri, professor of Pacific Island studies, linguist, and native speaker of Māori, when asked this question offered the following explanation (email correspondence; original emphasis):

There is a difference between Maori and Western views of empowerment that centre around individual values versus communal values. Empowerment of our own lives really focuses on empowerment of our whanau [family], hapū [clan] and iwi [tribe]. This might sound a little romanticised but the priorities and empowerment of the whanau, hapū and iwi (especially whanau) take priority over individual empowerment. Of course, those individuals who aspire to great heights take with them their whanau, hapū and iwi. So as a result of an individual’s success the whole whanau succeeds. Likewise, if an individual doesn’t succeed and, for example, goes to jail for something then the whole whanau suffers as a result. So, empowerment is really a community thing.\(^9\)

---

\(^9\) The Māori concepts “whanau”, “hapū” and “iwi” are used extensively throughout this dissertation. They represent one of the most fundamental aspects of a Māori worldview and any consideration of Māori cannot avoid an understanding of how these concepts relate to and organize basic structures in Māori society. Traditionally an individual’s Māori identity is most intimately connected to his/her whanau (extended family). The whanau is a part of a larger group known as a hapū, and both the whanau and the hapū are geographically connected to a specific territory justified through use, extended occupation and genealogical linkages. Hapū are further connected to iwi, which are made up of two or more hapū and are also territorially and genealogically defined. This ancestrally linked geography is still very much relevant in contemporary Aotearoa New Zealand society, although the urban context has certainly
This community based way of defining and understanding empowerment suggests a uniquely Māori cultural perspective, particularly in the way that it is formalized through a hierarchy of identity groups. In Māori culture this sense of empowerment links these identity groups to specific territories as well, thereby anchoring identities in geography as much as in social groups connected through ancestry. Therefore, the problem is not the use of empowerment per say (as Collins argues above), but rather in making sure that empowerment is viewed through the lens of Māori cultural perspectives. A first step in doing this is to use the concept Whakamanatanga as a way to reference Māori ways of understanding empowerment. This communal sense of empowerment was echoed in other responses I received to the question “how do Māori define empowerment?” For example, Dr. Merata Kawharu (email correspondence; original emphasis), described empowerment from a Māori perspective in the following manner:

Exercising rangatiratanga (or mana) over material, non-material and human spheres. Hapū and iwi groups building their cultural, economic and political strength in the face of current challenges and opportunities. This includes exercising mana whenua, and being recognised by Māori and non-Māori, particularly the Crown. This is at a group level. At an individual level: security and confidence in one’s tribally-based identity, tempered against applying oneself in ways that are culturally accountable (preferably to iwi, hapū etc).10

10 Rangatiratanga in this case is being used to mean sovereignty; mana is one of the more complex Polynesian concepts, but suffice to say here that it has the following possible meanings: authority, control, influence, prestige, power, psychic force, or vested with effective authority.
And Keri–Anne Wikitera (email correspondence; original emphasis), Auckland University of Technology PhD student argued,

Empowerment to me is related to mana. A *kaumatua* (our hapū chief) said to me once that a man (or woman) cannot give his/herself power it must come from his/her people. If the people aren’t following then you ain’t no leader. My word for empowerment is *manaakitia*. Through my support to whanau, *aku hōa* (mates, work colleagues, local school etc) I feel empowered. Thus you find lots of Maori ‘volunteering’ to help at things. Related to the *marae* operations with the workers volunteering they make up the ‘informal economy’ i.e. the backbone of keeping the fires burning at the marae. Without the obligatory nature of *tikanga*-Maori such as *manaakitanga*, the marae wouldn’t exist. For us to empower the hapū or community, we must strive to support as much as we can and when we are in need, that *tautoko* will come back for us.¹¹

Both of these responses align with Dr. Wiri’s statement that actions that reinforce communal ties are an essential component of what empowerment means from a Māori perspective. In all three of the above cases the views being expressed are from Māori who have strong connections to their traditional Māori *whakapapa* (genealogy). This means that each of these Māori are profoundly and directly connected to a hierarchy of whanau (extended family), hapū (clan), and iwi (tribe; more than one in all three cases) that gives them a solid identity forged in this fundamental Māori social system based on genealogical and territorial linkages.

Thus, one way to understand what it means to develop Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga is through the building of Māori urban geographies that foster a strong sense of community in the urban context. Through this building of community mana is increased for both individuals and
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¹¹ *Kaumatua* is an old man or woman, but this term seemed to me to always be used with a sense of respect for the wisdom that is the privilege of age; *manaakitia* translates in this case to “care for,” “show respect for,” “hospitality;” *marae* refers to a generally enclosed area that contain a series of Māori structures, often elaborately carved, used for funerals, meetings, and other community functions; *tikanga* refers to “custom” or “tradition;” *tautoko* as it is being used here refers to “support.”
groups. For some Māori this sense of community is tied profoundly to *whakapapa*, a genealogically based sense of identity, and it often creates strong links between Māori living in cities and their tribal affiliations, wherever that tribal group’s territory may be. In some cases this creates a rural-urban connection and in others there is an overlap between the urban area and tribal areas. Either way the main point is that a sense of whakamanatanga comes from a strong sense of linkages to *whanau* (extended family), *hapū* (clan) and *iwi* (tribe) and this sense of linkage is incorporated into an urban context.

For example, Dr. Merata Kawharu (quoted above) is a member of Ngāti Whātua o Ōrākei, an iwi whose geographic base covers large parts of Auckland, including its inner city. The process of integrating a Ngāti Whātua o Ōrākei socio-geographic perspective within the context of Auckland’s urban environment and the overlaying of urban systems based on a Western ideology has been a challenge for this iwi, and it is one that they have engaged creatively and successfully. They are creating Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga, purposefully and critically from a tribal perspective.\(^\text{12}\)

However, it can be noted here that those Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga that are tribally focused are diverse geographically and encompass rural-to-urban linkages, urban-to-urban linkages and even local-to-global linkages.

While these tribally based views are critical to any discussion of how to define core concepts from a Māori perspective, some of the people I spoke with on this issue of Māori definitions of empowerment were not as intimately

\(^{12}\text{Dr. Kawharu is one of the featured academics in chapter five where this issue will be covered in more detail.}\)
connected to their whakapapa. Some of the individuals that are embodying this movement are profoundly whakapapa linked while others are not, and this difference, my research suggests, does not in anyway point to degrees of relevance or impact as “players” in this movement.

One of the more profound and interesting responses to the question “how would you define empowerment from a Māori perspective?” came from a graphic and interior designer by the name of Carin Wilson. In an email responding to this question he wrote (original emphasis):

Empowerment has been a much over worked expression in these parts over the past few years. Kind of in vogue among the New Agers. I would say you have it right with whakamanatanga but that alone isn’t the whole story. Whakamanatanga comes from an informed sense of self, and with the shedding of that hesitant moment in thought...’who am I’ comes a better appreciation and understanding of who the other guy is: I’m able to no longer be threatened by any sense of one culture occupying a higher ground than the other. All of those tools we have been using (te reo, Māori studies, wananga, haka, dance, theatre, all of the art forms...) are all building back that solid base that was so eroded by the processes attached to ‘enlightenment’ (which we can now see as being far from enlightened), of religionism and colonisation—along with their myriad attendant tools of asserting ‘a greater knowing’. I’d suggest a bold proposition: that the whole thing is turning around, that what now informs or empowers at a global level is the feedback coming from those indigenous cultures that have been able to retain or recover critical fragments of identity and use this understanding to address urgent questions around behaviour and practice that now threaten our survival.

Carin’s views on whakamanatanga suggests another set of definitions of empowerment that, while equally grounded in a Māori sense of identity, incorporates concepts that move away from the communal definition given by Dr. Wiri, Dr. Kawharu, and Keri-Anne. But in doing so I would argue Carin also suggests that some Māori living in cities, even those raised in a context lacking a
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13 Te reo is a generic way of referring to the use, teaching, and speaking of the Māori language; Wananga are Māori schools which have proliferated over the last couple of decades; haka is a Māori form of dance.
strong whakapapa component, are beginning to contribute in meaningful and profound ways to the production of emerging Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga. Perhaps even more importantly is the way that Carin suggests that Māori whakamanatanga is not only happening through, for example, the efforts of language revival, education, and artistic expression, but also that through these efforts Māori identities are being forged that are moving beyond resistance and marginalization and into a consciousness that is no longer threatened “by any sense of one culture occupying a higher ground than the other.” Carin takes this argument one step further when he asserts that as a result of this shift in consciousness Māori, and those indigenous cultures that have made similar progress, are now forcefully and meaningfully asserting their views at the level of regional and global issues.

Carin’s view on empowerment suggests a central point that is argued throughout this research: that from this new phase of whakamanatanga-based Māori urbanisms are emerging perspectives that are outward looking at all scales, and that this outward focus marks a phase whereby Māori are inserting/asserting in powerful and meaningful ways their worldviews and values into contemporary society. This is not to say, however, that the more whakapapa-based views expressed by Dr. Wiri, Dr. Kawharu, and Keri-Anne are not outward looking. Many tribal groups are, to a greater or lesser extent, very much about connecting to regional and globalized networks, but while the tribal view is fundamentally grounded in forging a tribal group identity that is distinct from other Māori groups as well as non-Māori groups, Carin’s perspective suggests a broader, perhaps more abstract and even pan-Māori perspective. Are these contrasting perspectives contradictory? Or can they exist in a
complimentary fashion? The research undertaken here suggests that the answer is that both of these outcomes are possible, and that in fact this tension between tribally informed understandings of Māori identity and those informed by a more pan-Māori perspective have been intensified by processes of Māori urbanization. Ultimately, however, it is further argued here that Māori urban geographies that manifest whakamanatanga in the individuals and groups interacting with them are able, by definition, to overcome these tensions.

1.1.2 Ka tau puawai: the blossoming warrior

Another Māori concept that informs this discussion of Māori conceptualizations of empowerment is *ka tau puawai*. In particular this concept speaks to ways in which Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga are an emerging phenomenon that is still in the process of becoming. This Māori concept is one that I was first introduced to by Tipene O'Regan, an artist, builder, Māori martial artist, and Māori spiritualist. *Ka tau puawai* captures elegantly a basic assertion that informed much of my research: that there are a growing number of Māori that are reaping the benefits of the efforts by Māori, particularly over the last several decades, to resist the legacies of colonialism and reclaim their culture. From these efforts have emerged individual Māori and Māori organizations that no longer define themselves in terms of resistance and/or cultural reclaiming (or at least not primarily or exclusively), but instead have entered a new consciousness framework that is operating in a context that no longer needs to consider the legacy of colonialism as a significant motivator for their actions. No term that uses the word “colonial” in it can adequately
define this new framework (the words “postcolonial” and “decolonization” immediately come to mind as two such inadequate terms) because it is a framework that is no longer informed by its relationship to this legacy. Thus, we need to turn to Māori concepts to begin to develop adequate terminology for this emerging phenomenon. In the above discussion whakamanatanga was presented as one important Māori term that captures this new phase.

Ka tau puawai adds to the discussion of whakamanatanga by suggesting a process by which Māori are actively becoming empowered. The essence of this term is of an individual coming in to one’s inner power. Whether one is more comfortable conceiving of this from a psychological perspective or a spiritual one is not as important as understanding how it fits into this discussion of Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga. From either of these perspectives (psychological or spiritual) ka tau puawai involves developing a sense of whakamanatanga at the deepest levels of consciousness and being able to live your everyday life within the context of this sense of ones self (similar to what Carin refers to above as an “informed sense of self”). In the way that Tipene presented it to me it was clearly a spiritual concept, and in the context of Māori worldviews this is not a problematic statement. From Māori perspectives spirituality is an essential aspect of defining what it means to be human. Dr. Wiri added this more etymological interpretation of ka tau puawai concept in an email:

\[\text{\textcopyright Dr. Rapata Wiri, 2023} \]

\[\text{14 The following description related via email to me by Dr. Rapata Wiri succinctly demonstrates the idea that, from a Māori perspective, spirituality is an ever present and unproblematic component of human existence:} \]

\[\text{“According to Tutakangahau (a Tuhoe tohunga who was an informant of Elsdon Best) when Hineahuone was created she was implanted with a spiritual dimension (taha wairua) and an earthly dimension (taha whenua). The culmination of these two elements created the human element (ira tangata). So humans consist of these three dimensions.”} \]
Ka tau puawai means: "to grow and blossom." To break it down: "Ka tau" has many meanings depending on its context like "excellent" (Ka tau ke!). It can mean to land as in "ka tau te manu ki runga i te rakau," (the bird landed on the tree). It can also mean to be settled "ka tau oku maharahara" (my concerns have been settled). Tau is part of the word matauranga which can mean "to mature" or "to grow" or "develop intellectually." Here the meaning is knowledgeable in the most advanced sense of the word (i.e., "He tangata matauranga ia" - he is a knowledgeable person). Salmond argues that matauranga means that the knowledge has had an opportunity to settle in your mind. Therefore in learning you progress from mohiotanga (to know something) to matauranga. Puawai simply means to blossom as in "Kua puawai nga putiputi" (the flowers are blossoming), or it can refer to people or places that may be blossoming. "Kua puawai tenei taone" (this town has blossomed).

This etymological explanation points to the core strength of ka tau puawai as a phrase. In all its parts the term suggests excellence, groundedness, maturity through growth (mental and spiritual), to develop in positive ways, and to acquire profound knowledge; more importantly, by attaching puawai, all of these positive connotations are evoked as occurring now, coming into ones power, reaching a fullness of potential.

The connection between ka tau puawai and this research is in its ability to frame the process of Māori urban whakamanatanga in a manner that is grounded in Māori conceptions of growth and change. The following conversation between Tipene O'Regan and myself encompasses some of this argument:

Serge: How does ka tau puawai fit into this development of Māori living in cities in an empowered way?

Tipene: I think you’ve already encapsulated it in your whole movement. I mean when people get it, what’s the movement that you do? Finally got it! You know? And I think when your talking architecture (for example), there’s been such a growth in architecture because people understand, especially Māori, the impact of living badly around an environment that doesn’t work for you…what that makes you do. You know, you don’t have a sanctuary, and in a modern world it’s very important, especially to Māori, to have a sanctuary to come home to, and be able to call that home; and that is your tārangawāewae at that moment...because you live in the moment. So when your talking
ka tau puawai…I see a lot of designers now and a lot of Māori people…they’re getting it, and they’re creating they’re own boundaries in their design (like you’ve probably seen at designTRIBE…now that creates a wave of change, and that change has been going on for a while now…If you believe something you create it; and that is a very Māori way of dealing with things.\textsuperscript{15}

The movement that Tipene is referring to at the beginning of this statement is one he used continuously throughout our discussion to physically illustrate ka tau puawai. This movement involves an individual putting his hands over his stomach area, gathering his/her energy in this region and then folding his/her hands outward towards the person being addressed. At the end of this movement your hands end up palm upward as if you are holding water, but instead of water you are holding your “energy” in a way that is offering it both to the person you are speaking to and to the “Universe” in general. Embodied in this movement is a gesture that encompasses both sharing and strength. The sharing of ones \textit{wairua} (spirit, life energy) from a place of inner strength that allows for sharing in a spirit of trust and equality (hence individual power).

What is important here is the way Tipene then links this movement to an argument that Māori comprehend the importance of creating environments that foster a profound sense of place. He invokes the Māori concept \textit{tūrangawaewae} to describe this sense of place and in so doing references one of the more culturally

\textsuperscript{15} An important component of the story of ka tau puawai as related by Tipene is the context in which he received his formative training in this concept. He was introduced to the true meaning of ka tau puawai through his work with an organization that was dedicated to empowering Māori men who had recently been released from prison. Māori men in New Zealand have both a higher rate of incarceration than other groups as well as a higher rate of recidivism. The program Tipene became a councilor in took Māori men recently released from prison out into remote areas on the South Island and taught them to love and respect both themselves and other men. In this sense then, ka tau puawai represented a pathway to meaningfully impacting the lives of people that have, arguably, strayed as far away from empowerment as possible (see Harris R. and Robson B, (nd: 27-28) for an overview of this over representation of Māori in the Aotearoa New Zealand prison system).
and geographically powerful Māori concepts. Tūrangawaewae is a very complex Māori concept that is most often translated into English as “a place to stand” and is traditionally linked to allegiance to a geographic area, the socio-cultural “right” to occupy a particular place or territory, and the genealogical link justifying ones “right” to a place or territory (Karetu, 1990). However, Tipene is using this concept in a more general way to refer to the ability of Māori to manufacture a profound sense of place in a more flexible manner that suggests adaptation to new socio-geographic contexts such as those brought on by urbanization. He further argues that this need for tūrangawaewae is an essential component of being Māori and that those Māori in the business of designing spaces are incorporating these value systems into their designs.16

This last assertion links to one of the core arguments in this dissertation. Tipene argues that the process of actualizing and embodying ka tau puawai at the level of everyday consciousness, the need for tūrangawaewae, and the ability of Māori working in various professions that involve the incorporation of Māori values and worldviews into the design and creation of built environments all suggest a “wave of change” that is in the process of becoming. In his own way Tipene is making an argument that is fundamental to this research: that Māori, through their struggles to maintain cultural integrity in the context of colonialism, through engagement with contemporary society, and through their need for built environments that foster and reproduce their cultural values and worldviews, are producing these materialities in cities like Auckland. They are

16 The idea and challenge of incorporating Māori concepts, values and worldview into Māori design is one that has been taken up by Māori architects and designers, some of who were interviewed for this research project (see chapter five).
doing this in a wide variety of ways, using a broad range of mediums, and this creative productivity has a momentum that is beginning to redefine what it means to be Māori living in an urban context. It is this process that captures the essence of what I mean by Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga.

1.1.3 Defining Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga

The previous two sub-sections demonstrated ways in which Māori, from various backgrounds and professions, are able to define empowerment from a Māori perspective. This perspective involved a strong sense of community, spirituality and the assertion of Māori identity regardless of the context (e.g., rural, urban, business, academic). It was also argued that a new phase of Māori empowerment is occurring, especially in Aotearoa New Zealand’s urban areas, referred to as whakamanatanga-based Māori urbanisms. A critical component of these emerging urbanisms are material expressions of whakamanatanga or, to put it in the terms used throughout this dissertation, Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga.

A clearer understanding of how Māori define whakamanatanga allows for a first attempt at defining more specifically what is meant by Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga. These geographies demand three essential components: 1) that they be derived wholly or at least significantly from a Māori perspective and way of doing things (i.e., Māori are meaningfully connected to

17 I may be stretching Tipene's argument here a bit in making the strong connection to urban space. I do not think he would disagree with this connection, but he does not make this connection directly in the above quote, although in many of our conversations the urban component was discussed.
these geographies), 2) that the urban be an essential component of their production (i.e., they happen in cities), and 3) that these spaces/places foster, maintain and reproduce whakamanatanga in those individuals that interact with them (i.e., they increase mana in both individuals and groups). A whakamanatanga-based space/place is one that further demands three critical elements: meaningful control by Māori, lived participation by Māori, and creative growth of individual Māori and/or groups or organizations Māori are involved with. When these criteria are present the existence of Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga can be asserted. Chapters 5 through eight of this dissertation are dedicated to empirical studies that demonstrate this process at work in the everyday lives of Māori from a wide range of backgrounds and professions. The remainder of this chapter focuses on the theoretical and methodological challenges and strategies used in order to approach the study of Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga.

1.2 Researching Māori Urban Geographies of Whakamanatanga From a Theoretical Perspective

Whakamanatanga and ka tau puawai are Māori concepts that infuse all aspects of this research. A whakamanatanga perspective suggests that Māori are experiencing forms of urbanisms in socio-culturally progressive and positive ways as a direct result of the urbanization process. The addition of ka tau puawai emphasizes that whakamanatanga-based Māori urbanisms are continuously in the process of becoming and, arguably, have achieved a point where they are emerging as a significant counter urban experience to the more
negative ones that have achieved discursive prominence through books and movies such as *Once Were Warriors* (Duff, 1990; Tamahori, 1994). These two concepts, working in tandem, serve as the foundation for understanding the intent and “spirit” of this research. However, it is also necessary and important to consider more broadly ways in which to approach the study of whakamanatanga-based Māori urbanisms both theoretically and methodologically. In this section the question of theory is addressed and in the following one the main methodologies utilized in this research are discussed.

My research on Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga is theoretically grounded in three related arguments: 1) the assertion of a space/place ontology in which human existence is understood as simultaneously social, historical and geographical (following Soja, 1996); 2) an argument that cities create challenges and opportunities for those living in them not just as a result of historical and social processes, but also importantly and equally because of spatial/platial processes; 3) an argument that these challenges and opportunities lead to the formation of discernable urbanisms or urban ways of life.

These three perspectives are, in Chapters 2, three and four, more specifically linked to discussions of the historical and contemporary relationship between Māori and cities in Aotearoa New Zealand. The space/place ontology that I introduce in Chapter 2 is challenged and modified through an engagement with Māori worldviews. In Chapter 3 an argument that cities constitute distinctive space/place challenges and opportunities for those migrating to urban areas is framed within the context of the historic rural-to-urban migration undertaken by Māori. This discussion is further framed, in Chapter 4, within an
argument that this engagement between Māori and cities has led to distinctive Māori urbanisms that are a critical component of contemporary Aotearoa New Zealand cultural politics. Each of the three theoretical arguments mentioned above are briefly introduced in the next three sub-sections.

1.2.1 An argument for an indigenized space/place ontology

This research engages the concepts space and place and how these two concepts interrelate in order to emphasize the role of material geographies in the fostering, maintaining and reproducing of whakamanatanga-based Māori urbanisms. Given my background as a human geographer it makes the most sense to me to approach research on processes of Māori urbanization and formations of Māori urbanisms from the perspective of the interface between the socio-cultural expression of this phenomenon and its geographical manifestations. This discussion involves some of the most fundamental arguments that have developed in Anglo-American human geography in the 20\textsuperscript{th} and early 21\textsuperscript{st} centuries. The way that these arguments have unfolded, particularly in recent years, has profound implications for human geography as an academic field and one of the goals of this dissertation is to contribute meaningfully to this ongoing theoretical discussion.

From a personal perspective space and place have played a critical role in my development as a geographer. I began my career as a staunch humanistic geographer and, as an undergraduate, I was taught to view place as the concept most suited to rescue geography from an overly objective, rational, science-based and, most egregiously, de-humanized geography. My position as a place-
centered geographer lasted into graduate school until I developed my MA thesis research focus (a human geography oriented deconstruction of an early 1990s Waikiki planning document). This research had as one of its central theoretical components the work of Henri Lefebvre. While I was not willing to give up place, and actively incorporated it into my arguments, my intensive engagement with Lefebvre’s socio-spatial theory (and with geographers such as David Harvey and Edward Soja who developed some of their theories from Lefebvre’s work) led me to reassess my ideas about the relevance of space to geographic research. It was through this work that I began to develop a sense that both space and place were not only equally relevant concepts, but that it was the engagement between the two that reaped the most productive research and analysis. As it turned out I certainly was not alone in this movement towards theories that viewed these concepts as importantly linked rather than in opposition, or as in a subordinate, ordinate relationship.

In order to understand this relationship better, Chapter 2 looks more closely at the historical and contemporary development of space and place theory in human geography. The goal of this chapter is to develop a space/place conceptual framework that forms one of the main theoretical foundations for this research. This involves the proposition of a perspective that views space and place as inextricably related concepts—a perspective that forms the basis for a powerful approach to understanding human activities, processes and phenomena. Chapter 2 focuses on this proposition, but further introduces and inserts indigenous and Māori perspectives on space/place into this framework.

While it is far more common for researchers to make connections between indigenous’ worldviews and place (e.g., Murton, 2008; Low & Lawrence-Zuniga,
I argue in Chapter 2 that the development of socio-spatial theory also has important implications for indigenous studies. In particular, I argue that socio-spatial theory based on the work of Henri Lefebvre (1991) is useful when studying indigenous issues because it involves a critical engagement with, and critique of, forces of modern, industrial capitalist society, a critique that is certainly relevant to contemporary indigenous issues. This is especially the case in the context of indigenous urbanization, a process that involves indigenous peoples choosing to live in cities—the most intense and extensive manifestations of modern, industrial capitalist society (Harvey, 1982).

This argument does not, however, mean that place is relegated to a secondary level of importance vis-à-vis space, or that these two concepts are treated as mutually exclusive in this research. Rather, the theoretical framework that emerges from Chapter 2 is one that constructs space/place as mutually constitutive concepts, but also argues that applications of these concepts to indigenous issues must take seriously the ways in which indigenous peoples conceive these concepts. Any approach to space/place within the context of indigenous studies that does not do this is, I argue, flawed from its inception and in danger of reproducing Western-centric interpretations of indigenous issues.

To discursively reinforce this argument I refrain from referring to space or place as distinct concepts as much as possible and instead refer to space/place. Thus, I ask the reader to become accustomed to reading space/place as a reference to the argument that these two concepts, while not identical, are always in a mutually constitutive relationship. In other words, one does not exist without the other, and both are present and continuously being socially produced and reproducing sociality simultaneously. Ultimately, the main goal of
Chapter 2 is to elucidate this space/place framework and meaningfully couple it with indigenous and, more specifically, Māori understandings of space/place.

1.2.2 Cities as Māori spaces/places of challenges and opportunities

A second theoretical perspective that informs this research involves the role of cities in the formation of unique ways of life. Chapters 3 and 4 look more closely at the relationship between cities in Aotearoa New Zealand and processes of Māori urbanization and the resulting formations of Māori urbanisms. It is certainly the case that throughout processes of Māori urbanization both rural and urban Māori society has been profoundly altered; but it is also a central argument of this dissertation that the “urban-ness” of all of this is of critical importance. With this argument I follow closely Phil Hubbard (2006: 3) when he argues,

What is needed is urban scholarship that takes the city seriously as an object of study without lapsing into environmental determinism. Without such explorations, it is less than clear as to how we might suggest ways in which the trajectory of urban life might be changed through new ways of living, occupying or imagining cities.

Avoiding any form of urban determinism is, of course, important when discussing the relationship between cities and Māori society. The city has never made Māori do anything, but it has offered many choices for Māori that moved to cities from rural parts of Aotearoa New Zealand (or where Māori settlements were overtaken by expanding urban areas).18 However, if we accept that within the context of choices there is a “trajectory of urban life” that plays a critical role

---

18 For an example of a study detailing the impact of a rural Māori community being overtaken by urban expansion see Stokes (1980).
in how these choices manifest we can incorporate a framework that asserts that a different set of socio-cultural and socio-economic relationships come in to play when people settle in urban places.

However, having stated this it is also important to point out that despite the overwhelming number of Māori that have urbanized (often quoted as over 80 percent of the population), this has not been a static or one way process. Many of the Māori I got to know still have strong rural connections, and in fact it can be argued that this type of connectivity is a critical component of Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga, although perhaps not an essential component. The point here is to not view the city as a place of necessarily restrictive boundaries that “contain” Māori who have moved from rural areas (and their descendents born into an urban context). This argument follows the way Amin and Thrift (2002: 8) view the city:

[C]ontemporary cities are certainly not systems with their own internal coherence. The city’s boundaries have become far too permeable and stretched, both geographically and socially, for it to be theorized as a whole. The city has no completeness, no centre, no fixed parts. Instead, it is an amalgam of often disjointed processes and social heterogeneity, a place of near and far connections, a concatenation of rhythms; always edging in new directions. This is the aspect of cities that needs to be captured and explained, without any corresponding desire to reduce the varied phenomena to any essence of systemic integrity.

The ultimate goal here is to see the city as a site of possibility, process, fluidity, flow, permeability, and flexibility for Māori rather than as one that dictates one particular way of life or as an environment dominated by forces of constraint. What is being argued is that Māori, actualizing Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga, are finding ways to creatively and adaptively take advantage of this dynamic characteristic of the modern global city. They are doing this by
creating urban to rural linkages, urban to urban linkages, and even urban to global linkages.  

Armed with this theoretically dynamic sense of what it means to be urban and Māori we can then explore some of the relevant questions concerning the (continuously evolving) relationships between Māori and cities in Aotearoa New Zealand. When considering this relationship certain questions about the trajectory of Māori urban life can be asked. What is this trajectory? Is it movement towards greater levels of assimilation and acculturation into a modern urban context based on Pākehā socio-economic and socio-spatial norms? Or is it one of urban socio-economic and socio-cultural decay grounded in the legacy of colonialism? Or, alternatively, is it a trajectory towards Māori urbanisms that are culturally creative, politically progressive, and critical to the development of Māori/Non-Māori relations in Aotearoa New Zealand? While the research undertaken here suggests that all of these trajectories are simultaneously present in modern Māori urban society, the main focus of this dissertation is the latter of these trajectories.

1.2.3 The development of distinct whakamanatanga-based Māori urban ways of life

Two theoretical perspectives have been proposed in this section to this point. First, that a perspective that takes as its starting point the need to view human geographic processes as simultaneously social, historical and

---

19 In some cases the Māori I spoke with, interviewed and interacted with on a daily basis demonstrated active participation in all of these linkages.
20 Pākehā is the word used in Aotearoa New Zealand to refer to people of European ancestry. Generally this is a neutral term but, like the word Haole in Hawai’i, given the right context it can also be derogatory.
geographical represents the most theoretically advanced approach in contemporary social theory. Second, that within this social/historical/geographical framework cities constitute unique socio-spatial and socio-cultural phenomenon that have presented Māori with both challenges and opportunities. These challenges and opportunities have resulted in a range of Māori urbanisms and Chapter 4 is dedicated to exploring this important perspective on the Māori urban experience. However, more importantly Chapters 2 through 4 are all designed to emphasize the opportunities side of the Māori urban experience, and thus the city as a site of opportunity for Māori is a critical component of what it means to argue from a whakamanatanga-based Māori urbanisms perspective.

Given this argument, certain concepts will circulate throughout this dissertation, and as such need to be briefly introduced and defined at this point. The concepts urbanism and urbanisms are used frequently in this dissertation. I use these terms to refer to different aspects of the relationship between Māori and cities, and more specifically to the formation of uniquely Māori urban ways of life (more formal definitions of these concepts are found in Chapter 4). When I am referring to the general concept “urbanism” I use the singular form, but when referring to Māori specifically I use the plural form. The fact is that there are many forms of Māori urbanism, and, therefore, when I am more generally referring to the broad range of ways in which Māori have developed urban ways

---

21 An alternative way of thinking about the urban experience is as one that offers “problems and possibilities.” This is the approach taken by John Allen, Doreen Massey and Steven Pile in City Worlds (1999). I have chosen “challenges and opportunities” partly because I came up with this perspective prior to reading this book, but more importantly because the use of “problems” seems too easily connected to negative stereotypes about the urban experience when considering indigenous peoples such as Māori, and in this sense is more progressively replaced with “challenges”.
of life I use the plural form. Susan Lobo (2001, XV; original emphasis), in her introduction to the book *American Indians and the Urban Experience*, makes a similar argument when discussing the book’s title: “Although the title of this book is *American Indians and the Urban Experience*, it is evident that there exists not one experience, but many experiences and multiple perspectives.” In this dissertation I am making the same argument in that the focus, Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga, is but one aspect of Māori urbanisms—a phenomenon that is represented by multiple perspectives and experiences.

A second concept that is used throughout this dissertation is “indigenous” or, alternatively, “indigenous peoples.” According to Linda Tuhiwai Smith (1999: 6) the term *indigenous* “is problematic in that it appears to collectivize many distinct populations whose experiences under imperialism have been vastly different.” The meaning of this term has been further complicated, Smith notes (1999: 7), because of its use to “account for the distinctiveness of colonial literary and/or feminist traditions” as well as through its political cooptation by “descendants of settlers who lay claim to an ‘indigenous’ identity through their occupation and settlement of land over several generations or simply through being born in that place.” Despite these recognized problems with defining this concept, Smith seems content to allow for this ambiguity and still use the term, but she does so with specific definitional boundaries. In discussing the term *indigenous peoples*, she notes that the term first comes into use during the 1970s as part of the Native American and Native Canadian civil rights movements. The common factor that bounds Smith’s definition of indigenous peoples is the legacy of colonialism. She argues that indigenous peoples “is a term that internationalizes the experiences, the issues and the struggles of some of the
world’s colonized peoples. The ‘s’ is added to “peoples” as a way to recognize that there are “real differences between different indigenous peoples.” Smith (1999: 7) goes on to argue,

The term has enabled the collective voices of colonized people to be expressed strategically in the international arena. It has also been an umbrella enabling communities and peoples to come together, transcending their own colonized contexts and experiences, in order to learn, share, plan, organize and struggle collectively for self-determination on the global and local stages. Thus, the world’s indigenous populations belong to a network of peoples. They share experiences as peoples who have been subjected to the colonization of their land and cultures, and the denial of their sovereignty, by a colonizing society that has come to dominate and determine the shape and quality of their lives, even after it has formerly pulled out.

Adding to this discussion, Mathias Guenther (2006: 17) argues that the term indigenous “is applied to people—and by the people to themselves—who are engaged in an often desperate struggle for political right, for land, for a place and space within a modern nation’s economy and society.” He further argues that both “identity” and “self-representation” are critical aspects of indigenous politics.

Some authors have eschewed the term indigenous altogether preferring to refer to the particular people in question (e.g., Ngati Porou, Navajo, Inuit, etc.) or have opted for alternative pan-national terms (e.g., Native American, First Nation, Māori). Hal Levine (2001: 120) prefers the term “fourth world people” and defines this terms as referring to groups “who, unlike the citizens of third world countries, have become minorities in their own land...Their resources have been acquired by settler governments and they are overrepresented in measures of social distress.” Smith and Guenther’s definitions of the term indigenous share a sense of a people struggling to maintain socio-cultural integrity in the face of forces (the legacy of colonialism, the modern state) that
have systematically undermined this integrity. There is also a sense that these struggles are ongoing. Levine’s definition adds the characteristic of becoming minorities in the face of foreigners settling permanently in a colonized territory. Smith and Guenther’s characteristics, I would argue, are shared by most groups that would consider the label “indigenous” a relevant part of how they conceive their identity. Levine’s characteristic of minority status, on the other hand, narrows the definition of indigenous to include a smaller group (in terms of numbers of countries that fit his definition but not necessarily absolute numbers) that would most obviously include Canada, the United States, Aotearoa New Zealand, and Australia. While understanding that this last characteristic is somewhat more problematic in defining what is meant by the term “indigenous,” I nonetheless deem it an important characteristic for peoples such as the Māori because this demographic outcome of colonialism has played such a critical role in the power relationships established in Aotearoa New Zealand between Pākehā and Māori. It does not seem like a farfetched claim to argue that this power differential would be very different today if there were 3.5 million Māori and 500,000 Pākehā rather than the reverse.

Ultimately, for the purposes of this research, the term indigenous will be used when referring to groups that share the above definition but represent peoples from very different geographic regions of the world. Particularly in the context of processes of globalization the term indigenous becomes a convenient and useful one for linking up groups of people with important similarities in their experiences vis-à-vis the legacy of colonialism. When I am speaking more specifically of people in Aotearoa New Zealand I will use the term Māori or more specific names of Māori hapū or iwi.
The term “Māori”, however, does not necessarily cater to easy definition either. Although it is literally found on almost every page of this dissertation, it is not my intention to suggest an essentialized or easy understanding of what it means to be Māori or what it means to incorporate Māori values and worldviews into one’s identity. One of the more comprehensive documents I have come across that explores this issue of what it means to be Māori in an urban context is a five volume set titled *Well-Being and Disparity in Tāmaki-Makaurau* (Benton, 2002; 47-50).22 The authors of this document argue that it is very difficult to find one essential characteristic that individual Māori draw upon to define what it means to be Māori, but at the same time suggest that there are shared qualities (cultural, experiential, historical) that make the term ‘Māori’ a meaningful indicator of an identifiable group of people. This issue will be explored in more detail in Chapter 4 when I develop a basic definition of Māori urbanisms. At this point suffice to say that I decided early on to define Māori as anyone who told me that being Māori was an important part of his or her sense of identity. Whether the people I spoke with had deep connection to, and knowledge of, their Māori cultural traditions or were Māori many generations removed from this connection and knowledge did not factor into my acceptance of their claim to be Māori. If they said they were, I listened to their stories with my fullest attention and accepted their views as equal to any other.

One of the more important aspects of this research is the realization that the ways Māori are going about living in and molding space/place in cities like

---

22 Tāmaki-Makaurau is the general Māori name for the area now occupied by the Auckland urban area. Its English translation is “the land of a thousand lovers.” This apparently was meant to connote how desirable an area this was from a Māori perspective.
Auckland not only demonstrates critical aspects of the space/place theory that is developed fully in the next chapter, but perhaps more importantly demonstrates that an indigenous worldview (albeit a particularly Māori one) has as much to say about space/place theory and formations of urbanisms as these theories have to say about indigenous peoples. In other words, this research does not simply represent another example of theory generated from Western concepts and ideas being applied to “Non-Western” peoples. Instead, to the best of my ability, this research attempts to construct a conversation between different worldviews and find points of both contact and difference. The end product of this conversation is a demonstration of the power of space/place theory and theories of urbanisms to better understand real-world processes and, simultaneously, the power of locally derived forms of indigenous urbanisms to critically modify and/or challenge Western generated concepts and theories.

1.3 Researching Māori Urban Geographies of Whakamanatanga From a Methodological Perspective

Having discussed briefly the theoretical framework informing my research, and having defined some of the key concepts used throughout this document, I turn now to the issue of methodology. One of the main challenges of negotiating the type of conversation between non-Māori theories of space and place and Māori perspectives engaged in this dissertation is methodological. In particular the question as to how a researcher who is quintessentially an outsider

---

23 In fact I absolutely reject the term “Non-Western” because it infers that Western represents a normative standard from which all others are compared. This inherently colonial perspective is contradictory to the theoretical and methodological foundations of this research.
to both Aotearoa New Zealand society and Māori society more specifically can effectively contribute to developing this conversation. The following sections speak to the issue of methodology more generally, and then turn more specifically to the question of how an outsider can participate in this type of research. Equally important questions of how to methodologically apply a space/place conceptual framework to this research will also be considered in this section.

1.3.1 Methodological considerations part 1: quantitative versus qualitative research

First and foremost this research is methodologically grounded within a qualitative approach to the study of human processes. Qualitative approaches are understood here as those “intended to elucidate human environments, individual experiences and social processes” (Winchester, 2005: 3) and have generally been presented in opposition to quantitative approaches. To summarize a complex debate, this opposition between qualitative and quantitative approaches has been constructed as a focus on “natural” versus “experimental” settings, a “search for meaning” versus an “identification of behaviour”, a “rejection of natural science” approaches to human processes versus the adoption of these types of approaches, “inductive” versus “deductive” approaches, the “identification of cultural patterns” versus the “pursuance of scientific laws”, and a focus on “idealist” perspectives versus “realist” perspectives (Winchester, 2005: 11). This series of simplified oppositions point out broad differences between qualitative and quantitative research, but they also run the risk of oversimplifying this debate by, for
instance, characterizing qualitative approaches as purely subjective in nature while quantitative approaches are portrayed as objective and value free. It should be noted that one of the major contributions of the qualitative approach has been to demonstrate that no methodology is ever truly objective and value free (Winchester, 2005: 10-11). Arguably some of the most powerful research effectively combines both qualitative and quantitative methods using multiple method approaches (Winchester, 2005: 12). However, the research on Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga undertaken here draws primarily on qualitative approaches in its attempt to comprehend this socio-geographic phenomenon.

Two fundamental components of human experience are addressed within a qualitative framework: social structures and individual experiences (sometimes referred to as agency). That structures and agents exist in an interdependent relationship has been well established in the social sciences (Giddens, 1984), and this interdependency is a critical one to acknowledge and address when undertaking any kind of qualitative research. This relationship is explained by Winchester (2005: 5) in the following manner:

Structures constrain individuals and enable certain behaviours, but in some circumstances individuals also have the capacity to break rather than reproduce the mould. An overemphasis on structures and processes rather than individuals could lead to a dehumanized human geography. On the other hand, individuals do not have all-powerful free will and ability, which would enable them to overcome the powerful structures embedded in society, such as capitalism, patriarchy, or racism.

When studying the relationships between Māori identity formation, urbanization and urbanism, and geographies of whakamanatanga, the interdependent
interplay of structure and agency is a fundamental perspective maintained throughout this research.

The example of language is useful here as a way to clarify this statement. On the one hand, languages are highly structured cultural systems. They have rules (grammar, syntax, subject/object/verb ordering, etc.) that must be adhered to in order to effect communication. To step too far outside of these rules is to risk failing to communicate. Individuals, in other words, are constrained within the structure of language in order to function as communicators. On the other hand, each person using a language has the ability to not only bend the rules but also to create new ones and still manage to effectively communicate (and in some cases, perhaps, do so more effectively). We are at once constrained by the structure of language and simultaneously free to at least stretch the boundaries of this constraining system, and in some cases radically alter it. Thus, based on this example, there is an interdependent interplay between language as structure and individuals as agents utilizing this structure. What is being argued here is that when attempting to understand human processes and phenomenon (like Māori urbanization and urbanisms) this same notion of the interdependent relationship between structure and agency must be recognized and applied.

1.3.2 Methodological consideration part 2: decolonizing methodologies

The combination of my specific research focus (Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga) and theoretical underpinnings (qualitative approaches) is simultaneously informed by the basic tenets of decolonizing methodologies. These methodologies have developed out of post-structural contributions to
understandings of qualitative methodologies. Winchester (2005: 15) argues “the schools of thought that may have made the greatest contribution to answering qualitative research questions have been the feminist and the post-structural (including the postmodern and the postcolonial).” She further argues (2005: 15-16),

[...]these frameworks both recognize that multiple and conflicting realities coexist. They deliberately give voice to those silenced or ignored by hegemonic (modern, colonial), views of histories and geographies. They embody and acknowledge previously anonymous individuals. Paradoxically, however, the voice of the oppressed not only speaks for itself: it is part of a wider whole. Reality is like an orchestra: poststructural approaches differentiate the instruments and their sounds and bring the oboe occasionally to centre-stage; usually dominated by the strings, the minor instruments too have a tune to play and a thread that forms a distinct but usually unheard part of the whole.

This emphasis on giving voice to subordinate and marginalized groups and individuals also influences the way that the researcher positions him/herself within the context of the research undertaken. For example, qualitative/post-structural researchers often “outline their personal subjectivity and possible sources of bias by summarizing their own background as researchers and their relationship to the research and to its intended audience (Winchester, 2005: 11; original emphasis). By doing so the researcher acknowledges and attempts to mediate some of the inherent power relationships that are part and parcel of Western systems of knowledge gathering. This act of reflexivity is always a challenging one for researchers, but it is also one that is necessary and essential to any attempt to develop and actualize decolonizing methodologies.

Given the above argument this is, perhaps, as good a place as any to relate my background both personally and as a researcher, and to discuss my relationship to Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga. However, rather
than doing this to acknowledge any underlying power I have over those I engaged during my research, it seems more appropriate to do this out of respect for Māori culture. Reflexivity in this case is an act of honoring those you are involving in your research by sharing more intimate aspects of yourself personally and as a researcher.

I am a Caucasian heterosexual male who was born in Europe (my placenta and umbilical cord are buried in the backyard of the house in which I was born in Copenhagen, Denmark) and raised in Boston and New York City. I have always lived in or around the inner city of the urban areas I grew up in. Probably the most suburban I have ever been is during the last eighteen years in Honolulu, but even in this case I am only three miles from Honolulu’s CBD and can see it from my living room window (a visual connection that is a great source of comfort to me). This urban connection has been one of the strongest influences on my interest in urban geography both because I feel most comfortable in inner city environments, but also because I believe my knowledge of this type of environment affords me insights into issues involving inner city life. I have been a human geographer since the middle 1980s and it has long been my goal in my research to connect my interest in urban areas with my interest in humanistic approaches to geography. As an undergraduate student at Syracuse I did research involving the Onondaga Nation (Native Americans indigenous to Upstate New York) and from this engagement it became clear to me that I wanted indigenous studies to also be an important part of my professional research interests. Thus, my Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga thesis effectively combined these three areas of research interest (urban studies, human geography, and indigenous studies) that are most
important to me. Yet, despite this triangulation of interests developing during my undergraduate and graduate studies, I was also simultaneously confronted with the paradox of decolonizing methodologies. This paradox is quite simply stated: does a non-indigenous person have the right to do research focusing on indigenous peoples and issues? To understand how I eventually answered this important question it is necessary to delve more deeply into the concept of decolonizing methodologies.

A related subcategory of qualitative/post-structural approaches (see above), one that addresses specifically the impact of colonial discourses on Western systems of knowledge, is postcolonial and decolonizing methodologies. Howitt and Stevens (2005: 31) argue that these approaches to research revolve "around the importance of rejecting the attitudes, assumptions, purposes, and methodologies of what postcolonial theorists refer to as ‘colonial’ research in favour of those of ‘decolonising’, ‘postcolonial’ research” (original emphasis). Stevens (Howitt and Stevens, 2005: 32; original emphasis) differentiates between four types of research: colonial, postcolonial, decolonizing, and inclusionary research in the following manner:

Colonial research reflects and reinforces domination and exploitation through the attitudes and differential power embodied in its research relationships with ‘others’, its dismissal of their rights and knowledge, its intrusive and non-participatory methodologies, and often also in its goals and in its use of research findings. Postcolonial research...is a reaction to and rejection of colonial research and is intended to contribute to ‘others’ self-determination and welfare through methodologies and the use of research findings that value their rights, knowledge, perspectives, concerns, and desires and are based on open and more egalitarian relationships. **Decolonising research** goes further still in attempting to use the research process and research findings to break down the cross-cultural discourses, asymmetrical power relationships, representations, and political, economic, and social structures through which colonialism and neo-colonialism are constructed and maintained.
Stevens (Howitt and Stevens, 2005: 32) defines “inclusionary research” as “a particularly revolutionary kind of decolonizing research aimed at helping empower subordinated, marginalized, and oppressed others and to provide training and tools they can use to” radically reverse their social context.

The research undertaken in the following chapters attempts to apply the ideas informing postcolonial and decolonizing research. This is, however, sometimes easier stated then achieved. The difficulty of actualizing these methodological principles can be understood in two ways: the practical challenges of putting these principles into practice, and the more theoretical and ethical challenges of an outsider from a non-colonized context doing research involving the cultural politics of a formerly colonized people. The first of these challenges will be discussed below in the section on methods since it deals with the complexities of actually undertaking the research. The latter challenge is more appropriately dealt with here since it is more of a methodological consideration.

The idea of decolonizing methodologies gained greater prominence in the late 1990s with the publication of Linda Tuhiwai Smith’s (1999) book *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. The importance of this book for those engaging in research involving indigenous peoples comes from its ability to identify “research as a significant site of struggle between the interests and ways of knowing of the West and the interests and ways of resisting of the Other” (Smith, 1999: 2). Smith (1999: 5) argues that “research is not an innocent or distant academic exercise but an activity that has something at stake and that occurs in a set of political and social conditions.” The politics of research
involving indigenous groups, according to Smith (1999: 5), is encapsulated by a series of questions relevant to those groups being researched.

Who owns it? Whose interests does it serve? Who will benefit from it? Who has designed its questions and framed its scope? Who will carry it out? Who will write it up? How will its results be disseminated? While there are many researchers who can handle such questions with integrity there are many more who cannot, or who approach these questions with some cynicism, as if they are a test merely of political correctness. What may surprise many people is that what may appear as the ‘right’, most desirable answer can still be judged incorrect. These questions are simply part of a larger set of judgments on criteria that a researcher cannot prepare for, such as: Is her spirit clear? Does he have a good heart? What other baggage are they carrying? Are they useful to us? Can they fix up our generator? Can they actually do anything?

These questions serve as both a warning and guide to those engaging in research involving indigenous peoples. A warning in the sense that those of us on the outside (i.e., non-indigenous researchers) must acknowledge the inherent power relations in the structure of knowledge gathering that our training often encompasses. A guide in the sense that by acknowledging these power relations and committing ourselves to, as much as possible, working to create research formats and practices that subvert these unequal power relations we will be contributing to processes of decolonization rather than to reproductions of existing power structures.

While this latter commitment is important, Smith points out that for indigenous peoples some of the postcolonial literature has not delivered on this commitment. She notes many “indigenous intellectuals actively resist participating in any discussion within the discourses of post-coloniality. This is because post-colonialism is viewed as the convenient invention of Western intellectuals which re-inscribes their power to define the world” (1999: 14), and that there “is also, amongst indigenous academics, a sneaking suspicion that the
fashion of post-colonialism has become a strategy for re-inscribing or reauthorizing the privileges of non-indigenous academics because the field of ‘post-colonial’ discourse has been defined in ways which can still leave out indigenous peoples, our ways of knowing and our current concerns” (1999: 24).

Smith further argues that “post-colonial discussions have also stirred some indigenous resistance, not so much to the literary reimagining of culture as being centered in what were once conceived of as the colonial margins, but to the ideas that colonialism is over, finished business” (1999: 24).24

These are important cautionary statements that can have had a positive impact on non-indigenous researchers. Howitt and Stevens’ (2005) work is an example of this positive impact. This is evident when Stevens (Howitt and Stevens, 2005: 36), drawing extensively from Smith (1999), argues,

To me postcolonial research is...grounded in the perception of other peoples as ‘others’ who are different but not intrinsically different or alien, who differ culturally but not in essential humanity and value. It is attracted to difference rather than wary of it, it seeks to interact rather than to remain distant, it coexists with, respects, and honours difference rather than dominating or exploiting it. This difference of attitude and intention makes for very different conceptions of the purposes of research...With postcolonial approaches, the purposes of research...become cross cultural understanding, the celebration of diversity, and especially empowerment or emancipation—a decolonizing project based on rejecting the ethnocentrism and exploitation of colonialism through cross-cultural respect and through support for self-determination.

Thus, it is with Smith’s cautionary arguments from the inside combined with Howitt and Stevens’ articulation of postcolonial research from the outside that I

24 Interestingly, when I first read this in Smith’s book I was in complete agreement. However, subsequently, after developing the thesis for this research, I find this statement somewhat more problematic. I absolutely agree that at both the structural and agency levels the legacy of colonialism is still evident in both subtle and overt ways, and that in many cases the real-world ramifications of this legacy are painful and egregious. But at the same time this research is about Māori, individually and groups, who are actively attempting to move beyond or, even more radically, have moved beyond grounding their identities in this legacy.
have positioned the dissertation research undertaken in the following chapters. Smith describes a method referred to as “Kaupapa Māori” research. This type of research is defined by Smith, following Kathy Irwin’s (1994) work, “as research which is ‘culturally safe’, which involves the ‘mentorship’ of elders, which is culturally relevant and appropriate while satisfying the rigor of research and which is undertaken by a Māori researcher, not a researcher who happens to be Māori” (1999: 184). Smith further argues that this type of research, from its most radical stance, cannot be undertaken by a non-Māori at all, and from a less radical stance can only be undertaken by non-Māori in close collaboration with Māori. This latter stance would most likely involve a non-Māori researcher as part of a team of researchers made up predominantly of Māori in a research project designed by, or at least heavily influenced by, Māori. In terms of this research this will not be the case and therefore there is no assertion here that this research is Kaupapa Māori research.

However, this research does attempt, as much as possible, to be informed by Kaupapa Māori research and argues that this type of research can still be of use to Māori. In support of this assertion Stevens (Howitt and Stevens, 2005: 42) argues,

> both research by ‘insiders’ and cross-cultural research by ‘outsiders’ are important, and on the basis of my own experience I have come to believe that ‘others’ can value decolonising relationships and friendships with outside researchers, consider outsiders’ cross-cultural perspectives and insights into their societies and situations useful, seek to mentor and work with outside researchers out of interest in the research and belief in its significance, and view outside researchers as useful advocates and allies.

In this I agree, and my experiences while engaging in the field work portion of this research in Aotearoa New Zealand has born out this perspective over and
over again. Stevens (Howitt and Stevens, 2005: 42-43) argues that in order to facilitate the types of relationships noted in the above quote researchers must “make an effort to work in more culturally sensitive ways, prepare for research by learning the local language, interact with ‘others’ on their terms in their own social/political community venues, and become informed about local concerns, seek local support and consent for research, and honour local cultural research protocols and negotiated research agreements.” This set of protocol informed my research throughout and, as much as possible, this emphasis is reflected in the tone and perspective of this dissertation. Ultimately, the goal here is to adopt what Stevens refers to as an “‘empowered outcomes’ approach, in which research becomes a vehicle through which ‘others’ can obtain information they seek and which they can use to their benefit” (Howitt and Stevens, 2005: 43).

But how do we do this? From the experiences I have had doing this research I believe it involves telling the people we are working with and researching what exactly it is our research is about; we ask if they are interested in participating in this research and we remain constantly open to the possibility that the perspectives they offer may radically change many of the assumptions we brought into the research process. When we are writing up our findings we share our ideas and analysis with those that were involved in the research and give them the opportunity to participate in the process as it is evolving. And when a final product has been produced we share this with them and encourage and accept their criticism and feedback, and incorporate this into further research. To as great an extent as possible I have attempted to incorporate this philosophy and related practices into this research and it is hoped that this will be evident throughout this document.
There is one other point to make in this section, however. Given the arguments embedded in this research—that there are Māori emerging out of an urban context that no longer need to resist the forces of colonialism because they have effectively moved beyond, both psychologically and functionally, the subordinating aspects of this legacy—is a methodological stance that deems the researcher, simply because he/she is from a formerly colonizing culture, even necessary? There is an assumption found throughout those arguing from a decolonizing methodologies perspective that the researcher (assuming he/she is not indigenous) is automatically operating within an unequal power structure. This inherent inequality, this line of reasoning suggests, offers the researcher the opportunity to take advantage of those that are being researched. I certainly understand and have empathy for these arguments. They are based on many decades of indigenous experiences whereby researchers did operate from a position of unequal power and did take advantage of this inequality to the detriment of those being researched.

However, in my own experience the individuals I worked with were in no way subordinate to me intellectually, professionally and/or socio-economically. And perhaps this speaks to the very essence of the concept Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga: that there are Māori that have emerged out of years of resistance to the legacies of colonialism that have disrupted this structure of inequality and are forcing a different set of relationships even in the context of an outsider doing research that involves them. This in no way suggest that we should “let down our guard” when it comes to structures of inequality, whether they be race, gender, class, and/or economically derived. It does suggest, however, that we not become stuck in a methodological perspective that
does not allow us to grow and adapt to new circumstances. What happens when those that have been colonized are no longer living within that context (truly decolonized if you will)? Will we still need decolonizing methodologies at that point? Important questions such as these become most critical when the researcher enters into the “field”.

1.3.3 Methodological consideration part 3: in the field

As I developed my proposal for this research all of the above perspectives on decolonizing methodologies influenced my choice of subject matter. I was deeply impacted by Linda Tuhiwai Smith’s (1999) arguments and for a period of time seriously questioned whether or not I had the “right” to engage in research involving Māori when I am neither indigenous nor Māori. Although the above quote by Stevens (Howitt and Stevens, 2005: 42) gave me a lot of encouragement, I was still uncertain about my legitimacy as a researcher, even as I began my fieldwork in Aotearoa New Zealand. My initial focus was on the impact cities were having on Māori, and most of the literature I had read to this point led me to think of this impact as predominantly negative and/or about resistance to the negative impacts of urbanization. And yet as an outsider I felt exceedingly uncomfortable focusing on the negative relationship between Māori and cities, and as I began to tour the outlying lower income suburban areas of Auckland associated with Māori this uncomfortable feeling increased.

I did not feel right, as an outsider, coming to Aotearoa New Zealand to tell Māori about the problems urbanization had caused in their society (as if they didn’t already know this), even if there was some truth to this perspective, and
even if there was some utility in adding to this area of research. It was also clear to me that every time I attempted to explain my research to Māori based on this original negative focus they too were uncomfortable. Their reaction was invariably one that suggested (often enough through body language as much as in their comments) that here was another outsider coming to criticize their culture.

Simultaneously, however, as my fieldwork unfolded during my first two months in Aotearoa New Zealand in 2007, and as I met with Māori in Auckland and elsewhere, I was repeatedly confronted with Māori that seemed anything but marginalized by their urban experience. Meeting these Māori had a profound impact on my research focus. I began to conceive of a way to research and discuss the Māori urban experience not as a critique of this experience, but rather as a way to celebrate the power of cultural adaptability and innovative responses to the urbanization process. It was this realization that consolidated the final component of my Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga concept, and the significant point here is that it was through the fieldwork itself that this whakamanatanga-based concept developed. This is an important point to keep in mind as this discussion of field methodologies continues. Thus, one of the main challenges of applying qualitative decolonizing methodologies in the field is the need for a high degree of flexibility on the part of the researcher. This flexibility, as demonstrated through my own experiences above, allows the researcher to adapt his/her research focus based on his/her experiences in the field. In my case these experiences led to a focus on the positive outcomes of Māori urbanization.
Another challenge is applying methodologies that serve the dual function of accessing the information needed to answer the primary research questions while at the same time honoring the needs and protocol (formal and informal) of the people involved as research subjects. In order to achieve this balance, the methodologies used in this research include semi-structured and unstructured interviews and what I have come to refer to as participant inhabitation. Interviews were an essential method undertaken during this research, and much of Chapter 5 in particular draws on these interviews. Before discussing in more detail the interview methods used it is important to first note how I went about selecting the people interviewed. I used a method referred to as “snowballing” (Howitt and Stevens, 2005) whereby the researcher seeks out initial contacts and then asks them at the end of the interview to suggest people they think could contribute to the research topic. In this way a network of interviewees develops that allows the researcher both access to a significant volume of data, but also (and equally importantly) gives the researcher insights into connections within communities. In the case of this research, for example, it helped me understand Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga as a broader social phenomenon rather than as just occurring in individuals.

Kevin Dunn (2005, 80) outlines four main uses for interviews as a research strategy:

1) To fill a gap in knowledge that other methods, such as observation or the use of census data, are unable to bridge efficaciously

2) To investigate complex behaviors and motivations

3) To collect a diversity of meaning, opinion, and experiences. Interviews provide insights into the differing opinions or debates within a group, but they can also reveal consensus on some issues
4) When a method is required that shows respect for and empowers those people who provide the data. In an interview the informant’s view of the world should be valued and treated with respect. The interview may also give the informant cause to reflect on their experiences and the opportunity to find out more about the research project than if they were simply being observed or if they were completing a questionnaire.

These “uses” were fulfilled through the practice of unstructured and semi-structured interviews. These interviews certainly filled a gap in the existing knowledge base concerning the relationship between Māori and the urban areas in Auckland. They also allowed me to at least partially begin to unravel the complex behaviors and motivations wrapped up in the relationship between Māori urban identities and Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga. These interviews also assisted in my understanding the diversity of meanings, opinions, and experiences that are inevitably part-and-parcel of the urban milieu. And, finally, these interviews were certainly utilized in such a way as to further the goal of producing research that is decolonizing in intent and nature.

As previously stated both unstructured and semi-structured interview formats were utilized in this research. Unstructured interviews can include “oral history, life history, and some types of group interviewing and in-depth interviewing” (Dunn, 2005: 88; original emphasis). Dunn defines this form of interviewing in the following way:

Rather than being question focused like a structured interview, or content focused as in a semi-structured format, the unstructured interview is informant focused. Life history and oral history interviews seek personal accounts of significant events and perceptions, as determined by the informants, and in their own words...[and]...each unstructured interview is unique. The questions you ask are almost entirely determined by the informant’s responses. These interviews approximate normal conversational interaction and give the informant some scope to direct the interview.
Importantly, this does not imply that unstructured interviews are a kind of “lazy” interview. In fact, Dunn (88) argues, “an unstructured interview requires as much, if not more, preparation than its structured counterpart”. This is because, he argues, to make these types of interviews effective and productive the researcher has to develop a strong understanding of the context within which the person being interviewed is situated through extensive archival and secondary source-based research. In other words, the more knowledge about historical and contemporary context that relate to the person being interviewed that the researcher can bring to the interview the more productive the discussion will potentially be. Interview methods that progress organically contrast in important ways with more structured types of interviews.

Semi-structured interviews are defined as interviews that use an interview guide and the “questions asked in the interview are content focused and deal with the issues or areas judged by the researcher to be relevant to the research questions” (Dunn, 2005: 88). An interview guide “is a list of general issues you want to cover in an interview...[and]...may be a simple list of key words or concepts intended to remind [the researcher] of discussion topics” (Dunn, 2005: 88), or it may be a more formal list of questions that the interviewer follows in the course of the interview.25

In some cases during my research the use of unstructured interview formats was deemed more appropriate while with other individuals semi-structured interviews were more effective. While semi-structured interviews are useful because they help the researcher guide the conversation towards topics

25 See Appendix # for an example of the interview guide used during this research.
directly related to the research questions, they do not always work well with every research participant. This is because certain types of research participants may not engage in the same depth of conversation in the presence of, for example, a digital recorder or in the context of structured questions. In discussions with Māori Kaumatua, for example, I found the semi-structured research format and the use of digital recorders inappropriate. In these cases the level of respect demanded and deserved by these individuals requires fewer questions and more listening. It seems more appropriately a student/teacher type relationship rather than an interviewer/informant one. I also found the more formal environment created by semi-structured interviews not particularly well suited to discussions with some Māori artists I spoke with. Whenever possible I went with the semi-structured format, but I found I had to be quite flexible and “think on my feet” at times to intuit which interview method was best suited to the person I was speaking with.

One of the advantages of unstructured and semi-structured interviewing is its potential to adhere to the requirements of decolonizing methodologies. In support of this argument Howitt and Stevens (2005: 45) argue,

Informal, semi-structured interviews...may not conflict with local etiquette about social interaction and communication because they can be interactive discussions or conversations in which there can be reciprocal exchanges of information. Interviewees may indeed value such interviews as social occasions that provide an opportunity to get to know the researchers, inquire about research findings, and learn about the outside world.

Without a doubt I found this approach and attitude to the interview process to be absolutely essential within the Māori community. Approaching interviews as conversations where the interviewee has an equal ability to steer the direction of
the conversation seemed to create a much greater environment of mutual trust and lead, as a result, to much more productive discussions. Another strategy I found quite productive is the process of writing up my interview notes and then sending them via email to the interviewee for comments, revision and/or additions. Through this strategy the interviewee is given the opportunity to comment on my analysis and modify my interpretations of their kōrero.26 Some of the best quotations used in this dissertation come from these types of conversations that occurred post-interview.27 Moreover, a relationship between the researcher and informants is maintained and even strengthened through this continued correspondence.

One final point must be noted to conclude this discussion of interviewing techniques used during this research. It is common practice in social science research that utilizes direct quotes from interviews to give aliases when referencing the people interviewed. This is meant to create an atmosphere whereby the person being interviewed feels free to express their feelings and opinions without reservations and to protect them from any possible repercussions for expressing their opinions on a given subject. I made a decision before engaging my first interview to offer the interviewee the choice as to whether their real name would be used or not when I included their comments

26 Used this way kōrero is defined as “purposeful talk” (Kearns, 2005: 205)
27 There are many examples of the productivity of this methodology in chapter five especially. All five of the main individuals featured in this chapter (Dr. Merata Kawharu, Keri Wikitera, Melanie Wall, Rau Hoskins, and Lyonell Grant) responded to the initial transcripts I sent them with significant edits and comments. In several of these cases I used quotes from their email responses to bolster and hone my interpretation of their thoughts and ideas. Often they caught mistakes I had made, or requested that I modify what I wrote to come closer to their intended meaning. This was also the case in this chapter when discussing Māori notions of whakamanatanga. All of the quotes used in the whakamanatanga section came from email responses rather than the interviews themselves.
in my dissertation. To a person every Māori I interviewed asked that I use their real name. There seemed to be a strong sense among the Māori I interviewed that these were their words and ideas and they felt a strong sense of ownership over them. As a result they not only did not mind if their real names were used, but often insisted that this be the case.

As noted above I used both semi-structured/unstructured interviews and what I have chosen to call participant inhabitation as part of my research methodologies. I have chosen the term participant inhabitation in order to differentiate it from the more general methodological category, participant observation. Participant observation involves the researcher engaging him/herself in the lives and activities of the people interacting in the research context (both social and material) (Kearns, 2005). The key concept here is “observation” and, Kearns (2005: 193) argues, the observation activity “is the outcome of active choice, rather than mere exposure.” Importantly, Kearns (2005: 193; original emphasis) further argues, “Our choice—whether conscious or unconscious—of first, what to see, and second, how to see it, means that we always have an active role in the observation process.” Kearns (2005: 193) states that this issue of choice in the observation process can be understood as encompassing three broad “purposes.” These include the purpose of “counting” which “refers to an enumerative function for observation”; the purpose of “providing complimentary evidence”; and the purpose of “contextual understandings”.

Observation with the purpose of contextual understanding is the one that is most closely aligned with this research. Kearns (2005: 193) argues that the goal of the contextual understanding approach “is to construct an in-depth
interpretation of a particular time and place through direct experience.” “To achieve this understanding,” he continues, “the researcher immerses herself/himself in the socio-temporal context of interest and uses first-hand observations as the prime source of data...in this situation, the observer is very much a participant” (Kearns, 2005: 193). This type of approach—further defined by Kearns (2005: 194) as “uncontrolled observation”—allows the researcher to gain insights into the “characteristics of place and the feelings of residents” in ways that “controlled observation” cannot. The use of this type of participant observation is critical here because it allowed me to develop what Kearns (2005: 195) refers to as “a geography of everyday experience...[that]...requires us to move beyond reliance on formalized interactions such as those occurring in interviews.” This movement beyond formalized interactions is important because “no matter how much we are able to put people at ease before and during an interview, its structured format often removes the researcher from the ‘flow’ of everyday life in both time and space” (Kearns, 2005: 195).

I have chosen the term participant inhabitation because I believe it more closely “captures” the spirit of contextual understanding. The addition of the concept “inhabitation” is inspired by John Wylie’s (2007) differentiation between looking-as-observation versus looking-as-inhabitation. Wylie (2007: 5-6) argues that the former approach is one that positions the researcher as outside of the object being studied and therefore theoretically able to critically analyze human phenomenon without being influenced by it. This artificial disconnect between researcher and the object/subject being researched does not align well with decolonizing methodologies because of the unequal power relations inherent in this relationship. As Kearns (2005: 197) notes, “We cannot usually observe
directly without being present, and our bodily presence brings with it personal characteristics that mark our identity such as ‘race’, sex, and age.” For example, identities such as ‘researcher’, ‘white’ and ‘male’, or as ‘outsider’, all complicate and potentially influence the character and effectiveness of the research being undertaken.

In contrast, Wylie describes looking-as-inhabitation (or participant inhabitation as I am choosing to call it) as a methodology “broadly phenomenological in character” where the researcher attempts—through embodiment, inhabitation and dwelling—to meaningfully access the experiences of those actually living their everyday lives in the place being studied. To successfully engage this approach, Wylie (2007: 5-6) argues, the researcher must not only develop theories through “corporeal dwelling,” but also come to a deeper understanding of these theories through participating in the research context (i.e., the space/place and people) “with his or her whole body.” By doing this the researcher gains access to those involved in his/her study by ‘wading into the stream’ of everyday life along side these individuals and groups as they go about their daily routines.

Chapters 6 through eight of this dissertation involve an organization called Mana Moko-Te Karanga (Kfm), and it is in this place that participant inhabitation was primarily utilized. By spending considerable time in this place, writing, talking story, working in the tea bar, doing dishes and cleaning up at parties I was able to gain much deeper insights into how the people that created this place and participate in its day-to-day function experience it and conceptualize it emotionally and intellectually. But perhaps more importantly from a decolonizing methodologies perspective, I was able to meaningfully
contribute to the functioning of this place and thereby give back to this community and place rather than just extract information about it for this dissertation.28

1.4 The Plan of the Dissertation

This dissertation is organized into nine chapters with the above introduction constituting the first of these and the last being the conclusion. The purpose of Chapter 2 is to outline in detail the conceptual framework that informs the research undertaken in the remaining chapters. This conceptual framework, what I refer to as a space/place conceptual framework, argues that both space and place—two concepts integral to human geography—are best understood as mutually constitutive. In order to demonstrate this argument I draw on Lefebvrian socio-spatial theory and various contemporary theories of place (place as social construction, place as being-in-the-world, place as performance, and place as globally and locally situated). My conclusion is that these theoretical perspectives are all evolving towards a framework that combines both space and place into integrative approaches to studying human geographies. I argue that the best human geographies are those that are able to draw on these various theoretical approaches concerning space and place, and that this is necessary because each has strengths and weaknesses when it comes to studying human phenomenon and processes.

28 Linda Tuhiwai Smith’s (1999: 5) question at the end of the quote on page 32 above “Can they actually do anything?” played an important role in my desire to contribute to the functioning of Kfm in what I hope were meaningful and useful ways.
Chapter 3 is dedicated to an exploration of the historical process of Māori urbanization in Aotearoa New Zealand. Throughout this chapter the focus is on understanding how cities based on a Western model came to be present in Aotearoa New Zealand, how cities were initially integral components of the colonial process, and how Māori managed to adapt to cities and, eventually, migrated in large numbers to urban areas. Throughout this chapter cities are viewed as unique spaces/places that not only challenged Māori in new ways, but also afforded them social, cultural and economic opportunities.

In Chapter 4 the main question that is addressed is, in a contemporary context, what has been the legacy of Māori urbanization? It is in this chapter that the concept Māori urbanisms is defined and, more specifically, the idea of whakamanatanga-based Māori urbanisms are more thoroughly developed. The question of Māori urban identities is an important part of this chapter and, more importantly, how these identities are connected to urban space/place is examined. It is this question that connects to the main research concept in this dissertation–Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga.

Chapter 5 is the first of this dissertation’s four empirical chapters. In this wide ranging chapter interviews with individual Māori are featured as well as two sections that focus on specific Māori exhibits in two Aotearoa New Zealand museums. The purpose of this chapter is to show the diverse ways in which Māori are living Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga. The point of this chapter is to validate the important argument that these geographies are not limited to any one group of Māori, but rather that these Māori are representative of a phenomenon that cuts across a broad range of professions and activities.
This chapter is also intended to show the importance of space/place in formation of whakamanatanga-based Māori urbanisms.

Chapter 6 through eight are all concerned with one place in Auckland: Mana Moko-Te Karanga, otherwise known informally as Kfm. These chapters bring my empirical research down to the most intimate scale and get to the core issue of how a Māori urban geography of whakamanatanga is actually created and maintained. In Chapter 6 Kfm’s space/place context in Auckland is described, followed by a discussion of how Kfm came to be. In this chapter the space/place conceptual framework is brought to bear on this process of space/place formation, with a particular focus on Lefebvrian socio-spatial theory and a place as social construction perspective.

In Chapter 7 Kfm is explored in terms of its everyday life context. The question that is explored here is how Kfm and the people that are most intimately associated with this place are actualizing and facilitating place as a process of constant becoming. Lefabvre’s notion of spatial practice is combined with concepts associated with place theory such as embodiment, dwelling, and performativity in order to illustrate the interdependent relationship between space/place as sociality and space/place as materiality.

In the final empirical chapter, Chapter 8, Kfm is approached as a space/place-based social movement. It is argued in this chapter that Kfm represents a place that is simultaneously intensely local and global, and that this local/global context is profoundly related to Kfm’s identification as both a Māori place and a place of multiculturalism. From this perspective a final argument about Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga is presented; an argument that views Kfm as a space/place where a coming together of several
phenomenon—whakamanatanga-based Māori urbanisms, Auckland’s emerging multicultural society, and urban creative culture—is occurring. This coming together has created a space/place where Māori are able to both reinforce their local position as the first nation peoples of Aotearoa New Zealand and confidently engage with the forces of globalization that are coalescing in Auckland, with multiculturalism being one specific component of this globalization.
CHAPTER 2
SPACE/PLACE AND INDIGENOUS GEOGRAPHIES: TOWARDS A CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

2. Space/Place and Indigenous Epistemologies

In this chapter, and the two that follow, the three main theoretical arguments that form a conceptual framework for researching Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga are presented. As noted in the previous chapter, these three arguments are: 1) a space/place ontology that views all human phenomenon as simultaneously and always social, historical and geographical in nature, 2) an urban perspective that views the city as a space/place of challenges and opportunities for those engaging the urban context, and 3) an argument that processes of urbanization produce unique urbanisms or urban ways of life. These three theoretical arguments are further framed and modified through an engagement with indigenous perspectives, and more specifically Māori perspectives, in order to better understand the relationship between Māori, processes of urbanization and formations of Māori urbanisms.

I begin this conceptual framework discussion with the space/place ontology because it is from this base that my arguments about the relevance of the urban context for Māori unfold. The main objective of this chapter is, therefore, twofold. First, to assert an argument that space and place are best utilized as mutually constitutive concepts and, second, to argue that research involving indigenous issues must consider the way the indigenous group(s)
under consideration define space and place. The result is the development of what I refer to as an indigenized space/place conceptual framework in which both Western and indigenous notions of space and place inform one another resulting in a more ontologically sophisticated and, as a result, a more analytically productive framework for researching Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga.

2.1 Convergences of Space and Place

The space/place framework that I am proposing here is linked to a long-standing debate in geography and other disciplines concerned with the nature of, and relationship between, these two concepts. It is also, as noted in Chapter 1, derived from my personal academic evolution as a human geographer over the past quarter century. It is difficult to conceive of an Anglo-American trained human geographer not at some point having to grapple with either or both of these concepts during his or her research, and my experiences as a geographer certainly are no exception to this statement. This is the case because so much of how human geographers have defined their field has come out of this debate.

John Agnew (2005) has written one of the more recent and accessible discussions about ways in which space and place are theoretically related. I draw heavily on Agnew here because his conclusions about the ways in which space and place are theoretically related—that the two concepts are incorrectly conceived when theorized separately, synonymously or in opposition—are so closely aligned with my own. Agnew (2005: 81) argues that typically,
[i]n much academic usage...space and place are either not distinguished at all, but viewed as synonymous, or one is seen as trumping the other. In this latter view, different intellectual traditions tend to express themselves in the preference for one word or the other, in part simply to distinguish themselves through association with one or the other but also because the terms are seen as representing totally different views of the nature of the world and geographical representations of it.

Agnew finds these various treatments of space and place problematic because they focus primarily on how these concepts differ rather than on how they are connected. Alternatively, Agnew argues that it is better to focus on ways in which space and place must “invariably...[depend]...on the other for either to have much by way of a satisfactory theoretical basis” (2005: 81). In other words, Agnew is not arguing that space and place are converging in meaning, but rather that the individual meaning of these concepts cannot be constructed independent one from the other. That this is not fully understood or applied in the many ways space and place are utilized in academic literature across a broad spectrum of disciplines is evident from the ways in which space and place have been contrasted and theorized (also see Merrifield, 1993). This has resulted in many researchers constructing a range of incorrect oppositions when contrasting space and place.

The dominant theme running through many of these oppositional approaches is one of place representing rootedness versus space representing mobility and flexibility. For example, place is viewed as traditional and intimately local while space represents a more progressive and more global perspective. Depending on the perspective of the person discussing space and place this contrast is capable of putting either space or place in the morally and politically superior position. Those advocating for a space-oriented approach
might argue that place represents nostalgia for an imagined and idealized past and as a result is regressive and reactionary to forces of progress represented by space (e.g., new technology leading to faster modes of transportation; see Harvey, 1989). Some place advocates argue, in contrast, that these same forces result in placelessness whereby space, in the service of forces of modernity (e.g., capitalism and urbanization) erases the local (e.g., a McDonalds and Starbucks on every corner), and as a result undermines human connectivity to place-centered communities and environments.\(^\text{29}\)

However, within the context of this debate both space and place advocates, Agnew points out, suffer from an incorrect ontological understanding of space and place as inherently oppositional. This problem arises, Agnew argues, “whether Newton’s or Leibniz’s understanding of space prevails” (2005: 83). A Newtonian perspective is based on the notion that “space is absolute, in the sense that it is an entity in itself, independent of whatever objects and events occupy it, containing these objects and events, and having separate powers from them” (2005: 83). Whereas the Leibnizian perspective is based on the notion that “space is relational, in the sense that it has no powers independent of objects and events but can be construed only from the relations between them” (2005: 83). The important point here is, according to Agnew, that proponents of either the Newtonian of the Leibnizian understandings still suffer from conceptions of space and place that do not properly acknowledge the ways in which these concepts are theoretically interdependent (Merrifield, 1993 makes a similar argument).

\(^\text{29}\) See Relph (1976) for an early example of this argument.
As a response to this perceived failing in the theoretical treatment of space and place across a broad spectrum of disciplines, Agnew (2005: 84-85) offers a way of understanding the theoretically intertwined nature of these concepts:

If space and place are taken as internally related to one another in human practice, however, these oppositions dissolve. Space then signifies a field of practice or area in which a group or organization, such as a state, operates, held together in popular consciousness by a map-image and a narrative that represents it as a meaningful whole. Place represents the encounter of people with other people and things in space. It refers to how everyday life is inscribed in space and takes on meaning for people and organizations. Space is thus ‘top-down’, defined by powerful actors imposing their control and narratives on others. Place is the ‘bottom-up’, representing the outlooks and actions of more typical folk. Places can be localized when associated with the familiar. But they can also be larger areas, depending on patterns of activities, network connections and the projection of feelings of attachment, comfort and belonging. From this perspective, neither trumps the other. Indeed, each requires the other.

The key here is the link Agnew makes between space and place as “internally related concepts” and “human practice”. The point being that space and place are simultaneously and continuously inscribed in the lives of people as they go about their daily routines. This is true independent of geographic context. A person flying on a commercial jet at 500 miles per hour is no less experiencing place as he/she is space; and a person living most of his/her life in a small rural village in India is no less experiencing space than he/she is experiencing place. The distinction that Agnew makes between top-down space and bottom-up place is also significant. He suggests that space operates at a level of representation and discourse while place is understood as a more visceral experience at the level of everyday life. Yet despite this contrast it is clear from Agnew’s description that even at the most intimate scales of bottom-up place production, space is also very much present and a relevant part of sociality.
On the one hand, I do not think that Agnew’s attempt to demonstrate the ways in which space and place are mutually constitutive is entirely unproblematic. For example, the way in which he contrasts space as connected to “groups”, “organizations” and, especially, “powerful actors” while place is the purview of “more typical folk” seems conceptually limiting, and comes close to asserting space as dominant over place. But this is not the main point I want to make regarding Agnew. Rather, the point is that Agnew’s assertion of the mutually constitutive nature of these concepts is critical to developing a space/place ontology. And in fact Agnew goes on to highlight areas of geography where researchers have taken the discussions about space and place in this direction.

Agnew outlines four research perspectives in human geography that, he argues, have adopted theoretical perspectives that embrace notions of space and place as mutually constitutive aspects of reality. These four perspectives are as follows (2005: 89):

1) Humanistic or agency-based geographies
2) Neo-Marxist geographies (particularly drawing on Lefebvre’s theory of socially produced space)
3) Postmodernist-feminist geographies
4) Contextualist-performative geographies

The humanist/agency-based approach focuses on “relating location and locale to sense of place through the experiences of human beings as agents” (89). The neo-Marxist approach in geography has been deeply influenced by the writing of Henri Lefebvre. Levebvre’s theory of socially produced space is engaged in more detail below and is an important component of my own attempt to

\[30\] Agnew (89) defines “locale” as the “setting where everyday life activities take place.”
construct a space/place theoretical framework from which to base my arguments about Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga. Although Lefebvre rarely acknowledges place as an important component of his theory, geographers such as Agnew argue—as do I—that place is embedded in Lefebvre’s complex conceptual framework. The postmodernist-feminist perspective takes yet another approach to understanding the relationship between space and place. According to Agnew (2005: 91),

> Here the emphasis is on places as sites in the flow of social relations. Place is seen as constituted out of space-spanning relationships, place-specific social forms and a sense of place associated with the relative well-being, disruption and experience of living somewhere. The experience of place is quite different for different groups, such as children, women, subordinated social classes, minorities, etc.

Ultimately the postmodernist-feminist approach is focused on asserting multiplicity, alterity and difference over master narratives and universalizing theories of space and place. In the fourth approach to space/place, contextualist-performative geographies, places are conceived as “specific time-space configurations made up of the intersection of many encounters between ‘actants’ (people and things)” (92). Agnew notes that this approach is the most “radical” of the four in that social relationships are viewed as always productive of and intertwined with space and place at an ontological level (i.e., it is a part of how the very nature of our being is understood and constituted).

These four approaches represent a robust range of geographic perspectives all progressively and productively engaging space and place as mutually constituted theoretical constructs. In the remainder of this chapter

---

31 Also see Merrifield, 1993, as well as Soja, 1996: 40—especially footnote #18 (see below as well).
some of these approaches will be more deeply engaged than others, but it is important to note here that I consider all of them not only deeply relevant, but also, I argue, that none of them are mutually exclusive. In other words, these four approaches are not contradictory or totally in opposition. My own geographic training has involved the use of some aspects of all of these and I find them all to have their useful elements and arguments. They all inform the other despite a fair amount of cross-criticism and heated debate by advocates of each of these approaches. Ultimately this has resulted in improvements and greater connections across all four perspectives.

Any of these geographic perspectives can be used to better understand and analyze, for example, processes of Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga. Partly this is determined by what aspects of these geographies researcher are focusing on. I have chosen in this research to look more closely at Lefebvrian socio-spatial theory because I am intrigued by the prospects of exploring the potential for applying this theoretical framework to indigenous issues, as well as because Lefebvrian socio-spatial theory is particularly well suited to explorations that involve urban issues. The result of this engagement is a productive discussion between Lefebvrian socio-spatial theory and indigenous urban worldviews that result in new and improved understandings of both.

However, a Lefebvrian-Indigenous theoretical engagement is not enough. It is also necessary to bring into this engagement progressive ways of understanding place (mostly coming out of the other three perspectives outlined by Agnew above) in order to develop the full potential of a space/place conceptual framework. Thus, the remainder of this chapter is dedicated to
developing this three-way engagement. This will be achieved by first looking at the impact Lefebvrian socio-spatial theory has had on our understanding of space as socially produced, and at the elements of this theory that are closely related to the way some geographers define place. This will be followed by a discussion of the way place has developed as an analytic concept in human geography and the movement in the social sciences towards a sense of place that is both locally focused and, simultaneously, globally connected. Finally, these two strands of theoretical debate will be connected and then infused with indigenous perspectives on these same concepts, with the goal of asserting an indigenized space/place conceptual framework.

2.2 From Absolute Space to Socially Produced Space

Space has always been one of the central concerns of Anglo-American geography in the 20th century, and space has typically been theorized as ‘absolute’ and ‘pre-existing’ serving as a container, accessible through mathematical calculations, within which places and locations are perceived and experienced (Curry, 2002). According to Michael Curry (2002: 507) this understanding of space as absolute has “become the accepted way of conceptualizing and imagining space and the objects characterized as being

32 Thus demonstrating the dominance of a Newtonian conception of space in Anglo-American geography.
within it, and has come to be seen as foundational for discourse about the workings of the world, at an everyday as well as conceptual level.”

Although, on the one hand, this absolutist approach to space dominated Western thought for centuries, on the other, the ontological relevance of space became increasingly marginalized both in philosophy and in the social sciences in terms of its role in social processes (Soja, 1996). This was less the case in geography where space became increasingly central to the field, especially as it was coupled with the ‘quantitative revolution’ in geography in the 1960s (Agnew, 2005). Although competing and/or related concepts such as place and landscape never were completely removed from academic geography during this period, they were certainly marginalized for a period.

In the 1970s and 1980s human geographers drew from a broad range of philosophical sources (e.g., phenomenology, structuration theory, cultural studies, Marxism) in efforts to develop approaches to space, place in efforts to infuse their field with more theoretically rigorous and outward looking analyses of social processes. It was within the context of these fertile theoretical debates that Lefebvrian socio-spatial theory was introduced to geography by geographers such as David Harvey (e.g., 1982, 1989) and Edward Soja (e.g., 1996) and notions of space in human geography have never quite been the same.

---

33 Although Curry (2002) notes that alternative views did also ‘compete’ against this dominant view of space as absolute
34 It is during this time that the four areas of human geography that incorporate space and place noted by Agnew above come into their own.
35 Although it should be acknowledged that geographers bent on applying an absolutist notion of space to geographic analysis are still very much present in contemporary geography. Agnew (2005: 85) acknowledges this when he points out that “[s]patial analysis may have failed to capture the field in its entirety but it lives on in the practices of many geographers committed to mapping spatial patterns and reasoning back to the social, economic and/or political processes
The impact of Lefebvre’s theory of the social production of space on contemporary social theory cannot be overstated. What I am arguing here, however, is that Lebevrian socio-spatial theory can be understood as an engagement between space and place, even though Lefebvre rarely if ever uses the term place in his theoretical constructions. I further argue that a space/place approach to Lefebvrian socio-spatial theory can productively be applied to indigenous urban studies (and by extension Māori urban studies). Lefebvrian theory offers one way to understand why the urbanization process has been so challenging for many indigenous peoples, and also offers (in a tantalizingly abstract way) the possibilities of creating indigenized urban spaces/places that have the potential to resist forces of domination in cities—particularly collusions of capitalism and government control. In order to explain these arguments in more detail it is necessary at this point to explore some of the basic tenets of Lefebvrian socio-spatial theory.

The philosophical depth and complexity of Lefebvre’s theory of the social production of space makes it easy to get bogged down in its details. This is not my intention here. The goal here is to explain the basic principles and concepts of Lefebvrian socio-spatial theory in a way that is as accessible as possible, and to this end I am mostly drawing on Christian Schmid’s (2008) recent chapter titled *Henri Lefebvre’s Theory of the Production of Space: Towards a Three-Dimensional Dialectic*. While this will be the primary source, I will also be drawing directly from Lefebvre’s *The Production of Space* (1991 translation), as well as from other

---

that may have produced them. The focus is on relationships between events and objects in space by correlating their spatial co-occurrence.”
writers that have attempted to explain the basic theoretical structure of Lefebvre’s spatial ontology.36

2.2.1 Lefebvre’s socio-spatial trialectic

Lefebvre’s (1991: 11) monumental project in The Production Of Space is to unite the three "fields" of space that have traditionally been "apprehended separately" in Western philosophical and scientific thought: these include physical space, mental space, and social space. This fragmented treatment of space, Lefebvre argues, has not only led to profound misconceptions about the role of space in social process, but also, and perhaps more importantly, has served dominant forces—capitalism in particular—in maintaining and reproducing specific forms of socio-economic domination (also see Merrifield, 1993: 523). Merrifield (1996: 522) summarises Lefebvre’s (1991) work as “the culmination of a life-long intellectual project in which he sought to understand the role of space, the nature of the urban and the importance of everyday life in the perpetuation and expanded reproduction of the capitalist mode of production.” But more than just being interested in issues involving the perpetuation and expansion of the capitalist mode of production, Lefebvre was also intensely concerned with ways in which, through practices of everyday life, individuals and groups could reclaim from the forces of capitalism actual places (Agnew, 2008: 90). It is at this level of analysis—the relationship between everyday life and actual spaces/places—that Lefebvre’s theories seem to have the greatest potential to tell

---

36 For examples see Molotch, 1991; Merrifield, 1993; Gottdeiner, 1993 & 1994; Liggett, 1995; Soja, 1996; McCann, 1999; Amin & Thrift, 2002; Elden, 2004; Agnew, 2005; Hubbard, 2006.
us something meaningful about how people can liberate themselves from forces that constrict and control their lives. And yet, despite the obvious importance of Lefebvre’s ideas, application of these ideas has proved challenging, especially at the level of empirical research (Schmid, 2008: 43).

It is, I argue, the all-encompassing ontological nature of Lefebvre’s spatial theory that makes it so challenging to comprehend and, even more, to apply to empirical case studies. Attempting to cut through some of this complexity Schmid (2008: 28) summarizes Lefebvre’s theory in the following manner:

(Social) space is a (social) product; in order to understand this fundamental thesis it is necessary, first of all, to break with the widespread understanding of space imagined as an independent material reality existing ‘in itself.’ Against such a view, Lefebvre, using the concept of the production of space, posits a theory that understands space as fundamentally bound up with social reality. It follows that space ‘in itself’ can never serve as an epistemological starting position. Space does not exist ‘in itself’; it is produced (original emphasis).

Getting one’s head around this counter-intuitive, but most basic aspect of Lefebvre’s spatial theory is the first step to comprehending it. It is counter-intuitive to some because it goes against the basic Western notion (that we in the West have all had embedded in us whether we like it or not) that there is a separation between our perceptions of the world and the world itself. This begins with the idea that our consciousness is separate from our physical being (the first most basic Western separation of sociality and spatiality), but it extends to how we comprehend the world around us, and our place in it (Merrifield, 1993). Based on Lefebvrian theory, however, we cannot posit an objective space separate from ourselves and ask, how do we know this space, and through that knowing better understand our relationship to it? Rather, what we must ask is, how
does our knowing create this space, and how does this socially created space inform and reproduce our knowing?  

Since space is socially produced, it follows that it is “both result and precondition of the production of society” (Schmid, 2008: 29), and therefore does not exist universally. As a result, Schmid (2008: 29) concludes (following Lefebvre), that since space is socially produced it “can only be understood in the context of a specific society.” Thus, the fundamental question that must be addressed when outlining Lefebvrian socio-spatial theory is “how is (social) space produced” in a specific societal context (Schmid, 2008: 29)? To answer this question Lefebvre breaks from the standard ontological arguments developed by Western theorists that tend to posit a two-dimensional dialectic (e.g., mind-body).  

Lefebvre challenges this dualistic notion of space by instead replacing it with what Christian Schmid (2008) refers to as a “double-tiered three-dimensional trialectic.” Lefebvre’s objective was, according to Schmid, to posit an ontological theory that built upon the work of Hegel, Marx and Neitzsche but radically broke from these philosopher’s works by inserting space critically into their arguments and doing so within the framework of a trialectic rather than a

---

37 The same argument, of course, can and is made by Lefebvre concerning time. In fact, in all these discussions of Lefebvrian socio-spatial theory time should be assumed to also be a part of the equation, even though I have chosen not to mention it too often explicitly.

38 According to Schmid (2008: 30) dialectical thinking “means the recognition that social reality is marked by contradictions and can be understood only through the comprehension of these contradictions.” For a fuller discussion of dialectical thinking Schmid’s chapter is a good starting point, but ultimately one has to turn to the German philosophers Hegel, Marx & Neitzsche. Discussions of these philosophers is outside the scope if this dissertation. For a more in-depth discussion of Lefebvrian dialectics see Merrifield (1993) and Gottdeiner (1993). For Lefebvre’s (1939; translated into English 1968) views on dialectics one can begin with his early book Dialectical Materialism.

39 The “double tier” here is meant to represent the ability of Lefebvrian socio-spatial theory to incorporate both structure and agency into it framework, while the three dimensional component is meant to represent the incorporation of historicality, sociality and spatiality.
dialectic. Lefebvre’s challenge to dialectics differs importantly from an Althusserian or deconstructionist approach (Gottdeiner, 1993: 130). In these latter two approaches “analytical categories are perceived as oppositions or antinomies...[that]...usually results in static contrasts” (Gottdeiner, 1993: 130). Lefebvre rejects this view of dialectics because it lacks the dynamism of Marx’s “flowing, manifold, and complex” understanding of dialectics (Gottdeiner, 1993: 130). To avoid “static contrasts” Lefebvre defines dialectical “moments” as occurring in the form of double-layered triads—each with three categories instead of two. The introduction of a third term into dialectics “instantly deconstructs static oppositions or dualisms, and adds a fluid dimension to social process” (Gottdeiner, 1993: 130). The double layer is intended to theoretically “marry” Lefebvre’s “radical critique of Hegel based on Marx’s social practice and Nietzsche’s art” (Schmid, 2008: 33) with a phenomenological perspective emphasizing perception and experience. Consistent throughout this theoretical framework is an unbending insistence on social practice and perception being fundamentally intertwined with spatial practice and its resulting “concrete, produced materiality” (Schmid, 2008: 38).

In order to fully comprehend the nature of this structure Lefebvre proposed what has often been described as a double-layered trialectic (Schmid, 2008). One of these trialectical layers draws on Heideggerian, Merleau-Pontian, and Bachelardian phenomenological arguments (Schmid, 2008: 37-39) and involves the perceived, conceived, and lived aspects of socio-spatial relations and encompasses the spatial experience of the individual. This triad serves to connect the individual’s experience of space physically, mentally, and socially. There is according to Lefebvre a physical space that individuals can perceive
biologically (i.e. using all of our sensory organs); a mental space that is understood as “logical and formal abstraction” (Lefebvre, 1991: 11); and a social space that constitutes lived experience of space in the context of practices of everyday life (Schmid, 2008: 40). Importantly, it is through Lefebvre’s perceived/conceived/lived triad that the individual both produces and is reproduced by the socio-spatial elements infused with everyday life.

Lefebvre’s second triad of “spatial moments” adds to the first by connecting the individual’s experience of space to broader structural elements in society. This triad includes spatial practice, spaces of representation, and representations of space. As a whole (as well as in its parts) this triad reveals “the relations of assembly that produce space” (Liggett, 1995: 247). Spatial practice is closely related to perceived space. As Merrifield (1993, 524) puts it, “people’s perceptions condition their daily reality with respect to the usage of space: for example, their routes, networks, patterns of interaction that link places set aside for work, play and leisure.” Spatial practice is the space of everyday life. It refers to “the everyday social/spatial patterns of people in particular places” (Liggett, 1995: 249). Lefebvre (1991: 38) writes that,

The spatial practice of a society secretes that society’s space; it propounds and presupposes it, in a dialectical interaction; it produces it slowly and surely as it masters and appropriates it. From the analytic standpoint, the spatial practice of a society is revealed through the deciphering of its space.

---

40 Gottdeiner (1993: 131) refers to mental space as “a semiotic abstraction that informs...how people negotiate space,” and Schmid (2008: 39) argues relates to the notion that “space cannot be perceived as such without having been conceived in thought previously.”

41 Gottdeiner (1993: 131) defines social space as “a medium through which the body lives out its life in interaction with other bodies.”

42 In following sections below, descriptions of place as being-in-the-world seem to come quite close to Lefebvre’s perceived/conceived/lived triad.
Each of us, in other words, as we go through the actions of our daily lives, is continuously involved in spatial practices. These practices are so fundamentally a part of our lives that it is not necessarily (or primarily) a part of our conscious experience. As Lefebvre puts it, “A spatial practice must have a certain cohesiveness, but this does not imply that it is coherent (in the sense of intellectually worked out or logically conceived)” (Lefebvre, 1991, 38). He further argues (33) that,

Spatial practice ensures continuity and some degree of cohesion. In terms of social space, and of each member of a given society’s relationship to that space, this cohesion implies a guaranteed level of competence and a specific level of performance.

At the level of the individual, spatial practice involves the infinite "moments" of contact between our perceptual being and the physical world; it is the moment before meaning (absolute, abstract, intellectual, or emotional) is "attached" to our perceptions of the world. As Merrifield (1993, 524) puts it, "spatial practices are lived directly before they are conceptualized." The point of contact between spatial practices and any kind of real meaning associated with these practices is explained through Lefebvre’s notion of spaces of representation.

Spaces of representation involve "space as directly lived through its associated images and symbols" (Lefebvre, 1991, 38). Spaces of representation involve the meaning we associate with the "moments" of spatial practice. It is the meaningful point of contact between physical and mental space; it is, in other words, lived social space. This moment of space is, according to Liggett (1995: 43)

43 This notion of spatial practices comes very close to the contextualist-performative geographies noted by Agnew (205; above) and the way authors such as David Seamon (1980) and Nigel Thrift (1983), within this framework, talk about ways in which people “perform” space and place.
Spaces of representation (representational spaces), Lefebvre (1991: 42) writes,\(^4^4\)

need obey no rules of consistency or cohesiveness. Redolent with imaginary and symbolic elements, they have their source in history—in the history of a people as well as in the history of each individual belonging to that people...childhood memories, dreams, or uterine images and symbols (holes, passages, labyrinths)...[are representational spaces]...Representational space is alive: it speaks. It has an affective kernel or centre: Ego, bed, bedroom, dwelling, house, or: square, church, graveyard. It embraces the loci of passion, of action and of lived situations, and thus immediately implies time. Consequently it may be qualified in various ways: it may be directional, situational or relational, because it is essentially qualitative, fluid and dynamic.

Spaces of representation are paradoxically both potential sites of resistance (resistance to ideological domination through space) and sites vulnerable to domination. This form of space is a potential site of resistance because it is the site of difference, of Otherness. It is the site that reveals the contradictions (and therefore potentially the weaknesses) of dominant abstract spaces created, for example, under structural systems like capitalism. This form of space is also, however, a potential site of domination because it is susceptible to appropriation by representations of space.\(^4^5\)

\(^{4^4}\) Both Harvey (1989) and Gottdeiner (1993) use the term “spaces of representation” to connote this form of space. “Representational space” is based on Donald Nicholson-Smith’s translation of Lefebvre (1991). I have chosen to follow Harvey/Gottdeiner here.

\(^{4^5}\) It is this aspect of Lefebvre’s thesis that I connect, in chapter eight, to Kfm and refer to as ‘Māori spaces/places of difference.’ Although I tend to eschew aspects of resistance and, instead, prefer to think of the Kfm space/place as one that is productive of a new kind of positive urban socio-spatial context. Within this context a simultaneous occurrence of celebration of Māori identity and embracing of Auckland’s growing multicultural context is developing.
(Two central Lefebvrian concepts: abstract space and social space are important to note here. Gottdeiner (1993: 131) summarizes these two Lefebvrian concepts as follows:

Abstract space is constituted by the intersection of knowledge and power. It is the hierarchical space that is pertinent to those who wish to control social organization, such as political rulers, economic interests, and planners. Social space, in contrast, arises from practice—the everyday lived experience that is externalized and materialized through action by all members of society, even the rulers. Persons working from the model of abstract space continually try to reign in and control the social space of everyday life, with its constant changes, whereas social space always transcends conceived boundaries and regulated forms.

This ongoing tension between abstract and social space, Lefebvre argues, is omnipresent in modern society, but has its greatest expression in the urban context. Ultimately, Lefebvre's project is against the potential negative and exploiting aspects of abstract space. One of the main goals of his life was to find ways to resist the dominance of abstract space in the form of revolutionary, counter-social-spaces.)

The third component of Lefebvre’s structural trialectic, representations of space, is understood as intellectualized, ideological moments of space. As such, they are a form of abstract space and often function in the service of social domination. This is the realm of conceived space: it is the collection (appropriation) of the pre-perceptual moments of spatial practice and the meaningful moments of spaces of representation into an intellectualized and abstracted "package." Representations of space are an ideology about everyday life (or at least an abstract version of everyday life). These dominating forms of

---

46 In chapter eight I argue that Kfm (Mana Moko-Te Karanga) is an example of this sort of revolutionary, counter space/place.
space "are codified and often institutionalized ways of knowing space...[that]...form self-referential worlds, or detached ideologies that then can be used instrumentally to create certain kinds of space" (Liggett, 1995: 248).

Lefebvre (1991: 38-39) defines this form of space as,

conceptualized space, the space of scientists, planners, urbanists, technocratic subdividers and social engineers, as of a certain type of artist with a scientific bent—all of whom identify what is lived and what is perceived with what is conceived...This is the dominant space in any society (or mode of production). Conceptions of space tend...towards a system of verbal (and therefore intellectually worked out) signs. 47

The way that representations of space appropriate spaces of representation and attempt to dominate spatial practice is critical here. First, intellectually produced (especially in the case of architects, engineers, and planners) and then (potentially) physically constructed, representations of space attempt to erase all forms of difference that threaten a particular dominant ideology (Merrifield, 1993: 524).

One of the best explanations (that I have found) of the interdependent relationship between spatial practices, representation of space, and spaces of representation comes from Schmid (2008: 37):

According to this schema, (social) space can be analyzed in relation to these three dimensions. In the first, social space appears in the dimension of spatial practice as an interlinking chain or network of activities or interactions which on their part rest upon a determinate material basis (morphology, built environment). In the second, this spatial practice can be linguistically defined and demarcated as space and then constitutes a representation of space. This representation serves as an organizing schema or a frame of reference for communication, which permits a (spatial) orientation and thus co-determines activity at the same time. In

47 The dominant ideology that Lefebvre is critiquing is capitalism. It is also worth noting here that one of the featured case studies in chapter five is an architectural firm in Auckland named designTRIBE. The architects in this firm are also, following Lefebvre’s thesis, wielding abstract space, but from my conversations it is clear that they are attempting to do so in a way that breaks from the dominant ideologies embedded in the legacies of colonialism and capitalism (see chapter five for a fuller discussion of this connection).
the third, the material ‘order’ that emerges on the ground can itself become the vehicle conveying meaning. In this way a (spatial) symbolism develops that expresses and evokes social norms, values, and experiences.

But it is essential to remember that part of the Lefebvrian double-layered trialectic that Schmid is describing is the perceived, conceived, lived trialectic. The three dimensions of the production of space (spatial practice, representations of space, and spaces of representation) are given “phenomenological access” by Lefebvre through the perceived, conceived, and lived dimensions of his double layered trialectic (Schmid, 2008: 39). In this way Lefebvre has constructed a theoretical framework for comprehending social processes that encompasses both structure and agency, but does so in a way that uncompromisingly inserts space as a fundamental component of sociality.

2.2.2 Finding Place in Lefebvrian Space

Geographers who have focused their efforts on asserting the primacy of place in human geography might take pause at the notion that Lefebvre has created a theory of space that includes notions of “phenomenological access.” Certainly Lefebvre seems to be at the very least “flirting” with constructing a theory of space that easily includes place, even if he chose to not access this concept in his efforts. It is no wonder that a champion of place such as Tim Cresswell (2004: 10) when contrasting contemporary theories of space and place writes:

Although this basic dualism of space and place runs through much of human geography since the 1970s it is confused somewhat by the idea of social space—or socially produced space—which, in many ways, plays the same role as place.
But rather than adding confusion to discussions of space and place, I argue that Lefebvrian socio-spatial theory is, in everything but word, a theory of socio-space/place.

John Agnew (2005) makes this same argument when discussing various perspectives in geography that are attempting to theorize space and place interdependently. One of these, as noted above, is neo-Marxists geographies based on Lefebvrian socio-spatial theory (e.g., Harvey, 1989; Soja, 1989; Merrifield, 1993). Agnew (2005: 90) argues that Lefebvre,

focused on the social production of the spaces within which social life takes place. Under capitalism, ‘abstract space’ (the space produced by economic transactions and state policies) has ‘colonized’ everyday life by means of both spatial practices (commodification and bureaucratization) and representations of space (discourses of planning and surveillance). Lefebvre looked for a movement against this colonization of concrete space (or place) to reclaim the spaces of everyday life. This could be accomplished by insurgent ‘counter-discourses’ based on spaces of representation that build on memories and residues of an older ‘authentic’ existence and new practices in concrete space.48

Significantly, Agnew follows this interpretation of Lefebvre by concluding that Lefebvre’s “framework does suggest how uneven economic development is jointly produced by dominant practices and discourses but can only be challenged by and on behalf of people in places attempting to recapture concrete (place) space from the abstract space of modern capitalism” (90; added emphasis).49

48 Again, it is worth noting here that one of things I argue about Kfm in later chapters is that it is an example of these “new practices in concrete space.”
49 It is this argument that suggests important connections to research on the relationship between indigenous peoples and cities. While Agnew puts this argument in the generic terms of “people” challenging dominant practices and discourses, I am arguing that this can be applied more specifically to distinct cultural, ethnic and/or identity groups. Specific to this research I am arguing that when Māori moved to cities in large numbers (see chapter three) they too were faced with this challenge, but this challenge was layered with the legacy of colonialism and issues of racism and classism.
Edward Soja, perhaps the Anglo-American geographer that has most incorporated Lefebvrian social theory into his research, makes a similar argument when he writes (1996: 40, footnote #18),

Lefebvre rarely used the concept of ‘place’ in his writings, largely because its richest meaning is effectively captured in his combined use of ‘everyday life’ and ‘lived space.’ Many cultural geographers, in particular, have persistently attempted to separate the concepts of place and space and to give place greater concreteness, immediacy, and cultural affect, while space is deemed to be abstract, distanced, ethereal. As Lefebvre’s work demonstrates, this is an unnecessary and misleading separation/distinction that reduces the meaningfulness of both space and place.

Unfortunately, despite this argument that space and place cannot be separated, Soja has nonetheless written several books and articles incorporating a Lefebvrian perspective that effectively ignores place as a distinct concept that has the potential to inform and improve Lefebvrian socio-spatial theory. I find this argument highly problematic in that it ignores the important work on place done by researchers in geography and other disciplines, work that has, I argue, the potential to add considerably to Lefebvre’s overall socio-spatial framework by demonstrating the importance, the necessity in fact, of place to fully realize the potential of his conceptual framework. In many ways this may just mean recognizing (as I have done in footnotes throughout this section) where

50 Soja’s (1996) book Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and Other Real-and-imagined Places, is probably the best example of this exclusion of place, but perhaps more remarkably is the chapter he published with Barbara Hooper (1993) titled “The Spaces that Difference Makes.” This chapter was in a book titled Place and the Politics of Identity (Keith & Pile, eds.) and yet, despite the centrality of place implied by the title, continues to assert Lefebvrian space over any alternative or parallel notion of place!

51 My intention here is not to suggest that Soja’s arguments are irrevocably flawed as a result of his unwillingness to include place in his arguments. I ultimately agree with his assertion that Lefebvre has created a theoretical framework that incorporates many of the most important aspects of place theory despite choosing not to use this term. However, I would further argue that some of the most problematic failings of Lefebvre’s socio-spatial theory come from his unwillingness to include place in his arguments. In particular Lefebvre’s lack of examples based on empirical data, especially in his opus The Production of Space, is a result, I argue, of an unwillingness to “ground” his theory empirically in actual places.
developments in the place literature obviously connect to Lefebvre’s ideas about socially produced space. However, I would go further and argue that the best work on place by geographers offers important additions and corrections to Lefebvre’s work. In particular these place-based theories seem to do a much better job of accessing life as actually lived and, as such, are much easier to connect to empirical studies. It is to this discussion that I now turn.

2.3 From Ideographic Place to a Global Sense of Place

The flip-side of arguing that Lefebvrian socio-spatial theory has within it a place-based argument is to argue that embedded in contemporary notions of place are meaningful and important connections to Lefebvrian socio-spatial theory. At their most progressive, these contemporary notions of place go beyond just connecting with Lefebvrian socio-spatial theory and instead contribute critical dimensions to a Lefebvrian framework (e.g., Massey, 1993 & 1997; Dirlik, 2001). Although Lefebvre’s socio-spatial theory has been applied with great effect to broad understandings of political economic and urban processes (e.g., Harvey, 1989; Soja, 1996), there is little evidence of Lefebvrian theory being applied effectively at levels of analysis that meaningfully engage empirical place-based data (Schmid, 2008: 43). Lefebvre’s framework has proven to be useful for understanding processes of capitalism and the power relations embedded in these processes, as well as the role of space in all of this. When applied at a more local scale, his framework is also useful for demonstrating the struggle between dominant and subordinate groups, institutions and forces attempting to control space in order to maintain certain socio-cultural power
relationships and hierarchies; particularly in terms of the tension between
capitalisms tendency to want to homogenize space in the service of capital versus
a social potential, in the course of everyday life, to create spaces of difference
and/or spontaneity (McCann, 1999). However, it can also be argued that the
level of theoretical abstraction incorporated in Lefebvre’s work makes it difficult
to apply his theory at the level of everyday experiences and relationships
(whether human or more broadly within nature—see Evans & Jones, 2008, for an
example of an attempt at the latter). And this is true despite the fact that one of
Lefebvre’s central stated concerns was everyday life.

A good example of this inability of Lefebvrian socio-spatial theory to
access everyday life experiences is Eugene McCann’s (1999) attempt to apply
Lefebvrian theory to a study of race riots in Lexington, Kentucky. McCann
argues, correctly I believe, that the application of Lefebvrian theory must be
informed by the specific social and material context of the place and event(s)
being studied. McCann (1999: 164) argues, for example,

social theories such as Henri Lefebvre’s discussion of the social
production of space, both inform and are informed by the material
circumstances of everyday life. As such, they must be transported from
one context to another with care and sensitivity.

The use of words such as “context” and phrases such as “the material
circumstances of everyday life” represent little more, I argue, than substitutes for
contemporary notions of place, despite McCann never making this connection.
As a result, I argue, McCann never actually accesses everyday life in his analysis
as he would if he inserted contemporary notions of place into his Lefebvrian
analysis. For example, he argues that (1999: 164),
Lefebvre’s conceptual framework is especially instructive when used to understand how the production and maintenance of ‘safe’ public spaces in U.S. cities is fundamentally related to representations of racial identities and to an ongoing process in which subjective identity and material urban spaces exist in a mutually constitutive relationship.

But what ends up happening in his analysis is that he makes a strong connection between “representations of racial identities” and state efforts to homogenize and control actual places, but he never accesses the mutually constitutive relationship between “subjective identities” and “material urban spaces.” It is in this failing that the inclusion of place-based arguments could have added considerable depth to McCann’s assertion of accessing everyday life in his analysis. In order to understand this it is useful to consider how place has developed in geography to a point that it is able to stand up theoretically to Lefebvre’s conceptual framework.

2.3.1 Development of place theory in human geography

One of the more recent attempts to produce an accessible account of place in human geography is Tim Cresswell’s (2004) Place: A Short Introduction. In briefly outlining the development of place in human geography I lean heavily on his writings in order to get more efficiently to a discussion of more recent progressive conceptions of place. Cresswell points out that place can be confusing when defined and applied conceptually in human geography because it is both object and a ‘way of seeing’ (2004: 15).\(^2\) This duality in the definition of the place concept marks its ontological aspect (defining what exists) and its

\(^2\) The difference of stating, for example, that Honolulu is an interesting place (i.e., an object that is of interest) versus stating that Honolulu has an interesting sense of place (i.e., a material space that evokes certain emotions and feelings).
epistemological role (a way of seeing and knowing the world). As a result, Cresswell further argues, different theories of place have developed in geography and in other fields, but always within the framework of place as both an object of study and as a context that influences how we see the world.53

Cresswell lays out place’s genealogy in the following manner.54 He notes that in the early part of the 20th century US geography was mired in environmental determinism. Within this framework differences between places were perceived as linked causally to aspects of the natural environment within which individual places developed. Later this determinism shifted to a human/cultural focus but place remained a concept utilized to determine differences between locations. Up to the 1960s human geography in the United States was regional and ideographic (focusing on uniqueness rather than general laws) and the place concept was approached through questions such as why are places different, and how could this difference be defined and bounded? During the 1960s many geographers in the US, dissatisfied with an ideographic geography, turned to the natural sciences for theoretical and methodological models. The quantitative ‘revolution’ in geography attempted to develop generalizable laws and models to explain human geographic processes. In this endeavor space replaced place as the central geographic concept and the academic field of geography was reconceptualized as a spatial science. During this same period place mostly disappeared from geographic research, and even when used in name (e.g. central place theory) it was treated as location with particular quantifiable characteristics. Thus, it was during this period that place

53 I would argue that Lefebvre brings this same dual understanding to notions of space.
54 See specifically Cresswell’s chapter two, pp. 15-51.
became conceptually framed as subordinate to space. Place was relegated to mere description while space was elevated to a concept useful for developing generalizable spatial laws grounded in mathematics. It was at this time that the tension between space as absolute, unlimited and universal and place as particular, limited and local became central to how these concepts were defined and contrasted in contemporary Anglo-American human geography.

The humanistic turn in the 1970s was a direct response to the quantitative and space focused geography of the 1960s. Humanistic geographers such as Ann Buttimer (1971), Edward Relph (1976), Yi Fu Tuan (1977) and David Seamon (1979) all argued in various ways that the quantitative/spatial turn in geography resulted in de-humanized geographic research. These geographers re-asserted place as a theoretically informed concept with subjectivity and experience emphasized over universalizing and de-humanized geographic theory. According to Cresswell (2004: 20) this shift was significant in the way that it drew on established philosophical traditions from Europe, specifically phenomenology and existentialism, as a way to assert place as a “universal and transhistorical part of the human condition.” No longer was distinctiveness between places the main concern, but rather place “as an idea, concept and way of being-in-the-world” was emphasized. Place was contrasted to space by these geographers as the locus of dwelling, experience, meaningful involvement, locally linked values and ideas of belonging. Space, on the other hand, was seen as abstract, intangible, the domain of action and movement, and of economic rationality.

The humanistic turn in geography was not without its critics. As other theoretically informed human geographic frameworks developed in Anglo-
American geography, such as Marxist geographies, feminist geographies, and post-structuralist/postmodern geographies they each took certain aspects of the humanistic approach to place and geography to task (while at the same time, I would argue, both contributing to and gaining much from the humanistic geographers’ conceptions of place). To summarize a massive amount of literature, the basic criticism geographers based in these other emerging areas of the discipline levied on the humanistic approach is as follows: feminist geographers as well as the Marxist and post-structuralist/postmodernists all argued that the way humanistic geographers defined and applied the place concept was deeply flawed in that their application of place was devoid of any sense of the power relations that were embedded in the way individuals experienced and constructed places.

Feminists argued that the way humanistic geographers defined place was overly connected to romantic and/or nostalgic concepts of home. Cresswell (2004: 24) sums up this romanticized/nostalgic way of defining place as a focus on place as attachment, rootedness, the center of meaning, a field of care, an intimate place of rest and withdrawal, a space of control, and a place to be yourself. This initial critique of place as a romanticized or nostalgic sense of home has developed into a wide-ranging feminist geography literature on place that has contributed significantly to understandings of place as socially and politically dynamic and rife with socio-cultural hierarchies and power relations (e.g., Rose, 1993; Massey, 1993, 1994 & 1997; Hooper, 2001).

Marxists also criticized the humanistic approach for being devoid of any substantive understanding of the power relationship that they argued were inherent in place—especially those involving relations of capital and class.
Geographers such as David Harvey (e.g., 1989) argued that place significance had increased, but that this was primarily due to place struggles that were a direct reaction to, and resistance against, the forces of mobile capitalism. Unique places were under threat, according to Harvey, because of the global economic spatial restructuring leading to the increased mobility of capital and production, and the need to merchandise and market and control fixed places. Resistance to these forces by those intimately connected to individual places was, from Harvey’s perspective, reactionary rather than progressive, and always informed by, and fundamentally about class relations in the context of capitalism’s modes of production.

At the same time as radical Marxist geographies were being introduced into Anglo-American geography in the 1980s, Cresswell (2004: 29) argues, another group of geographers were developing a critical cultural geography theoretically grounded in post-structuralist perspectives. Issues of age, gender, class, lifestyles, sexuality (for example) were connected to space and place in this literature leading geographers to ask broad questions about place such as, how places ‘work’ in a world of social hierarchies. How can places be understood through the lenses of social and cultural conflict? Ultimately these geographers argued, from a broad range of theoretical perspectives (e.g., structuration theory, discourse analysis, deconstruction, postcolonialism), that “place was not simply an outcome of social processes though, it was, once established, a tool in the creation, maintenance and transformation of relations of domination, oppression and exploitation” (e.g., Jackson, 1989).

Whether one is talking about humanistic, Marxist, feminist or post-structuralist/postmodernist geographies of place (and all the permutations,
amalgamations, and other approaches that borrowed or branched out from these) they all share at the very least a sense that place is not only a critical component of geography, but also one that is about a lot more than just a tool for describing how one location is different from another.

There is, however, another more fundamental philosophical component embedded in these debates about the nature of place. This involves the debate between place as socially constructed and place as being-in-the-world. Cresswell (2004, 29-33) argues that initially these two approaches to place were seen as oppositional perspectives. In general, Cresswell argues (30), contemporary critical human geography has been dominated by a social constructionist approach to studying and understanding place. From this perspective places are viewed as not natural or given, but rather created by people. As a result people can both create and un-create places (i.e., it is within the power of humans to change places), and understandably this perspective was very attractive to those with radical or revolutionary agendas because it suggested the possibility for positive place change. Within this framework both the meaning people ascribe to a place and the material aspects of a place are socially constructed.

In contrast, and to some extent in opposition, to this socially constructed notion of place is place as being-in-the-world. As this notion has been applied in human geography it has been theoretically grounded in the existential phenomenology of Martin Heidegger and Maurice Merleau-Ponty. From this

David Seamon (nd; original emphasis) gives a very accessible definition of phenomenology: “phenomenology...[is]...the exploration and description of phenomena, where phenomena refers to things or experiences as human beings experience them. Any object, event, situation or experience that a person can see, hear, touch, smell, taste, feel, intuit, know, understand, or live through is a legitimate topic for phenomenological investigation. There can be a phenomenology of light, of color, of architecture, of landscape, of place, of home, of travel, of
philosophical base geographers and others have developed theories of place that suggest that places are much more than social constructions. These are most often referred to as being-in-the-world or dwelling approaches to place and they all share a basic sense that our relationship to place is much more than what is understood as social. According to David Seamon (nd) being-in-the-world is a perspective that does not acknowledge any meaningful disconnect between an individual and their surrounding environments. This contrasts markedly from a social constructionist perspective because “It is impossible to ask whether person makes world or world makes person because both exist always together and can only be correctly interpreted in terms of the holistic relationship, being-in-world” (Seamon, nd).

Drawing on authors such as Robert Sack (1997) and Jeff Malpas (1999), Cresswell (2004: 31) argues that perhaps the best perspective is one that acknowledges the possibility that place as socially constructed and place as being-in-the-world are co-existent aspects of how we experience the world:

Note that Malpas, and Sack for that matter, do not deny that specific places are the products of society and culture. They insist, however, that place, in a general sense, adds up to a lot more than that. They point out that society itself is inconceivable without place—that the social (and the cultural) is geographically constructed. On the face of it this does not seem a lot different from the claim that the social and the spatial are mutually constitutive—a claim which is central to some forms of social constructionism. But the claims of Sack and Malpas are different from that because of their claim that the realm of the ‘social’ has no particular privilege in the discussions of place.

This theoretical position on place is important because it is the one embraced in the research undertaken in this dissertation. In the empirical chapters that follow

seeing, of learning, of blindness, of jealousy, of change, of relationship, of friendship, of power, of economy, of sociability, and so forth. All of these things are phenomena because human beings can experience, encounter, or live through them in some way.”
(Chapters 5, 6, 7 & 8) my discussions of Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga are grounded in the notion that Māori are actively constructing positive, productive and empowering places in Aotearoa New Zealand cities, but at the same time are bringing a Māori sense of being-in-the-world into the urban context. The relevance of these approaches to place for understanding the relationship between Māori and cities, as well as to Lefebvrian theory will be dealt with in more detail below. Before doing so, however, two other approaches to place that add to, rather than conflict with, a social constructionist or being-in-the-world perspective need to be discussed because of their relevance to the empirical research in later chapters.

The first of these adds to notions of how place is socially constructed and experienced by introducing a more intimate understanding of how this process is occurring through people’s everyday lives and actions. According to Cresswell (2004: 33-39) geographers such as David Seamon (1980), Allan Pred (1984) and Nigel Thrift (1983) have all added considerable complexity to our understanding of how places are constructed and experienced. They have all, he argues (2004: 39), demonstrated,

how place is constituted [through] reiterative social practices—place is made and remade on a daily basis. Place provides a template for practice—an unstable stage for performance. Thinking of place as performed and practiced can help us think of place in radically open and non-essentialized ways where place is constantly struggled over and reimagined in practical ways. Place is the raw material for the creative production of identity rather than an \textit{a priori} label of identity. Place provides the conditions of possibility for creative social practice. Place in this sense becomes an event rather than a secure ontological thing rooted in notions of the authentic. Place as event is marked by openness and change rather than bounded-ness and permanence.

Thus, places are socially constructed, but not in a way that locates the social in a dominant position over place. In other words, it is just as legitimate to ask in
what way do places produce social milieu as it is to ask how a place’s meaning and materiality is socially produced. Also, the way places are produced and experienced is performative and active; individuals and groups are always actively creating place (particularly its meaning) through their place-based interactions and actions. This process is part of the interplay between structure and agency (the reality that people are both subject to forces that constraint their actions and have the freedom to act spontaneously and unpredictably in response to these forces).

Ultimately, Cresswell (2004: 51) concludes that the development of place in human geography has resulted in three types of analyses: 1) a descriptive approach, 2) a social constructionist approach and, 3) a phenomenological approach. “Research in all three levels,” he argues (51), is “important and necessary to understand the full complexity of the role of place in human life.” All three of these “levels” of place analysis are applied to processes of whakamanatanga-based Māori urbanisms in the empirical chapters to follow. There is, however, one other approach to place that must be added to this multi-level place analysis in order to develop a place analysis framework that can function along side the Lefebvrian framework outlined in the previous section. This involves understandings of place as both locally and globally connected.

2.3.2 Globally and locally connected place: theorizing a progressive sense of place

A second addition to the socially constructed/being-in-the-world understanding of place involves issues of place scale and connectivity. While, on the one hand, places are constructed and experienced at a profoundly local scale
(intimately tangible and comprehensible in the context of everyday life), on the other, they can also be understood as having connections and networks that span much larger scales including the global.

Geographer Doreen Massey, one of the strongest advocates of this global sense of place, developed her arguments as a correction to researchers asserting the primacy of space over place in the context of globalization. Her goal was not to deny the efficacy of space as an analytical tool, but rather to make sure that those carrying the banner of space did not misrepresent or erase place in the process. She writes in 1994 (154; quoted in Agnew, 2005: 91):

Instead then, of thinking of places as areas with boundaries around, they can be imagined as articulated moments in networks of social relations and understandings, but where a large proportion of those relations, experiences and understandings, are constructed on a far larger scale than we happen to define for that moment as the place itself, whether that be a street, or a region or even a continent. And this in turn allows a sense of place which is extroverted, which includes a consciousness of its links with the wider world, which integrates in a positive way the global and the local.

This dynamic and progressive sense of place is an important component of, and addition to, notions of place as socially constructed, experienced, and descriptively contextualized. Massey was one of the first (within human geography at least) to recognize places as having the potential to be simultaneously global and local in the way people experience them, but in such a way as to not demote place to sites of vulnerable localness in the face of structural forces of capitalism.

Other researchers have built upon this global/local sense of place outside of geography arguing once again that place must not be shunted to a secondary position, even in the face of forces of globalization. Two of these authors, Arturo
Escobar (2001) and Arif Dirlik (2001), have written passionately about the importance of place in an increasingly globalizing twenty first century world. Escobar states that (140),

The question of ‘place’ has been newly raised in recent years from a variety of perspectives—from its relation to the basic understanding of being and knowing to its fate under globalization and the extent to which it continues to be an aid or a hindrance for thinking about culture and the economy. (Arturo Escobar, 2001: 140)

The arguments made by both of these author’s suggests the critical importance of place-based understandings and place-based consciousness to the unfolding social, political, economic, and cultural forces of the coming decades. Essential to these debates is the relationship between conceptions of humanity based on forces of globalism versus those grounded in localism. Rather than suggest a dichotomy between localism (place) and globalism, however, both Escobar and Dirlik propose ways of comprehending this relationship as dynamic, interwoven, interdependent and intensely complex rather than static, contradictory, competitive, or simplistic.

Escobar begin by arguing that recent trends in academia suggest an erasure or devaluing of place over processes of globalization. He argues that in many fields—philosophy, globalization studies, and anthropology (three he specifically names)—place as a relevant concept and experience has been ignored, discursively erased, or questioned as to its conceptual and relevance. He further argues that some have celebrated this intellectual attack on place while others have argued against it. He stakes his position on the subject by arguing that,

To be sure, the critique of place in anthropology, geography, communications, and cultural studies of recent times has been both
productive and important, and continues to be so. New spatial concepts and metaphors of mobility—deterrioralization, displacement, diaspora, migration, traveling, border-crossings, nomadology, etc.—have made us aware of the fact that the principal dynamics of culture and economy have been significantly altered by unprecedented global processes. Yet there has been a certain asymmetry in these debates...this asymmetry is most evident in discourses of globalization, where the global is often equated with space, capital, history and agency and the local with place, labor, and tradition. Place has dropped out of sight in the 'globalization craze' of recent years, and this erasure of place has profound consequences for our understanding of culture, knowledge, nature, and economy. It is perhaps time to reverse some of this asymmetry by focusing anew—and from the perspective afforded by the critiques of place themselves—on the continued vitality of place and place-making for culture, nature, and economy. (141)

This argument suggests the migration of a more theoretically sophisticated and progressive place-based approach out of human geography into other social science disciplines. Escobar’s approach to place is similar to Massey’s (1993) “progressive sense of place,” where the notion of place as a reactionary, essentialized, or merely defensive response to capitalist forces commanding space is replaced with a notion of place as both locally and globally dynamic, and about a lot more than just class and political economy. Writing from an anthropological perspective, Escobar argues,

The anthropology of place is the other, necessary side of the anthropology of non-places and deterrioralized cultures. It is important to keep in mind the power of place even in studies of placelessness (and vice versa). To make this assertion does not mean that place is ‘the other’ of space—place as pure and local and in opposition to a dominating and global space—since place is certainly connected to, and to a significant extent produced by, spatial logics. It is to assert, on the contrary, that place-based dynamics might be equally important for the production of space, or at least they are in the view of some place-based social actors. (147)

This flowing, dynamic understanding of the relationship between space and place allows for understandings of place experiences that can be at once intensely local and global, or as Escobar puts it, “examining the practices through which people construct places even as they participate in translocal networks” (147).
These dynamic locally situated but globally connected notions of place also demonstrate the way place formation has the ability to “push” back against the forces of globalization in ways that have the potential to significantly influence these forces.

For example, one of the main arguments concerning the dominance of space over place is the way in which those that command space impose the spaces of capitalism in order to further agendas of profit and domination. But Escobar argues that a dynamic notion of place suggests “capitalism is at least to some degree transformed by places; that in the same way as women are not completely defined by their relation to men, places and non-capitalisms are not completely defined by their relation to capitalism and space” (158). In support of this argument Yang (1999: 5) argues that “indigenous economics do not always get ploughed under with the entrance of capitalism, but may even experience renewal and pose a challenge to the spread of capitalist principles and stimulate us to rethink and rework existing critiques of capitalism” (quoted in Escobar, 2001: 155). This ability of place-based identities and movements to not just resist forces of capital, but to simultaneously effectively respond to them through active engagement with these forces suggests linkages to Massey’s “articulated moments in networks of social relations” noted above.

This argument is mirrored in the writings of Arif Dirlik (2001). Like Escobar, Dirlik is concerned with reasserting the role of place in contemporary forces of globalization. And also like Escobar, Dirlik demonstrates the importance that dynamic, flowing notions of place have for understanding local-global processes. Dirlik writes (2001: 22-23),
Groundedness, which is not the same thing as immutable fixity, and some measure of definition by flexible and porous boundaries, I suggest, are crucial to any conceptualization of place and place-based consciousness. Place as metaphor suggests groundedness from below, and a flexible and porous boundary around it, without closing out the extralocal, all the way to the global. What is important about the metaphor is that it calls for a definition of what is to be included in the place from within the place—some control over the conduct and organization of everyday life, in other words—rather than from above, from those placeless abstractions such as capital, the nation-state, and their discursive expressions in the realm of theory. It is these features, I think, that justify attention to the place-based against kindred notions of local and spatial. The latter may serve in certain usages as equivalents to place-based, but they also may be, and are, mobilized as projects or qualifications of those placeless abstractions which both in intention and effect negate places conceived in terms of control over everyday life.

Dirlik’s main project is to wrest back control of place from, in particular, global forces such as capitalism. And in fact he does this even more explicitly than Escobar. But Dirlik is certainly not an idealist positing an unproblematic and easy relationship between the local and global:

The global is localized, and the local is globalized. That is the symmetry. But the globalization of the local does not compensate in terms of politics, economy, and culture for the localization of the global. That is the asymmetry, that requires for its appreciation a sense of context and structure, even if the context is a product of the content, as the content is a product of the context. It requires also a sense of history, that what appears today as something of an exchange, in which both sides participate, may turn out to be less than an exchange because it is unequal exchange, because one side will see its life transformed by television while the other side will through the same television invade the world and create a new structural context for its operations (38; original emphasis).

Thus, elements of both hope and caution are evident in Escobar and Dirlik’s reformulated sense of place and place-based social movements. Hope in that this more dynamic and progressive understanding of place acknowledges that real power exists at the level of the local, power that can be utilized to create intimacy and community while simultaneously engaging meaningfully with global forces and movements; caution in the sense that these global forces often manifest in
the service of dominating forms of power (usually through the mechanisms and logics of capital and state control) that often have advantages (in terms of access to capital, access to political power, access to military and other organizations of control).

I want to be clear at this point that I have inserted this global/local sense of space/place because of its relevance to my research on Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga. In the empirical chapters that follow I apply the multi-leveled notions of space/place described above (descriptive, social construction, and phenomenology) to better understand how Māori have made the city a positive and productive space/place both individually and as part of groups. I also use it to analyze the development of one specific space/place, Kfm, in order to understand at a deeply empirical level how an entity like Kfm is socially constructed, embodied, and performed. However, in the final empirical chapter (Chapter 8) I look at Kfm as an example of a locally grounded but globally connected space/place-based social movement. The arguments made by Massey, Escobar and Dirlik are essential to making this argument about Kfm. This globally connected sense of space/place also links well with Lefebvre’s socio-spatial framework because of its ability to incorporate processes of urbanization, flows of capital, and the influence of abstract space on space/place formation. It also adds considerably to Lefebvrian socio-spatial analysis by inserting a more sophisticated understanding of space/place-based processes as well as a methodological approach more suited to empirical research.
2.3.3 Finding space in a progressive global/local sense of place

One of the most exciting aspects of Dirlik’s approach to place is his acknowledgment of Lefebvrian socio-spatial theory as being profoundly relevant to how spaces/places are constructed. He writes (2001: 30),

If places are produced, as Lefebvre tells us, and are not merely preordained locations where things happen, the production of place includes as part of its very constitution the production of that ‘particular mix of social relations,’ which implies that social relations, and the categories in terms of which we conceive them, make sense most if we conceive them in terms of place-based manifestations, if not only in place-bound ways. That particular mix, in turn, produces the particular set of structures that gives concrete meaning to social relations represented in categories of class, gender, race, and so on—and to place itself.

By inserting Lefebvre into a progressive sense of place-based social movements, Dirlik is acknowledging the usefulness of a Lefebvrian framework in understanding issues involving space/place. He does this without feeling the need to engage in a debate about the relevance of Lefebvrian socio-spatial theory to place-centered research and, by doing this, suggests a growing understanding among place oriented researchers that Lefebvre’s ideas are compatible with their research rather than inevitably leading to an assertion of space over place.

Moreover, by incorporating Lefebvrian theory into his arguments about place, Dirlik is able to construct a theoretically sophisticated global sense of place. The conjoining of place research with Lefebvrian theory creates a framework that is capable of grasping space/place as simultaneously global and local and thereby grasping not only the global forces at work to dominate individual places, but also, more importantly, forces within the local to which space/place itself is actualized and comingles with the global. In a sense, Dirlik is attempting to incorporate in a balanced way the productive debate engaged in
geography between David Harvey and Doreen Massey on the relationship between space and place. Following Massey’s arguments about a progressive sense of place, Dirlik’s ability to conceive of and apply this local-global framework without subordinating place to global space allows him to ask, “What if the global were local, or place-based, just as the local or place-based were global?” (2001: 24).

2.4 Towards a Space/Place Conceptual Framework

This last question posed by Dirlik serves as an excellent starting point for the proposition of a space/place conceptual framework—a proposition that I have been building towards through the discussions of space and place explored in this chapter to this point. This dynamic sense of place as both locally and globally articulated is, I argue, a perspective that incorporates both space and place into a space/place framework. As this framework is constructed here, based on the arguments developed in the previous sections, it is one that draws on Lefebvrian socio-spatial theory and actively combines this theory with progressive notions of place proposed by geographers and other social scientists. In the following chapters this space/place framework is applied to, first, an exploration of the relationship between Māori and cities in Aotearoa New Zealand from both an historical and contemporary perspective, and then to various case studies of whakamanatanga-based Māori urbanisms and Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga. In the final three empirical chapters (6, ___)

56 For an excellent overview of this debate from a place perspective see Cresswell (2004).
7 and 8) this framework is applied at the most intimate scale to the production of a single unique place in Auckland known as Mana Moko-Te Karanga (Kfm)—a place that both exemplifies many of the characteristics of Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga, but also extends this concept in ways that suggest the potential for these geographies to be open and outward looking as much as they are internally organized and defined (i.e., a Māori global sense of space/place).

At times this framework infiltrates these chapters passively and at others the application is more aggressive and overt. Throughout it is fundamentally assumed that space/place is an integral part of the human experience whether conceived specifically through Lefebvre’s double-layered trialectic or through space/place description, space/place construction or space/place as being-in-the-world, as dwelling or “reiterative social practice” (Cresswell, 2004: 39). Furthermore, no matter how intimately local my empirical analyses become, they are simultaneously linked to networks at various scales extending from a specific establishment in a specific urban neighborhood all the way out to the global. At points during my analyses I will actively point out spaces/places where different aspects of my space/place conceptual framework apply with particular relevance—for example, where Lefebvre’s socio-spatial framework offers insights into processes of Māori urbanization or formations of Māori urbanisms, or where a space/place as social construction approach works well to better understand the formation of a specific entity such as Kfm, or in the way spaces/places and people are in a continuous process of mutual reproduction through the interactions between people’s everyday actions and activities in a specific location.
However, the space/place conceptual framework that I am proposing and applying here is not one that takes Lefebvrian theory and place theories and combines them to such an extent that a new theory emerges entirely, but rather it is a framework that sees value in each of these approaches, sees their connections, and argues that they all need to be recognized and applied where appropriate to facilitate the best possible understanding of, in this case, processes of whakamanatanga-based Māori urbanisms. The connective tissue, if you will, that allows for this dynamic space/place approach is the ontological argument that space/place matters; it matters because it is a fundamental aspect of human existence along side the traditionally acknowledged importance of historicality (time) and sociality (social) (Soja, 1996).

In proposing this space/place conceptual framework there is one discussion that has as yet to take place, but it is one that is essential to any application of this framework to a study involving indigenous peoples generally, or, Māori more specifically. All of the theories outlined in the previous sections, and informing the space/place conceptual framework being proposed here, are fundamentally produced predominantly within Western academia and as such could be accused of representing a Western-centric interpretation of space and place. As a result applications of these theories to issues involving indigenous peoples and/or Māori are highly problematic if they are not coupled with, and modified by, understandings of these concepts from these non-Western perspectives. It is this last essential aspect of my conceptual framework that I turn to now.
2.5 Towards an Indigenized Space/Place Conceptual Framework

Up to this point the main concern has been with establishing the building blocks for what I have chosen to call a space/place conceptual framework. Throughout this discussion I have, at times touched upon ways in which this framework has applications and relevance for indigenous studies generally, and Māori studies more specifically. Ultimately, application of this framework to indigenous or Māori issues must include the critical insertion of an indigenous/Māori perspective into this framework. It is a central part of my argument that the space/place conceptual framework being proposed here has important implications for indigenous research, and two perspectives are central to this assertion: 1) that a space/place conceptual framework has the potential to take indigenous studies in new and important directions and, conversely, 2) that indigenous perspectives on space/place also have the potential to take a Western-centric space/place conceptual framework in new and important directions. In the following section I consider what it means to claim an indigenized space/place conceptual framework.

2.5.1 Indigenous and Māori understandings of space

My discussions of space have, to this point, focused predominantly on Lefebvrian socio-spatial theory. Lefebvre’s project was a political one—his goal was to suggest ways in which people could resist the dominating forces of capitalism through a better understanding of how these forces occupied and

57 See chapter one for a more in-depth discussion of how “indigenous” is defined in this dissertation.
transformed space to service this domination. Since these forces are working just as profoundly on indigenous urban peoples as they are on any other group living in, particularly, an urban context, it stands to reason that embedded in Lefebvrian theory are lessons and perspectives that will be useful to constructing culturally and socially productive (i.e., positive) indigenous urban ways of life.

Māori scholar Linda Tuhiwai Smith, in her book *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples* (1999: 51) recognizes the important applications Lefebvrian theory have for understanding processes of colonialism:

> [f]or the indigenous world, Western conceptions of space, of arrangements and display, of the relationship between people and the landscape, of culture as an object of study, have meant that not only has the indigenous world been represented in particular ways back to the West, but the indigenous world view, the land and the people, have been radically transformed in the spatial image of the West. In other words, indigenous space has been colonized.

After making this important point, however, Smith does not pursue the potential of an engagement between indigenous worldviews and Lefebvrian theory beyond the ability of this theory to reveal processes of colonial domination. Yet, it is at the very least inferred in her arguments that indigenous notions and formations of spaces/places existed (and still exist) that are under attack by forces of colonialism. It was noted above that since, from a Lefebvrian perspective, space/place is socially produced then it must follow that space/place “can only be understood in the context of a specific society” (Schmid, 2008: 29), and this suggests a window into arguing and accessing the way indigenous peoples socially produced space/place. It also suggests that to make arguments concerning, for example, indigenous space/place, it is essential
to do so within the context of the way specific indigenous societies conceive and occupy space/place.

Here, the question of how indigenous peoples conceive space/place becomes particularly pertinent. Although it has been argued that place is a concept much better suited to indigenous worldviews (Murton, 2008), this does not mean that indigenous peoples do not also conceive of space in some meaningful way. David Gegeo (2001), for example, offers a much more explicit description of one indigenous group’s understanding of space and place. Writing from the perspective of Kwara’ae epistemology (a people indigenous to the Solomon Islands in the Pacific), Gegeo argues that notions of space and place are inextricably intertwined. The English translation of the Kwara’ae definition of space is, according to Gegeo (2001: 494), “place situated in dwelling.” But this translation belies its full meaning. “Space,” he continues (2001: 494; original emphasis),

refers to a space that is not of one’s identity or origin. Space has to do with the location where a Kwara’ae person may be at any given time as necessitated by contemporary conditions (such as going to an urban area to get a job to meet basic needs, or going overseas in pursuit of an education). The underlying image in kula ni tua [space] is that one is sitting in a space that, should one get up and leave it, will be occupied by someone else. Space is the location a Kwara’ae person occupies while in motion or circulation...

On the one hand, the way Gegeo describes a Kwara’ae conception of space seems remarkably similar to Western conceptions of space—although seemingly more closely to the Leibnizian relational sense of space than the Newtonian sense of space as container. On the other, however, the Kwara’ae perspective contains a profoundly embodied notion of space that, while evident in some Western conceptions of space (e.g., Casey, 1996), does not allow for the more abstracted
and de-humanized conceptions of space found in, for example, the geography as spatial “science” emphasized in 1960s Anglo-American geography. There are also intriguing convergences between Kwara’ae notions of space as involving “motion or circulations” with notions of space spanning from Tuan (1977) to Harvey (1993) that seem to make the same distinction between space as movement and place and a stopping off of this movement. The important point here is to demonstrate that there are both convergences and differences when comparing Western notions of space (and place, see below) with indigenous ones, and that it is through this engagement that the proposition of an indigenized space/place conceptual framework must begin.58

In this sense, then, there are some important lessons to be gleaned from Kwara’ae notions of space that, when incorporated into the space/place conceptual framework developed here, add important modifications. What the Kwara’ae perspective insists is that space, whenever applied in this framework, must avoid the tendency in Western usages to slip away from any sense of human meaning and involvement. Space cannot, in other words, from the Kwara’ae perspective become an amorphous de-humanized entity, a mere container for human activity, but rather is infused with human action and meaning. This is not to say that Kwara’ae are incapable of abstraction when conceiving space, but rather that there is a much stronger emphasis, even

58 The potential for this type of discussion to stimulate further important debates was evident when I read edits of this chapter by one of my committee members, Dr. Jon Goss. He argued in one of his editing notes that he believes the types of distinctions found in the Kwara’ae conception of space suggest that notions of space and place are universal, rather than particular to specific societies. I would further argue, however, that while there may be some universal aspects of these concepts there are also important distinctions in, at the very least, emphasis from society to society and culture to culture. I would further argue that a truly universal conception of space and place would not only recognize these differences of emphasis but also be willing to incorporate these into the construction of a universal definition.
insistence, on maintaining a sense of human connection and action when conceiving space.

Bill McKay and Antonia Walmsley (nd) make a similar point when attempting to explain Māori conceptions of space. They argue (nd: 87) that within the Māori worldview space always has a subjective orientation (based on point of reference and movement); it is always grounded in a qualitative point of view, in the experiential, rather than the quantitative and objective. They further argue that this notion of space developed from the way Māori experienced movement to the extent that the “primacy of experienced time in traversal of landscape rather than the objectification of space” (nd: 88) became the primary delineator of space as conceived. Importantly, they argue that this suggested an understanding of “landscape features in both a physical and spiritual sense” (nd: 88). In a separate article looking at Māori architectural theory McKay (2004: 8) further argues that Māori conceptions of space are deeply entwined with their notions of time:

The Māori time-space construct can be thought of...like a constellation with the past and the people of the past always felt in the present, like the constellations of the sky to the voyager: enmeshing, surrounding, always before you, always behind, forming patterns that can be interpreted in various ways. The past always resonates in the present.

One can only wonder how Lefebvre would have incorporated this kind of perspective into his socio-spatial framework. My argument is that he would see immediately in Kwara’ae and Māori notions of space evidence of his socio-spatial trialectic. Clearly, the way authors such as Gegeo, McKay and Walmsley describe indigenous understandings of space suggest space as relational, and that this notion of relational space is linked to embodiment (in the case of both
the Kwara’ae and Māori) and whakapapa (genealogy, in the case of the Māori) and therefore represents an understanding of space that cannot be disentangled from human experience and memory.

What is intriguing in the context of indigenous studies is to ask how different societies that developed outside of a capitalist mode of production (at least as it was developed in the West) developed their own set of socio-spatial trialectics. Drawing more specifically on a Māori context it is truly fascinating to consider the application of Lefebvre’s double layered trialectic to ways in which Māori conceived their world. What was the Māori form of abstract and social space/place (or was/is this dichotomy even possible to conceive?)? How did Māori conceive, perceive, and live their socially produced space/place? How did Māori construct spatial/platial practices, representations of space/place, and spaces/places of representation? Moreover, in a contemporary context the question then needs to be asked as to how Māori have retained aspects of their space/place system into the present. This question will then lead, I argue, to understandings and, perhaps more importantly, strategies for reinforcing, reasserting, reconstructing and reproducing Māori socio-spatial/platial systems in contemporary Aotearoa New Zealand, with the urban context representing a crucial site of negotiation for this process to unfold.

The development of an indigenous space/place conceptual framework, as it is being defined here, will play a critical role in helping researchers understand the relationship between indigenous and non-indigenous conceptions of space/place. Arguably, indigenous ideas about space and, as we will see below, place have incorporated a space/place conceptual framework long before twentieth century Western academics formulated similar ideas. As Gegeo (2001:
notes regarding Kwara’ae perspectives on space and place, “For the Kwara’ae, therefore, because of the possibility of space, a person can be anywhere and still be inextricably tied to place.”

2.5.2 Indigenous and Māori understandings of place

While it is clear from the above discussion that notions of space as distinct from place are easily incorporated into indigenous perspectives and worldviews, it is also true that the concept of place, especially as developed within the phenomenological-influenced social science literature, resonates profoundly with indigenous peoples ways of seeing the world. Brian Murton (nd: 11), speaking broadly on this subject, argues that one of the reasons for this convergence between Western conceptions of place and indigenous place perspectives is due to a shared acknowledgment of multiple worldviews:

The importance of place also is gaining recognition in de-centering the authoritative form of knowledge in the world today: techno-science. Starting from the position that there is a great diversity of knowledge traditions, not just one universal form of knowledge (Western science), sociologists of knowledge...have looked at the way knowledge is constructed by different groups of people. Although knowledge systems, which are conceptualized as motley assemblages of ideas, practices, strategies and devices, may differ on many dimensions, a characteristic that they all share, even modern science, it is argued, is their localness (or ‘placeness’). However, knowledge is not simply local, but both situated and situating. It has place and creates a space—a knowledge space—of linked sites, people and activities.

Murton further argues that one diverse group of knowledge systems that has added dramatically to this idea of place as constituted by both situated and situating practices falls under the category of what is often called Indigenous Knowledge.
As Western academics developed increasingly sophisticated theories of place informed by phenomenology, a growing awareness began to emerge of parallel indigenous ideas about place. In particular the notion of being-in-the-world and, especially, the idea of “dwelling” combined with notions of embodied existence developed in Western academia seemed to come close to describing how indigenous peoples understand their position in the Universe. As Murton (2008: 13) notes:

Indigenous knowledge embraces the central premise of phenomenology by rooting the entire tree of knowledge in the soil of direct physical and perceptual experience of the earth. Indigenous peoples have a co-creative relationship with their land, making places as much as places make them. The body as the source of thinking, sensing, acting and being, and as the basis of all relationships, is central to Indigenous thinking. To the sensing body, all things are active, and Indigenous thought and perception is oriented toward active participation, active imagination, and active engagement with place. This embodied relationship is one in which the act of dwelling creates meaning which Indigenous peoples invest into their landscapes.

One of the more important aspects of this discussion is the fact that, as Western academics increasingly applied their progressive ideas about place to indigenous issues, Western scholars realized that their contemporary notions of place were already deeply embedded in indigenous worldviews. Moreover, the way indigenous peoples conceived of place involved sophisticated notions of a profoundly interconnected world that Western scholars were only recently beginning to develop. Along these same line of reasoning Murton (2008: 14) notes that,

Further, according to Indigenous scholars, a holistic perspective which maintains connections between the spiritual, moral, scientific and natural worlds, is based on a metaphysics in which all experiences constitute a social reality, a fabric of life in which everything has the possibility of intimately knowing relationships, because ultimately everything is related.
Indigenous notions of place have just as much, or more, to contribute to contemporary notions of place as those contributed by Western scholars.

For example, as was noted above David Gegeo’s (2001) explanations of Kwara’ae conceptions of space were deeply connected to their understandings of place. As a sign of the importance of place in indigenous worldviews, Gegeo’s discussion of Kwara’ae notions of place is far more extensive than his discussion of space. He describes Kwara’ae understandings of place as being represented by nine aspects of Kwara’ae placeness (2001: 493-494):

1) Kwara’ae place as geographical location within their homeland
2) Kwara’ae place as genealogically oriented
3) Kwara’ae place as being inextricably linked to control over land
4) Kwara’ae place as “unquestioned position, based on genealogy and marriage, from which one may speak to important issues in the community”
5) Kwara’ae place as language fluency
6) Kwara’ae place as cultural knowledge
7) Kwara’ae place as kin-based obligations and responsibilities
8) Kwara’ae place as shared indigenous ontology and epistemology
9) Kwara’ae place as cultural literacy

In this framework there is no division between notions of Kwara’ae place and Kwara’ae socio-cultural context. To be Kwara’ae is to be in place, and their sense of place is inextricably infused with their sense of cultural identity.

Similarly, from a Māori perspective, the essence of what it means to be Māori is deeply place oriented. In Māori the word for place is whenua, which means both earth and placenta “and as such it metaphorically represents the connection of people and individuals to their origins: material, historical, and spiritual” (Roberts & Wills, 1998: 54-55). This connection is maintained and reproduced in Māori society through the mechanisms of whakapapa (genealogy), place naming, waiata (songs), and whakatauaki (proverbs). The act of
Place naming, for example, creates a cultural context whereby the “land...serves as a living encyclopedia in which names act as mnemonic devices” that reinforce the connection between Māori identity and land (Roberts & Wills, 1998: 55). Place names for Māori, thus, “not only record and express important mythological and historical aspects of...[a]...particular tribe, but by virtue of the knowledge contained in the names, they, and the landscape they represent, are the physical manifestation of the tribe” (Roberts & Wills, 1998: 55).

Another Māori concept that is closely related to place is tūrangawaewae. It is this Māori concept that comes the closest to the Western concept “sense of place” (Benton, 2002: 9). Tūrangawaewae is a concept that profoundly connects individual Māori and Māori as collective entities to a specific territory. According to the Māori author Timoti Karetu (1990) tūrangawaewae is an essential “clue” to understanding Māori cultural identity. Like most cultural concepts tūrangawaewae is complex in meaning. Karetu explains that tūrangawaewae can be divided into two general areas of understanding: 1) tūrangawaewae specifically defines those places where a person has allegiance and a “right to stand” and, 2) tūrangawaewae more broadly is a concept that encompasses a person’s identity as a Māori. These two meanings are not mutually exclusive but rather are interdependent in the sense that one cannot exist without the other. In other words, in Māori society to maintain ones connection to a place is to maintain ones cultural identity (Karetu, 1990: 117).

Similar to the Kwara’ae understanding of place, the Māori concept tūrangawaewae assumes active participation in Māori cultural practices. In traditional Māori society every individual, through their whanau (extended family unit), hapū (clan, or tribal sub-division), and iwi (tribe) is connected to a
particular geographic region with distinct boundaries. An individual’s connection to his/her tūrangawaewae begins from birth when the parents bury the child’s placenta and umbilical cord within that territory (Karetu, 1990: 112). An individual or group is then responsible for maintaining their tūrangawaewae through continuous occupation of a place over at least three generations; conversely an individual or group can lose their tūrangawaewae rights if this occupation is not maintained (Karetu, 1990: 112). Importantly, especially from a geographic perspective, tūrangawaewae also assumes a certain level of knowledge about the land; i.e., knowledge about the metaphors and symbols embodied in land features that tell the story of creation and connect the group to their territory (Karetu, 1990: 114). Thus, through birthing rituals, generations of occupation, and cultural landscape literacy Māori establish from the start a profound bond with a particular geographic region.59

2.5.3 Implications of an indigenized space/place conceptual framework

In both the Kwara’ae and Māori examples the profound connection between these peoples’ sense of space/place and the land within which their cultures developed is evoked. Moreover, a definition of space/place emerges from these worldviews that is holistic in its incorporation of material, social and spiritual aspects of human geography. From this understanding emerges an indigenized space/place conceptual framework that informs the research I have

59 In a contemporary urban context, where Māori from tribal areas all over Aotearoa New Zealand are living in territories outside of their traditional tūrangawaewae, or where Māori have lost the knowledge about their tūrangawaewae, the application of this concept is increasingly complex (Benton, 2002). This idea is developed in more depth in chapters three and four.
undertaken in the following chapters. This framework incorporates Lefebvrian notions of socially produced space/place and combines this productively with contemporary notions of place, with a particular emphasis on space/place as simultaneously socially constructed and as intimately experienced and enacted. This framework also, when applied empirically to indigenous issues, is significantly informed by indigenous perspectives on space/place and takes seriously the specific space/place context and worldviews of the particular indigenous group under consideration.

The application of an indigenized space/place conceptual framework to indigenous issues suggests some very provocative implications. For example, if we accept this framework then acts of colonialism were as much about imposing a new socially produced space/place on indigenous cultures as about anything else. Arguably, the imposition of European-based conceptions of space/place is in fact one of the most fundamental aspects of colonialism (Alsayyad, 1992; Jacobs, 1996). While this process of colonial space/place imposition was never fully realized (e.g., Māori maintained during the colonial period, to the best of their abilities, a spatiality/platiality, sociality and historicality based on Māori social systems, worldviews and values), it was nonetheless pervasive and set up a context whereby indigenous peoples have had to continuously struggle to maintain their own socio-culturally-based manifestations of space/place. I would further assert that this struggle continues to this day and, in fact, gets to the very heart of what colonialism is all about: a struggle over who has the power to produce spaces/places within the context of their cultural worldview.

The stakes of this struggle are high and this speaks to the incredible contemporary challenge the legacy of colonialism has created for indigenous
peoples. Because if foreign conceptions of space/place are pervasively imposed on a subordinated society, and those that have been colonized begin to operate in this new socio-spatial/platial context, then how do the colonized maintain, or, if necessary, reconstitute their own socio-culturally-based manifestations of space/place? How is it possible, once individuals are operating in a new socio-spatial/platial system to find an “anchor” for a traditional system that is now perceived as alternative, abnormal or counter to the dominant discourse and mode of production? Perhaps if indigenous societies lose too much of their own spaces/places it becomes increasingly more difficult to find their way back to the socio-spatial/platial systems they developed previous to being colonized, and maybe it is never possible to do this one hundred percent. This may represent one theoretical mechanism for engaging in a conversation about how deeply processes of colonialism have consumed particular indigenous groups. This might also represent a way to gauge how much and what type of work will be involved in attempts to revitalize, stabilize, or reconstruct indigenous socio-spatial/platial systems; and it may also suggest the importance of focusing on envisioning and reinforcing indigenous notions of space/place in attempts to insert/assert indigenous ways of being into the contemporary indigenous context, even in places as intensely and overwhelmingly dominated by Western socio-spatial/platial ideologies as urban areas tend to be.

At the beginning of this section it was argued that Western notions of space/place and indigenous notions of space/place have the potential to inform one another in productive ways. A truly indigenized space/place conceptual framework is one that incorporates this perspective. Western notions of space/place are useful in the context of indigenous studies because they help
indigenous peoples understand the way in which colonizers imposed their space/place, in the service of power, on their lands and on their people. Indigenous notions of space/place are equally essential because they insert/assert understandings and conceptions of the relationship between sociality, historicality and materiality that incorporate a profoundly space/place conceptual framework that views space and place as inherently relational and embodied. These perspectives are useful when engaged in a contemporary context, especially in urban areas where so much of indigenous space/place has been literally covered in concrete and steel. Throughout the remainder of this dissertation this indigenized space/place conceptual framework will inform the arguments, analysis and conclusions being made.

2.6 Conclusion: Linking an Indigenized Space/Place Conceptual Framework to Processes of Māori Urbanization and Urbanisms

This chapter has been about the theoretical linking of space and place in order to construct a stronger space/place conceptual framework for studying processes of whakamanatanga-based Māori urbanisms. The conceptual framework developed in this chapter is one that draws equally on Lefebvre’s socio-spatial framework and contemporary notions of place, but argues that in each of these approaches (or sets of approaches in the case of place) is a framework that, at its best, treats space and place as equally relevant and mutually constitutive. In combining space and place in this way a more dynamic understanding of how global forces and locally based social movements interrelate is achieved. Locally oriented space/place becomes useful as a way to
understand how people, through practices of everyday life, are able to respond and engage forces operating at scales beyond the local. It is also useful for understanding how individuals and groups create intensely contextualized spaces/places that not only have real meaning for those occupying those spaces/places, but also serves as a base for the negotiations of power relationships occurring at the local, regional, state, and global scales. Simultaneously, a more globally oriented space/place framework allows researchers to understand better the global forces at work, particularly those operating and controlling capitalism, and the way that these forces infiltrate all levels of daily life for most people in the world.

This space/place conceptual framework becomes an essential component of developing a theory of Māori urbanism and, importantly, the emergence of Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga. It becomes clear as the discussion of Māori urbanization and the resulting Maori urbanisms is engaged that space/place play a critical role in how Māori confront the challenges and opportunities of urbanization. In many ways the perceived successes or failures of this urbanization process can be viewed in terms of how successfully Māori, both individually and as groups, confronted state and global forces of capital in urban areas through their assertion of whakamanatanga-based Maori space/place. It is argued throughout these chapters that Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga are representative of those Māori (again individually or as groups) that have managed to integrate themselves into global networks and spaces/places of the city, but have simultaneously asserted a Māori urban space/place identity grounded in real Maori human geographies.
CHAPTER 3
COLONIAL URBAN SPACE/PLACE AND MAORI RURAL-TO-URBAN MIGRATION

3. Māori Urbanization: Challenges and Opportunities in an Urban Context

In the previous chapter it was argued that space and place are mutually constitutive concepts that must be considered in this manner when researching human geographic phenomenon. It was further argued that a space/place conceptual framework, when applied to Māori issues, must consider ways in which Māori understand these concepts. In this chapter this ontological argument is connected to processes of urbanization, with a specific focus on the relationship between Māori and cities. An understanding of contemporary Māori urbanisms begins with a discussion of how cities based on a Western model were first diffused to Aotearoa New Zealand. This discussion also involves understanding the role cities played in the colonial process, and the role these cities played in the evolution of Māori society. A major focus of this discussion is necessarily the massive rural-to-urban migration that Māori undertook in the latter half of the 20th century and the resulting large percentage of Māori that established urban ways of life. Therefore, this chapter serves as a critical foundation for a much more in-depth discussion in the following chapter of what I mean by the term Māori urbanisms and, more specifically, whakamanatanga-based Māori urbanisms.

Throughout this chapter and the next I emphasize the fact that the relationship between Māori and cities was never unidirectional, especially in the
sense that the city had a one-way impact on Māori. In other words, the very fact that cities were established in Aotearoa New Zealand was a product of a relationship between Māori and Pākehā; between Māori notions of space/place and Pākehā notions of space/place. While at some point urban growth did begin to develop momentum that Māori had little or no control over, their relationship with cities, even after this point was past, was always a choice. Māori were never passive victims of the urbanization process, but rather always active participants in this process. While Māori may not, in the long run, have had a choice about the formation of cities in Aotearoa New Zealand, many Māori certainly had a choice about how, and how much, they were going to interact and engage this new socio-spatial/platial phenomenon.

This last point is important because it touches on the very essence of what it means to argue from a whakamanatanga-based Māori urbanisms perspective. While the urbanization process was not always one that empowered Māori, and in fact in many cases cities were actually tools of colonial domination, nevertheless Māori have struggled from the moment cities were first established to make them spaces/places that worked for them. And even though for some Māori cities were not positive spaces/places, the existence of whakamanatanga-based Māori urbanisms suggests that this struggle has never ended and, in fact, has for some Māori led to the ability to make cities spaces/places that are culturally, politically and economically productive; spaces/places that foster, maintain and reproduce identities that are powerfully Māori while simultaneously being predominantly urban.

The formation of Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga is, I argue, a critical part of this productive process. But in making this argument it is
important to be reminded here of the indigenized space/place conceptual framework outlined in the previous chapter. From the perspective of this framework the development of cities in Aotearoa New Zealand marks the coming of a foreign socio-spatial/platial system, and the movement of Māori into cities marks a process whereby Māori were challenged to find ways of being successful within this foreign urban geography. This contrast must be kept in mind throughout this chapter because it informs many of the arguments made. It is argued in this chapter (and the one that follows) that cities were simultaneously challenging spaces/places and spaces/places of opportunity for Māori, and that this challenge/opportunity context certainly involved social, cultural, political and economic forces, but was also a function of the role of space/place in all of these aspects of urban life.

3.1 The City as a Colonial Space/Place

It is useful to consider at the outset of this chapter how cities first came to Aotearoa New Zealand as a starting point to better comprehend the relationship between Māori and European expressions of urban space/place. The main argument that is made in this section is that the introduction of cities in Aotearoa New Zealand was an important part of the colonial project and that space/place played a critical role in this process. If indeed, as Lefebvre (1991) argued, societies produce their own unique forms of space/place, then it follows that colonial cities were at least partly and importantly a manifestation of European space/place ideology (Jacobs, 1996; Alsayyad, 1992). As a result, indigenous
peoples, when associating with urban spaces/places, were forced to adjust—
culturally, economically and politically—to these new urban geographies.

Application of Lefebvre’s socio-spatial trialectic to this discussion
demonstrates the profound challenge of this adjustment. European cities
represented the most intense manifestations of European forms of social and
abstract space, spaces of representation and representations of space, and a
whole set of ways of living, perceiving and conceiving space/place was part of
this newly introduced urban environment. As such, it is reasonable to argue that
Europeans as individuals and groups were better suited to functioning and
prospering in these urban spaces/places than were indigenous peoples coming
from an entirely different socio-spatial/planial system.

It is important, however, to not oversimplify the urban context in these
discussions. On the one hand, it is critical to understand that the colonial city
gave Europeans certain advantages over the indigenous populations. For
example, from an economic perspective Europeans by and large had greater
access to capital, greater access to the political and administrative system being
set up by Pākehā, and better access to, and understanding of, foreign trade
networks. Moreover, when Māori did demonstrate an ability to compete
economically with Pākehā in urban areas Europeans were more able to
manipulate the political and economic landscape to undermine these advantages.
On the other hand, however, from a Lefebvrian perspective it must be
acknowledged that a whole host of internal oppressions and power relations
embedded in forces of capitalism would be at work in these cities to stratify and
divide Europeans as well. Lefebvre’s thesis is about how all individuals are
controlled and oppressed by urban space/place with little or no differentiation of
class, race, gender and/or colonialism. Moreover, and this is important, Maori did quite well early on in urban areas in terms of inserting themselves into a capitalist system. It was the wielding of urban space/place as an ideological geography by the colonizers, however, that created a context where Maori increasingly struggled to be relevant in urban areas.

In a similar vein, the application of place theory to an understanding of colonial urbanization and the impact this urbanization had on indigenous peoples is useful. As much as city formation in colonies was a spatial process, it was also simultaneously a place making process. Cities were places for Europeans settling in a foreign land to comfortably make a home (Barnes, 1994), to successfully engage in economic activities (Jacobs, 1996), and as a place to control nature to the greatest extent (Park, 1995). No matter how threatening a foreign land might be to European settlers and colonizers, cities represented familiar refuges from this unfamiliarity or, to put it simply, spaces/places where they could be comfortable. Issues of familiarity and comfort certainly speak to the emotional and experiential aspects of space/places as well as to the ability of Europeans to socially construct spaces/places within the territories of the people they were colonizing that were less threatening and, importantly, facilitated the colonial project.

These discussions of space/place and urbanization are important because colonialism was not a benign process. It was a process of attempted conquest and domination of both land and people and cities were a part of this process (King, 1990; Alsayyad, 1992; Jacob, 1996). A review of the broader literature on the relationship between urbanization and colonialism is instructive to understanding the challenge that cities posed for indigenous peoples.
Colonialism has always brought with it unique political, economic, and cultural systems, and these systems were imposed, to various degrees and in various forms, on colonized peoples throughout the world. This was a multidimensional process, i.e., it was pervasive across the full range of socio-spatial/platial categories: cultural, political, economic, psychological, and geographic (McMichael, 2004). As has been noted, one important, and some would say essential, aspect of this process was the implantation of urban systems into colonial territories based on Western models of urbanization (King, 1990; Alsayyad, 1992; Jacob, 1996).

Understanding the role of urbanization in the colonial enterprise demands an exploration of what is meant by the term colonialism. There are many definitions of colonialism, but I find Philip McMichael’s (2004) approach useful. He defines colonialism as the subjugation by physical and psychological force of one culture by another—a colonizing power—through military conquest of territory and caricaturing the relation between the two cultures” (2004: 4). Colonialism, based on this definition is a process of both material and psychological exploitation and is pervasive across cultural, social, economic and political systems. Colonialism, McMichael continues, predates the European age of exploration and expansion and has examples that extend into the twentieth century that do not directly involve European powers (e.g., Japanese colonialism, Russian colonialism, Chinese colonialism). He further notes that there are two basic kinds of colonialism: colonies of rule and colonies of settlement. Colonies of rule involve mostly administrative and military control resulting in the reorganization of colonized cultures in order to “impose new inequalities to facilitate their exploitation” (2004: 4). Colonies of settlement involve the same
elements as colonies of rule, but add the further dimension of a significant migration of foreigners into the lands of those being colonized. Colonies of settlement generally resulted in either the elimination of indigenous peoples or their extreme marginalization and a demographic shift to minority status. While in both the case of colonies of rule and colonies of settlement cities played an important role, it is in the latter that cities became important not just as centers for the administration of the colonial project, but also as recipients of the growing majority settler population. In this sense, then, cities in colonies of settlement served as zones of ever intensifying foreign socio-space/place intensification alongside growing demographic pressure.

One way geographers have contributed to this discussion is by inserting this type of spatial perspective into our understanding of the role cities have played in processes of colonialism (e.g., Alsayyad, 1992; Jacobs, 1996). For example, Jacobs (1996: 16), in her discussions concerning relationships between colonialism, imperialism, and indigenous societies refers to the “spatiality of imperialism.” She argues that “Colonialism…is a specific articulation of imperialism associated with territorial invasions and settlements…[and that it]…entails the establishment and maintenance of domination over a separate group of people, who are viewed as subordinate, and their territories, which are presumed to be available for exploitation.” She (1996: 19) further argues that “[i]mperial expansions established specific spatial arrangements in which the imaginative geographies of desire hardened into material spatialities of political connection, economic dependency, architectural imposition and landscape transformation.”
The way that the spatiality/platiality of colonialism has manifested throughout the former and presently colonial world has variation based on both historical and geographic context (Alsayyad, 1992). Different colonial powers had different strategies and ideologies that created different colonial geographies (Alsayyad, 1992). Simultaneously, the unique context, characteristics and responses of the colonized peoples equally mattered. This is particularly true in terms of urbanization. In Africa, for example, the historical form and function of colonial urbanization varied based on whether or not the culture that was colonized already had an urban tradition (Southall, 1971). Other local factors that influenced spatial patterns of colonialism include population dynamics, variations in culture, and environmental and topographical factors. Nevertheless, despite the great degree of variation that exists in terms of the spatiality of colonialism, one element is consistent: cities were almost always a critical component of this process and, in terms of shear built environment, represent the most tangible material manifestation of the legacy of these forces.

Cities were, then, the locus of colonial power. Cities needed to be built in the colonies, according to Jacobs (1996: 20), in order to insure the “successful exploitation of colonial resources.” They were also, she argues, critical “as centres for colonial administration, sites of local production and consumption, and conduits for the flow of goods and services” (20). The colonial cities that developed as a result of colonialism also, and equally importantly, became “sites in the transfer of modern capitalist cultures to new worlds,” as well as “sites in the deployment of the technologies of power through which indigenous populations were categorised and controlled” (Jacobs, 1996: 20; following King, 1990).
According to Jacob’s (1996) the process of transferring modern capitalist cultures to new worlds was as much about creating spaces/places familiar and amenable to these cultures as it was about creating socio-economic systems to facilitate them. The spaces/places created within this context were not empty containers, but rather were infused with the constructions of space/place a particular to a European worldview, and nowhere was this more evident than in the formation of colonial cities.

Thus, colonial cities were both spaces/places of power and also sites where cultural domination was articulated into spatial/platial form. Alsayyad (1992: 5) argues that the intellectual, physical, economic, and symbolic dominance inherent in colonialism is most clearly expressed in the form and function of colonial cities. For example, one of the most profound geographic expressions of colonial cultural domination is the geography of segregation. Policies of segregation, found throughout much of the urban colonial world, were one of the most obvious and extreme ways to effectively reinforce in space/place the cultural politics of dominant versus subordinate groups. In Africa, for example, Southall (1971: 242; original emphasis) argues that of the many “striking uniformities running through the cities and towns which were more direct creations of...[colonialism]...was the de facto segregation, in the purely objective sense of physical separation, between predominantly African and predominantly European areas.” Importantly, as Southall (242) notes, separation between the Europeans and Africans was a product of European

---

60 For examples from other parts of the world see for India King, 1976; for Papua New Guinea see Levine & Levine, 1979; for the Philippines see Reed, 1992; and for the contemporary Pacific see Connell & Lea, 1999.
urban planning and policies (in Lefebvrian terms the use of abstract space in the service of power). Also, with few exceptions this segregation was accompanied by economic and material inequalities.\textsuperscript{61}

Another more specific example of an urban form of colonial domination was the imposition of the grid system of roads as a part of colonial urban planning. Jacobs (1996: 105) writes, referring to the spatial (platial) outcomes of the colonial process, that “An ordered grid was emphatically placed over the land and provided the spatial skeleton for an embodied settlement.” She further argues (1996: 105; following Carter, 1987), “[g]ridded urban plans were undoubtedly imported spatial orderings intended to realise colonial authority.” Equally important to issues of authority, however, especially for the colonial settler, was the cultural familiarity of the grid system. For these settlers, Jacobs notes (1996: 105), the grid system represented a “familiar spatiality in an unfamiliar land.”

Here the confluence of Lefebvrian spatial practices of domination and place is evident. The grid is an ultimate expression of the use of abstract space to impose a European rational Western notion of space/place upon foreign territories and societies, but it also simultaneously resulted in spatial/platial arrangements that linked to cultural familiarity for Europeans, and as such implied the creation of spaces/places that resulted in feelings of familiarity, comfort and security. However, as a form of cultural domination the grid had

\textsuperscript{61} The South African period of apartheid was the paradigmatic example of government policies of segregation taken to its fullest expression (see Western, 1996 for a geographers perspective on the apartheid period).
the opposite impact on the indigenous populations. Referring to the impact of the grid on Australian Aborigines Jacobs (1996: 105) writes,

> the corners and lines which began to be carved into their land did not herald a familiar order that need only be awaited. This new geometry literally marked an unknowable future of imperfect encounters with those who sought, ceaselessly, to realise the perfection of the grid.

With the production of the gridded city came the juxtaposition of a culturally familiar and economically efficient space/place for the colonizers versus a “new geometry” marking an “unknowable future” for the colonized. This process marks the forced transition from a socio-spatial/platial system produced in one cultural context (e.g., Aboriginal) to another (e.g., European), and nowhere was this transition more intense than in urban areas.

How this transpired differed significantly from location to location depending on a complex layering of local and external variables. For example, the impact that colonial urbanization had on a space/place like India, with an already established urban infrastructure differed dramatically from the development of colonial cities in spaces/places like Aotearoa New Zealand, where no urban tradition existed previous to European settlement (for India see King, 1976; for New Zealand see Hamer, 1995). It is, therefore, important to note that each space/place and society that was subjected to colonial forms of urbanization may be considered using a general model or framework of colonial urbanization, but ultimately must also be considered within its unique historical, geographic and socio-spatial/platial context.\(^{62}\)

---

\(^{62}\) Anthony King (1990) gives an excellent overview of these models. Also, the book *Forms of Dominance: On the Architecture and Urbanism of the Colonial Enterprise* (Alsayyad, 1992) demonstrates the usefulness of taking seriously the idiosyncratic elements in each space/place
As noted above, the form of colonial urbanization relevant to this research involves the insertion of colonial cities into societies with no previous urban tradition combined with the imposition of a settler population on those societies, usually to the point where the indigenous population becomes a minority in their own homeland. This occurred in many places throughout the European colonial territories, and usually involved the attempted occupation and exploitation of what would be referred to today as indigenous societies and their territories (Alsayyad, 1992).

3.2 Islander Responses to Colonial Urbanization in the Pacific

Indigenous responses to colonial urbanization varied depending on where the colonialism was occurring, what colonial power was involved in the urbanization process, and when the colonialism was occurring. Thus, it is important to be cautious in imposing or implying broad generalizations when discussing the impact of urbanization on indigenous peoples. Ultimately it is more reasonable and productive to talk about the impact of colonial urbanization on the people of Papua New Guinea, on Māori, or on Navajo than it is to discuss these individual tribal groups as one collective entity referred to as “indigenous peoples”. However, at the same time productive discussion about how urbanization impacted these individual groups can come through comparing the experiences of one indigenous group to another. This is especially true when certain aspects of this process are shared among groups. For example, if subject to colonial forms of urbanization, as well as the differences in the way each colonizing power approached systematic forms of conquest.
categories such as the country doing the colonizing, the general time period when the colonizing was occurring, and the context of a settler colonial society are all shared then comparisons are merited and worthwhile. All of this is, of course, leading up to a discussion of the impact of colonial urbanization on Māori, but it is argued here that an overview of places that share important characteristics with the way urbanization was brought to Aotearoa New Zealand shores is quite useful to an analysis of how these processes transpired more specifically in this place.

From a global historical perspective, urbanization in the Pacific Islands is a relatively recent phenomenon. Prior to contact with Western Europeans and Americans beginning in the late 18th century the people of the Pacific Islands did not have an urban tradition. Although some Pacific Island cultures did have small villages and/or hamlets, beyond this large scale nucleated settlements did not develop. Large-scale urbanization did not develop in the Pacific Islands until the 20th century. Western forms of urbanization in the Pacific Islands began as either centers of European trade, missionary enclaves, or military outposts, or some combination of these three (Ralston, 1978; Doumenge, 1999). These early urban settlements were the spatial/platial manifestations of European imperialism in the Pacific Islands. Later, as these urban centers developed they became the beachheads for formal European colonialism in the Pacific Islands.

The formation of urban nodes did not occur in the initial phases of European-Pacific Islander interaction (late eighteenth century-early nineteenth century). Early interaction and trade between Europeans and islanders were conducted on board the European ships or on shore. The development of more formal Western style settlements was not immediately possible or necessary.
The first commercial ventures in the Pacific—provisioning of fur traders in Hawaii, the Tahitian pork trade, and the sandalwood trade in Fiji (and later the Marquesas)—did not necessitate the development of what Ralston (1978: 46) refers to as “proto-urban” communities. This was because the earliest exploited commodities were readily available with a minimum of support facilities.

The development of more formal urban nodes came about when the initially highly profitable and easily accessible resources were exhausted (fur and sandalwood in particular) and European traders began having to spend more time collecting cargoes. Also, with the discovery of distant (from the peripheral urban centers) whaling grounds, European and American traders needed services that could only be supplied by more centrally located Western style port facilities (e.g., deep water close to shore, piers for loading and unloading goods, warehouses and ship yards). Before the development of these port facilities the main refitting, provisioning, and administrative centers were on the periphery of the Pacific—Sydney, Manila, Canton and Valparaiso. These colonial urban centers were ultimately too distant to meet the immediate needs of a developing Pacific Islands/European/United States trade economy (Ralston, 1978: 46). As new commodities and trade patterns developed in the Pacific Islands the need for port towns also developed. For example, the sandalwood trade in Hawaii, and the beche-de-mer trade in Fiji both created the need by Europeans for port facilities. In general, the provisioning of whaling ships throughout the Pacific Islands also demanded the development of port towns (Ralston, 1978: 46).

All successful port towns had a combination of physical and economic advantages. Physically, port towns needed a harbor with good anchorage close to shore, an approach relatively free of reef, and ease of access and entry with
appropriate winds. Economically, port towns developed primarily in areas with an available exportable resource (Ralston, 1978: 47). The fact that the number of port towns was initially small, argues Ralston (1978: 47), suggests the “interdependence between trade and port location, plus the fact that only certain harbours were suitable for European shipping in each potential trading area, imposed severe limitations on the number of new centers.” These first port towns were “creations of necessity” developed to facilitate economic trade. Early centers included Honolulu (Hawaii), Papeete (Tahiti), Kororareka (Aotearoa New Zealand), Levuka (Fiji), and Apia (Western Samoa). None of these five early port sites “had enjoyed any great importance in pre-European times.” That is to say, none of the areas that were subsequently occupied by these port towns were considered particularly important to the local populations (Ralston, 1978: 57).

The important point in this overview of colonial urbanization in the Pacific Island region is that the establishment of port towns created an intensified zone of indigenous-foreign contact. Although global geographic and economic forces were an essential element of the development of early port towns, none of these early towns would have maintained their existence without the initial involvement and consent of the local populations (Ralston, 1978: 56). Prior to the development of these proto-urban sites the dominant socio-space/place-based system was that of the local societies. The development of the early port towns marks the first instances of a radically different socio-spatial/platial system being introduced into Pacific Island societies (Herman, 1999).

Prior to the development of port towns Europeans living in the Pacific Islands generally adapted their way of life (both social and spatial/platial) to fit
in with that of the local culture (Ralston, 1978). From a Lefebvrian (1991) perspective this suggests that the indigenous populations expressions of space/place were still the dominant socio-spatial/platial context, one which foreigners needed to adapt to in order to survive. The creation of port towns, however, marks a significant Lefebvrian socio-spatial/platial moment in foreigner/Islander interaction. Port towns represented material expressions of a Western socio-spatial/platial system. Within the confines of this Western interpretation of space/place Europeans no longer were as inclined to adapt to Islander ways of life. Instead, when Islanders entered these towns they began to have to adapt to foreign ways of life, and foreign constructions of urban space/place. In a very real sense this change in socio-spatial/platial relations marks a shift in the balance of power in the Pacific. Ralston (1978: 66) illustrates the impact of this change for both the indigenous and non-indigenous populations:

> carpenters, coopers, blacksmiths, boatbuilders, merchants and storekeepers, grog sellers, boarding-house keepers, and frequently a tailor, bootmaker and butcher, were the core of these early beach community populations. For some beachcombers the movement into a proto-port town was a relatively easy process of re-identification with fellow Europeans and frequently the resumption of jobs for which they had been trained in earlier life. The social and sexual attraction of island life which they had more recently enjoyed was continued in the ports. For the islanders, however, the rise of the first port towns was a crucial development in their relationship with foreigners. In the earlier beachcomber period the onus of assimilation and the assumption of new codes of behaviour had fallen heavily on the Europeans, if they wanted to survive and be accepted, but in the new proto-urban environment, the pendulum began to swing in the opposite direction. With the sense of security and self assurance that results from greater numbers, the expatriates slowly imposed their ways upon the islanders, who had to adopt European methods and work habits to succeed in a beach community. Forces of cultural change emanated from the new centres in the form of Western goods, ideas and economic life. For many years there was no compulsion upon the islanders to become involved in the new foreign communities. But the very presence of the port towns underlined the intensification of European and American interest in the Pacific—their desire to control and exploit its economic resources, which
inevitably led to greater and more sustained demands on many aspects of island life.

I quote Ralston at length here because I consider this part of her analysis to be extremely important to understanding this moment of transition that occurred in proto-urban centers throughout the Pacific between socio-spatial/platial systems dominated by the indigenous populations to the establishment of settlements where this was no longer the case. It also shows the critical role that urban development played in this process. It should be further noted that this macro view of early foreign/indigenous urbanization in the Pacific masked great variations in how this process occurred in individual spaces/places. This point does not, on the one hand, undermine the main argument that the urbanization process in the Pacific played a critical role in colonialism and followed certain consistent patterns, but it does, on the other, suggest that researchers should attend to the unique socio-cultural, historical and geographic context of each individual island in order to account for these differences. Regardless of these differences, however, it seems clear that foreigners, and especially those of European ancestry, were more at home in urban spaces/places and were often able to use the urbanization process to their advantage in dealing with the indigenous populations.

Thus, Europeans and Americans did not just gain a “sense of security and self assurance” (Ralston, 1978: 66) from the concentrations of their fellow countrymen found in these early urban centers. They also gained this confidence from the creation of culturally familiar spaces/places. The local population, on the other hand, was faced with an increasingly alien space/place where they did not have the advantages they had in the earlier beachcomber phase of foreign
This transitional period marks a gradual shift from a Pacific Islander socially constructed spatial/platial system to that of a Western urban one. As evidenced in the Ralston quote above (1978: 66), this shift also marks a significant change in the sense of space/place that permeated these early towns, a sense of space/place that became increasingly familiar and comfortable for foreigners and increasingly less so for Pacific Islanders.

In these early urban sites the transition from local to foreign socio-spaces/places was not immediate. As port towns developed there is a sense of an early overlap or co-presence that existed between foreign and local spatial/platial systems. For example, this co-presence was expressed in the simultaneous existence of local architecture, and local sacred spaces/places with the foreign buildings and port facilities common in nascent port towns. In these early proto-urban communities, then, the transition from local spatial/platial systems to foreign urban spatial/platial systems was gradual and overlapping. Later, when these towns were enlarged or renovated, and/or when new more purely colonial towns were created this was not as much the case (Ralston, 1978: 91). There is evidence, also, that the involvement of indigenous peoples in these early port towns was much more extensive in the beginning, and then gradually lessened as the towns developed.

An interesting and instructive example of this co-presence and gradual shift towards a predominantly foreign urban space/place is Honolulu. In an article looking at the impact of Anglo-American colonialism in Hawai‘i, Doug
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63 For example, as discussed in the previous section, the creation of the grid system was a familiar space for Europeans and Americans but quite alien to Pacific Islanders (see Jacobs, 1996, 107).
64 Although it is an open question as to whether or not this lessening of indigenous presence in urban areas was a demographic reality or a process of discursive elision.
Herman (1999) included two maps of Honolulu at various stages of the colonial period. In the first map showing Honolulu in the early 19th century there is a clear co-presence between foreign and Hawaiian uses of space/place. The presence of Hawaiian architecture, Hawaiian building layout, Hawaiian agriculture and Hawaiian sacred spaces/places is quite evident, as is the simultaneous presence of a Western-style fort, warehouses and a pier. In the second map from the late nineteenth century the only sign of Hawaiian space/place is the labeling of Hawaiian ali’i (chiefs) housing and, in several areas of the map, the more telling labeling of “Native thatched houses” and “Scattered native houses. This shift marks the gradual cartographic elision of Hawaiians from Western representation of colonial urban space/place. The Ralston quote above (1978: 66) suggests that this pattern of a shift from indigenous/foreign space/place co-presence to one dominated by foreign space/place was a common pattern in the early Pacific colonial urban ports.

Ralston (1978: 92) refers to these early urban areas as “alien enclaves,” a clear suggestion of her interpretation of their separateness from the local socio-spatial/platial environment, as well as the problem these new urban spaces/places posed for the indigenous populations. Islanders did not fully or necessarily accept these changes passively as Ralston notes (1978: 99-100):

[w]hile settlers were endeavouring to consolidate and, when conditions permitted, to extend their newly-found urban beachheads in the islands, the islanders themselves strove to maintain an uneasy ascendancy over the slowly expanding foreign populations.

Over time the forces of change and the balances of power did shift, especially in those cities where colonies of settlement began to dominate. One mark of this shifting balance of power involved developing patterns of urban ethnic
segregation. As port town foreign populations grew, in conjunction with the ascendency of colonial and/or local foreign powers, segregation became an increasing factor. As Ralston notes (1978: 164):

[t]his continued growth of foreign populations in the port towns resulted in a distinct modification of settlement patterns—the foreigners no longer occupied dwellings interspersed among those of the islanders, but moved together into what became sizeable nuclei of predominantly white settlers. Islanders still lived in close proximity to the foreigners, but certain areas became recognised white preserves in which the former were visitors or employees (usually domestic) rather than neighbours.

This critical shift in the way the colonizers viewed their geographic relationship with the indigenous population marks the growing unequal power relations being literally inscribed in urban space/place. How and to what degree this transition happened varied from one Pacific Island nation to another, and thus it is at this point that we can turn more specifically to the growth of European urbanization in Aotearoa New Zealand.

3.3 Colonial Urbanization in Aotearoa New Zealand and Māori Responses

Western forms of urbanization began in earnest in Aotearoa New Zealand with the rush of European settlers in the 1840s (Hamer, 1995; Park, 1995; Belich, 1996a). Prior to this decade small proto-urban port towns had developed, with one, Kororareka (today this town is named “Russell”) becoming one of the primary European ports in the Pacific Islands. To call Korareka a “European”

---

65 See also Gavin Daws’ (2006) recent book on the development of Honolulu in the 19th century for a detailed historical perspective on the shift from a Hawaiian space/place to one that increasingly becomes dominated by European urban socio-spatial/platial systems. What is fascinating about Daws’ account within the context of this research is how valiantly but vainly the Hawaiian leaders attempted to control this process.
port, per say, is, however, not entirely accurate. It existed early on because Māori chiefs wanted it there to increase their mana and to give them access to Western material items (Ralston, 1978). Māori were omnipresent in these types of towns. Perhaps it would be better to refer to places like Kororareka as Māori supported European ports, or even better, perhaps, a typical proto-urban Euro-Pacific indigenous settlement.66

The basic pattern of colonial urbanization in Aotearoa New Zealand has been described as “decentralized” (Hamer, 1995: 7), due to the fact that it consisted of many small towns either partly or entirely separate one from the other. The main reason for this relative separation, according to Hamer, was the fragmented topography of Aotearoa New Zealand that “presented settlers and travelers with many obstacles to movement” (Hamer, 1995: 8). This geographic fragmentation resulted in “numerous small pockets of space, the bounds of which were essentially determined by the distance that could be traversed in one day by the farmer going to market and back home or by the traveler progressing by coach” (Hamer, 1995: 8). By the end of the nineteenth century four main cities began to dominate the Aotearoa New Zealand urban hierarchy running from north to south—Auckland, Wellington, Christchurch, and Dunedin. These four cities are still the main urban centers, although Auckland has become by far the dominant urban center.

Towns were founded in Aotearoa New Zealand either by private companies, individual promoters, or by the colonial government. Belich (1996a:

66 In this context “mana” is best defined as social prestige, spiritual capital, a legitimization of an individuals authority. See chapter one for a more in-depth explanation of the important Māori concept “mana.”
189) refers to the main European settlements in Aotearoa New Zealand as “bases of secondary colonisation.” From an economic standpoint the successful towns “tended to be those that had succeeded in establishing hegemony over a region” (Hamer, 1995: 23). According to Belich (1996: 189) there were three variables that played a role in the success of early towns: “geography, economic opportunities, and Maori consent.” The most successful cities generally had favorable combinations of all three of these factors.

Beginning in the 1840s, when Europeans began migrating to Aotearoa New Zealand in greater numbers, the development of settlements in the form of “instant townships” became a critical part of the colonial and settlement process (Belich, 1996a: 188). For example, one of the main individuals responsible for the development of towns in Aotearoa New Zealand, Edward Gibbon Wakefield, strongly believed “that towns were a central feature of ...colonization” (Hamer, 1995: 16). Hamer (1995: 28) argues that many “immigrants to Aotearoa New Zealand wanted to be town dwellers, not to live on and work the land.” He further argues that New Zealand as a place of comfortable, civilized towns where an individual could make money through land speculation, advance professional careers, or engage in trade or manufacturing was a part of the marketing of Aotearoa New Zealand. In many ways the settlers immigrating to this part of the colonial world represented an urban industrial population bringing their knowledge of urban society with them to their new home. Moreover, the establishment of urban settlements in Aotearoa New Zealand meant more to the

---

67 Although it should be noted that the main colonial power in Aotearoa New Zealand—Great Britain—was not always in agreement or in control of the process of settlement. There were 12,000 Pākehā (people of European descent) in New Zealand in 1844, 26,000 in 1851, 59,000 in 1858, and 99,000 by 1861 (Belich, 1996a, 189). An increase of 87,000 Pākehā in 17 years!
settlers, however, than just economic advantages; there was also an important symbolic function that urban settlements fulfilled. As Hamer (1995: 29) notes,

[c]ities assumed a prominent position in perceptions—both by the settlers themselves and by outsiders—of new countries such as New Zealand for one very basic reason: they were an indicator of progress being made toward ‘civilization.’ The colonial city was a source of pride, a proof that the colony was not inferior to the mother country in the level of civilization that it had reached.

Whether early towns were formed based on laissez faire market forces or through more formal processes of urban planning (or a combination of the two), they all shared a basic social, physical and symbolic feature: they all served as spaces/places of cultural and social familiarity for Europeans and helped reinforce a belief in their racial and social superiority (Belich, 1996a). In the case of Aotearoa New Zealand, of course, the most immediate object of this feeling of superiority was the Māori.

Yet despite this feeling of cultural superiority the fact is that the initial Pākehā urbanization in Aotearoa New Zealand was made possible because of Māori (Hamer, 1995). As has been noted the processes of colonialism brought many changes to Māori society. By the time of contact with Europeans (briefly in 1642, but more substantially with Captain Cook in 1769) Māori had developed a complex agricultural and hunting/gathering-based society. Māori were, according to Joan Metge (1967: 4) “a pre-literate, tribal people whose tools were mainly of stone, and whose economic and political organization was based on kinship.”68 At the time of European contact Māori population was divided into roughly 50 iwi (tribes) that occupied separate and delineated territories. Each

68 I prefer the term “orally-sophisticated” to “pre-literate.”
iwi was a “descent-group in the broadest sense, membership being based on descent (or adoption by a descendant) from an ancestor identified as the tribe’s ‘founder’, traced through both male and female links (Metge, 1967: 5). Iwi were sub-divided into hapū (clans), each of which controlled a part of the larger iwi territory. Hapū were also based on a descent group from a founding ancestor, and “operated as a group on many more occasions than the tribe, especially with regard to land use, the production and use of capital assets such as large canoes and meeting-houses, and the entertaining of visitors” (Metge, 1967: 5). Both iwi and hapū were flexible institutions in that they were subject to change through warfare and population growth. The smallest and most basic social unit of Māori society was the whānau (household, extended family unit; see Metge, 1995).

According to Metge (1967) Māori settlements consisted of two basic forms. The pā was a fortified stronghold located on either hilltops or headlands. Pā were highly defensible sites that were protected by palisades, ditches, earthworks and fighting platforms. Inside the pā was densely constructed housing, the largest being able to contain several thousand people. In some cases pā were lived in over extended periods of time. Unfortified settlements were called kaainga and were often described by Europeans as villages. Kaainga “were typically hamlets of five or six houses scattered over the countryside with the paa as focus” (Metge, 1967: 9; original emphasis). Each major settlement, whether pā or kaainga, had a marae which consisted of “an open space used as a gathering place, a large house variously described as a whare runanga (council house) or whare hui (meeting-house), and one or two storehouses set on piles” (Metge, 1967: 8-10). However, this traditional form of Māori settlement did not over time survive the impact of colonialism unchanged.
In the first half-century of Māori-Pākehā contact Māori were eager to engage in economic relations with Pākehā, and were extremely adept achievers of their own needs and desires from this relationship (Belich, 1996a). Hamer (1995: 35) notes that the Māori

desire to facilitate the presence of Europeans and their trade undoubtedly was a reason not just for willingness to sell the land on which towns were then established but also for the subsequent protection of the infant settlements by powerful chiefs at times when they were threatened with attack and could easily have been destroyed. Indeed, Maori did much to enable towns to survive by supplying food and labor in the critical early years.69

In these early years of urban development in Aotearoa New Zealand Māori were deeply involved in urban economic systems. In the case of Auckland in 1848, for example, “an Auckland newspaper remarked that Maori ‘are our largest purveyors of foodstuffs; so large indeed as nearly to monopolize the market and to exclude the Europeans from competition’” (Belich, 1996a: 215).

As a result of this intensive economic activity Māori were a prominent presence in the early Pākehā urban settlements. Hamer (1995: 35) writes that in “the early years of both Auckland and Wellington, visitors noted how many Māori were to be seen in the streets.” He further suggests that the reasons for this strong Māori presence, was “partly because of trade and partly to conduct official business with the new European authorities.” But he further argues that Māori were present in these early urban sites “because the land on which the towns were now growing was land that they had been accustomed to visiting and using for purposes of their own, purposes that were increasingly

69 My discussions with Māori throughout this research, including Dr. Merata Kawharu—one of the Māori featured in chapter five, suggests that Hamer’s unproblematic use of the word “sell” does not really illustrate the complexity of this relationship. If nothing else it seems as if Hamer should have put quotation marks around this word to connote this complexity.
incompatible with the presence of a European town” (1995: 35). In this sense then, Māori interaction with early Aotearoa New Zealand urban centers was economic, political, and cultural in nature, and these interactions had both compatible and incompatible elements. As cities grew and as Pākehā-Māori relations became more contentious towards the end of the nineteenth century these incompatibilities became increasingly pronounced.

These growing incompatibilities were economic and cultural, but also, importantly, about space/place. From an economic perspective, “[n]o place was allowed…[for Māori]…within the growing cities, in which allocation of space was determined by market forces and especially the overwhelming speculative interest of Europeans in urban land” (Hamer, 1995: 35-36). From a cultural perspective, there was a growing assertion of European superiority that was expressed through the spaces/places of the cities. By the 1870s Hamer (1995: 35) writes, “very few Maori were to be seen” in the towns, and by the turn of the century “they were a rarity in city streets.” As European urban society developed in Aotearoa New Zealand, Hamer continues, “the Europeanness of the city as a form of community asserted itself, and Maori became less and less welcome or comfortable as sojourners or even as visitors” (Hamer, 1995: 35).

Ultimately, Hamer argues, the Pākehā excluded Māori from the developing cities for not only economic reasons, but also ideological. Part of this ideology involved “the assumption that the natural process of social evolution was from wilderness and ‘primitivism’ to more and more sophisticated forms of

---

70 Similar to this Māori-specific discussion, Ralston (1978), in her discussion of early European towns in the Pacific, notes how over time, as European towns developed and became more established as clearly European spaces/places, Pacific Islanders became increasingly uncomfortable in these towns (see previous section above)
community” (Hamer, 1995: 35). “At the end of the process,” Hamer continues, “came the evolution of cities. Since indigenous peoples were equated with savagery and primitive nature, towns and cities were not seen as places to which they ‘belonged’” (Hamer, 1995: 35).

Gradually, an official policy of Māori exclusion from urban areas was promoted. Hamer (1995: 36) writes,

> [t]he idea gained ground that the civilizing of the Maori was best promoted by their exclusion from the towns, either because they were unable at least initially to cope with direct association with a more ‘advanced’ civilization or because the less desirable features of European life were concentrated in the cities and were corrupting the Maori.\(^71\)

Significantly, as a direct result of the exclusion of Māori from urban areas, European settlers were able to maintain not only geographic segregation, but were also able to deny Māori the economic advantages found in urban areas. Thus, unequal power relations were achieved in urban areas both through ideological and economic means.

### 3.4 A Case Study of Māori Involvement in the Development of Auckland

When one looks at the development of a single urban area in a colonial territory many of the broader questions discussed above take on more idiosyncratic elements. However, at the same time broad patterns of development are discernable both in terms of how Europeans went about the

\(^71\) This type of policy was even more extreme in Papua New Guinea. Papuans were forced to leave towns after sunset in many European towns during the colonial period and, even more intensely, were not allowed to wear European style clothing when in these towns (Levine & Levine, 1979). It is also clear from this quote that Europeans were quite adept at using contradictory ideology to exclude Māori from cities—whether the city was portrayed as the height of civilization or as Sodom and Gomorrah the point was to exclude Māori.
business of constructing cities in colonial territories and in how the indigenous populations engaged and interacted with the development of European cities in their ancestral lands. Auckland, which today constitutes by a significant degree Aotearoa New Zealand’s largest urban area, is no exception to this argument (see Figure 3 next page). On the one hand, Auckland went through many of the same processes of urban planning (or lack of planning), and the politics and economics of urban growth, regional trade and regional competition as did many cities that developed during the colonial era. On the other hand, there are many unique aspects to Auckland’s development including its unique physical geography, the form of colonialism that was occurring in Aotearoa New Zealand during its early development, and the uniqueness of Māori culture in general, and the agendas of the specific Māori iwi and hapū occupying the Tamaki-Makau-Rau isthmus at the time this city was founded.

However, it is not my intention here to undertake a detailed historical geography of Auckland’s growth into a major global city. Rather, the issue that I engage in this section involves the impact of Auckland’s urban development on Māori. More specifically, did the development of this city follow the same patterns of early indigenous engagement with a gradual move towards

72 There are both online and hardcopy sources that cover this history adequately. A good place to start online is the Auckland Regional Councils home page where one can navigate to an excellent overview of Auckland’s historical development (http://www.aucklandcity.govt.nz/auckland/Introduction/bush/default.asp). For another online source that has more of an historical geographic focus (i.e., maps) this same website offers an article, “A Brief History of Auckland’s Urban Form” (http://www.arc.govt.nz/auckland/built-environment-and-land-use/a-brief-history-of-aucklands-urban-form.cfm). For an in-depth history of Māori occupation of the lands that now encompass Auckland see, Stone, Russell (2001) From Tamaki-Makau-Rau to Auckland. For a less in-depth and more far-ranging discussion of Auckland see the New Zealand Herald online series, “Auckland, Tale of a Super City” (http://www.nzherald.co.nz/auckland-tale-of-asupercity/news/headlines.cfm?c_id=1502974). Another excellent online source for information about Auckland is Te Ara: The Encyclopedia of New Zealand (http://www.teara.govt.nz/). (Belich (1996) also touches on Auckland occasionally, as does Hamer (1995).
indigenous alienation as Ralston (1978) suggests occurred in other Pacific Island towns? And if indeed this is the case, as I argue it is, was this as much about alienation through space/place as it was through socio-cultural and socio-economic alienation?

Figure 3: Map of Auckland Greater Metropolitan Region (source: Auckland Regional Council Official Website, “A Brief History of Auckland’s Urban Form”, http://www.arc.govt.nz/auckland/built-environment-and-land-use/a-brief-history-of-aucklands-urban-form.cfm).

The literature on Auckland’s development tends to present Māori involvement with this urbanization process as occurring in four periods: 1) a period before Auckland is established when Māori from various iwi and hapū occupied and struggled over the Tamaki-Makau-Rau isthmus (pre-1840); 2) a period of intense Māori/Pākehā interaction as Auckland first established its urban roots (1840-1860); 3) a period, from about the time of the New Zealand Wars (1860) to the end of WWII, where Māori seemingly disappear from the
story of Auckland; and, finally, 4) the post-WWII period of intense Māori rural-to-urban migration when Māori once again become a prominent part of Auckland’s urban story. On the surface these four periods seem to support Ralston’s arguments about the role of urbanization in, overtime, alienating Pacific Islanders from urban areas. On closer inspection, however, some questions arise as to what exactly is meant by “alienation”. Did Māori become so disconnected from Auckland socially, culturally, economically and politically that they literally vacated the city until socio-economic conditions post-WWII reversed this trend? Or was this only partly the story and, in fact, many Māori remained in Auckland but were relegated to the “poor” and/or effectively erased from the urban story as told by mainstream Pākehā history?

As it turns out the answer to these questions lie somewhere in the middle. On the one hand, Auckland did become a space/place of increasing alienation for Māori as their land base was eroded. On the other, many Māori, particularly those connected to hapū/iwi who claimed the Tamaki isthmus as their tūrangawaewae (rightful territory) remained in Auckland as it grew into a major urban center. These latter Māori seem to have become relegated to “urban poor”, but nevertheless very much remained a part of the city. As with Māori in many other cities around Aotearoa New Zealand there was from the beginning an overlap between a Māori iwi/hapū geography and the new urban geography being constructed by Pākehā.

Without a doubt the historical and archaeological data shows that Māori occupied and intensely cultivated the Tamaki-Makau-Rau isthmus for hundreds of years before Europeans ever set eyes upon it. This history, described in detail by Stone (2001), is one of both periods of peaceful settlement and cultivation, and
intensive warfare and struggle over the regions rich resources. The Māori name for Auckland, Tamaki-Makau-Rau, certainly suggests the desirability of this region in that it is typically translated to mean “land of a thousand lovers.” Metaphorically this alludes to the fact that many Māori iwi and hapū valued this area of the North Island and were willing to fight over it to control its resources. By the time Europeans were invited by Māori to consider this site for Aotearoa New Zealand’s first capital, one iwi, Ngāti Whātua o Ōrākei, could legitimately claim manawhenua (rightful stewardship) over large portions of the Tamaki isthmus.

The leaders of Ngāti Whātua offered land along the north side of this isthmus to the then Governor of New Zealand, William Hobson, as a means to insure adherence to the Treaty of Waitangi, as well as to gain further access to valuable Pākehā technologies and medical skills (Kawharu, 2001; see Figures 4 and 5). Initially 3,000 acres were “given”, with an additional 8,000 acres “given” shortly after (the initial 3,000 acres cover the boundaries of what is today Auckland’s central city). Quotes are put around the word “given” here to suggest the different interpretations of this process by the two parties. According to Sir Ian Hugh Kawharu (2001), leader of Ngāti Whātua (now deceased), from the Māori perspective this offering of land was tuku rangatira. Directly translated tuku rangatira means “gifts between chiefs,” but far more important than the translation is the intent and “spirit” of this gifting process. For Māori this process represented a transfer of “use rights” but “the underlying title remained with the donor group” (Kawharu, 2001: 3). This perspective was diametrically opposed to the Pākehā notion of a capitalist land transfer whereby the purchasing party is free to do as he/she wants with the property purchased.
This misunderstanding is, according to Kawharu (2001), fundamentally based on radically different notions of the relationship between people and land:

Unfortunately, there was no such thing or word in Maori as money at this time, so to begin with, ‘buying’ and ‘selling’ were utterly foreign concepts for Ngati Whatua to have to come to terms with. Even more foreign was the concept of legal title to land and the framework of law and commerce surrounding it. But whatever the nature of the titles, the Crown felt able to claim them as its own. More than a third of the Tamaki Isthmus thus passed out of Ngati Whatua control, enabling the Crown both to provide the settlers with the land they needed and to do so at astronomical rates of profit for itself. Payment in the form of meeting the expectations of Ngati Whatua was never considered by the Crown, just as the variety of trade goods and sovereigns were never considered by Ngati Whatua to be anything other than symbols of an alliance yet to be confirmed. These things were ‘koha’, gifts, just like the Treaty blankets. The people undoubtedly continued to believe that the land and their mana were still theirs, untouched and beyond negotiation. Hobson and his officers and their families were invited—like the missionaries before them—to share the bounty of the land and the harbours so long as they resided within the Ngati Whatua domain and shared their taonga, i.e. their skills and knowledge, with Ngati Whatua.

Despite the fact that there was a treaty in place, and despite the fact that the Crown devised policies theoretically intended to allow Māori to keep control over at least some of their land, and to benefit through the creation of an endowment from land purchases, the end result was one typical of what happened to indigenous peoples through their dealings with Europeans: a vast land controlled by Ngāti Whātua o Ōrākei was reduced and then eventually removed from their control.

Despite these Ngāti Whātua land losses most histories of Auckland acknowledge that, initially, European settlers in Auckland were absolutely dependent on Māori for the supply of essential foods and supplies as well as for exports. This intense engagement between Māori and non-Māori Aucklanders

73 Early on Māori owned a third of the shipping fleet, but eventually could not compete with more technologically advanced steam ships, which they could not afford.
suggests that Māori were not, at least initially, uncomfortable with European forms of early urbanization, and in fact

Figure 4: This 1842 map of Auckland shows an area hardly discernable from what one sees today (see Figure 5 below). More importantly, despite the fact that all reports from this period state clearly that Māori were heavily involved with this proto-urban center the key to this map (not shown) does not note a single Māori presence. Even at this stage of intense Māori/Pākehā involvement maps discursively ignored the presence of Māori (Source: Te Ara Online Encyclopedia: http://www.teara.govt.nz/en/roads/1/3).

Figure 5: Contemporary map of Auckland showing approximate area of 1842 map with points of similarity (source: base map from Google Maps).
thrived economically.\textsuperscript{74} As was noted in the previous section, Hamer (1995) points out that Europeans in early Auckland and Wellington remarked on how many Māori were seen in town. He further points out that this was due to the fact that Māori were deeply involved in these cities economies, as well as the fact that all cities occupied land that Māori had used for centuries and continued to use even after European urban centers began to take shape. Hamer’s observations fit well with Ralston’s (1976) arguments about Pacific Islander-Foreigner interaction in Pacific Island proto-urban centers. At the initial stage of urban development an overlap and inter-linkage between Pacific Islander land use and foreign land use occurred, and during this stage both Pacific Islanders and foreigners successfully functioned and were present. Ralston further argues that over time, as foreigners increased their control of these early urban centers and continued to develop them along European models of urbanization, Pacific Islanders began to feel less comfortable and were less welcomed as everyday occupiers of urban space/place.\textsuperscript{75} Did this happen in Auckland? Certainly Hamer notes that one can find late nineteenth century quotes from Pākehā attesting to the lack of Māori in city streets as Aotearoa New Zealand cities like Auckland and Wellington developed. But it is also a fact that Ngāti Whātua o Ōrākei members remained in Auckland as it grew, even as their control over Tamaki land was eroded.

An interesting quote from the article “A Brief History of Auckland’s Urban Form” (Auckland Regional Council Official Website: 3) offers some clues

\textsuperscript{74} Whether or not, or to what percentage, the Māori engaged in trade were Ngāti Whātua or members of other iwi/hapū I have, as yet, not been able to determine.

\textsuperscript{75} Hamer also notes this transition in the way Māori felt in Aotearoa New Zealand cities as they developed (see previous section above).
to historical events that may have lead to Māori being less visible in cities like Auckland. They write that,

[i]n the early 1860s, Māori resentment over land losses and Auckland’s growth led to Pakeha fears that Auckland was vulnerable to attack from Waikato to the south. The city’s garrison was enlarged by 12,500 British troops and military settlers. Preparations for war began with the construction of the Great South Road and a chain of military redoubts through Franklin—later the foundation of farming communities.

It certainly does not seem too much of a hypothetical stretch to argue that increasing hostilities between Pakeha and Māori, culminating in out right war between some Māori iwi/hapū and British and colonial soldiers, may have lead to cities becoming increasingly hostile spaces/places for Māori.

Figure 6: Contemporary map of Ngāti Whātau o Ōrākei tūrangawaewae; the circle indicates the area their land holdings were reduced to within three years of their first inviting Governor Hobson to establish Aotearoa New Zealand’s capital in Auckland (source: base map from Office of Treaty Settlements Official Website: http://nz01.terabyte.co.nz/ots/fb.asp?url=Live Article.asp?ArtID=94391604).

But what of the Ngāti Whātau o Ōrākei members who’s lands the city of Auckland was established upon? According to their historians they remained on
the Tamaki isthmus as it transformed into the city of Auckland. Despite the fact that within three years of Auckland’s establishment Ngāti Whātua’s land holdings, for reasons that involved the Crown disregarding safeguards it had put in place through legal means to stop this from happening as well as due to mistakes made by their own members, had been reduced to 700 acres that became known as the Ōrākei block (Kawharu, 2001; see Figure 6). In 1865 this small parcel of land was “awarded” to Ngāti Whātua by the newly formed Māori Land Court. However, between this time and the early 1970s this remaining land was systematically and illegally taken from Ngāti Whātua until all that remained was a quarter acre *urupa* (Māori cemetery).

During this same period Auckland grew rapidly to become the sprawling metropolis it is today (see Figure 3 above, page 140). However, from the 1860s until the end of WWII the general literature does not mention Ngāti Whātua or, for that matter any other Māori groups. Māori in cities like Auckland become the urban poor, discursively portrayed within a class-based perspective of urban society. Perhaps this reflects a general belief among Pākehā society that Māori were a dying culture heading inevitably towards assimilation and acculturation into Pākehā society. It is not until the post-WWII that Māori appear again in the literature about Aotearoa New Zealand urbanization. It is at this point that large numbers of rural, village and small town Māori begin to relocate in Aotearoa New Zealand’s major cities to take advantage of social and economic opportunities, as well as to escape entrenched rural poverty and chronic unemployment. It is to this story that I now turn.

3.5 20th Century Patterns of Māori Urbanization

By the time the Māori urban story gets picked up again in the literature half of the 20th century has come and gone. Up until the end of World War II Māori remained essentially a rural agrarian/labor people, with less than 15% of Māori residing in urban areas (presumably, many of these are iwi such as Ngāti Whātua who’s tūrangawaewae overlaps spaces/places where major urban areas formed). This trend would change dramatically beginning in the 1940s. It was noted in the previous section that cities in Aotearoa New Zealand became increasingly difficult space/places for Māori to inhabit. Partly this was due
Pākehā attitudes and official policies encouraging Māori not to be city people. But there are also, of course, other reasons why Māori were predominantly rural rather than it just being due to a Pākehā policy of exclusion (economic, cultural, and/or ideological). Māori were also making choices and for many it is certainly not unreasonable to suggest that they did not want to associate with cities. The point being that this was in no way a one way process of Pākehā dictating the geo-demographic patterns of Māori, but rather a complex relationship where both Pākehā and Māori were profoundly involved with making choices about where they wanted to reside within the bounds of Aotearoa New Zealand, with an equally complex assortment of cultural, economic, and political forces influencing these choices.

Whether by force or by choice, the fact is that by the midway point of the 20th century the Māori presence in Aotearoa New Zealand urban areas was small, although this certainly had geographic variation. Cities like Rotorua, for example, had urban areas that overlapped existing iwi and/or hapū core territorial areas and as a result probably had more significant Māori presence from an earlier date. Despite policies of exclusion, Māori were never totally absent from any medium or large city in Aotearoa New Zealand, but their presence in cities took on a new dimension post-WWII.

The dramatic rural-to-urban migration of Māori post-WWII marks the beginning of much higher concentrations of Māori in Aotearoa New Zealand’s urban areas and resulted, eventually, in significant percentages of Māori born and raised in an urban context. This geodemographic shift is significant because (and this is the main topic of Chapter 4) it is through this process that generation of Māori living uniquely Māori urban ways of life began to develop. Two
changes mark the beginnings of distinctive Māori urban ways of life or Māori urbanisms: a percentage shift whereby the Māori population becomes an increasingly significant demographic presence in Aotearoa New Zealand cities, and the increasing number of Māori born and raised in urban areas as a result of this demographic shift. One way to understand how these changes came about is through a discussion of Māori demographic patterns during the 20th century.

Māori experienced rapid population growth, particularly in the first half of the 20th century, as well as a shift from a predominantly rural, agrarian society to a predominantly urban industrial society. This marked a radical shift from 19th century patterns where, as Rowland (1973: 150) points out, “the major characteristics of...[Māori]...demography were decline and retreat.” After formative contact with Europeans beginning at the end of the eighteenth century Māori population declined 60-80%, registering an all-time low of 42,113 in the 1896 census (Rowland, 1973: 150). The main mechanisms responsible for this decline were a combination of the diffusion of European pathogens and the social disorganization and impoverishment associated with wide scale land alienation (Rowland, 1973; Pool, 1991). At the same time as population decline was occurring, Māori also became increasingly geographically isolated (through warfare, land alienation, and by choice) in “areas that were mainly relatively infertile parts of the country, most distant from European penetration” (Rowland, 1973: 150).

However, despite many of these negative trends Māori still managed to rebound demographically undergoing a remarkable period of rapid growth during the 20th century. This growth “can largely be attributed to a very high birth rate (constantly above 40 live births per 1000 population annually during
the 20th century) and a low death rate” (Rowland, 1973: 151). The most spectacular periods of growth began in the 1920s and ended in the 1960s. Between these decades the Māori population increased from a total of 56,987 in 1921 to 201,159 in 1966 (Rowland, 1973: 150). Although fertility rates dropped dramatically after the 1960s, the extremely large number of young Māori (under the age of twenty five) has maintained significant population increases up to the present due to demographic momentum. By 2009 there were an estimated 652,900 Māori totaling 15% of the New Zealand population (4.35 million) and they remain the fastest growing population in New Zealand (Statistics New Zealand, 2009 estimates).

Although the Māori population recovery began in the early part of the 20th century, the rural-to-urban migration of Māori did not begin until after WWII. By the midway point of the 20th century Māori rural communities were very different from Māori communities at the time of European contact, although these rural communities were still considered the cores of Māori society and culture (Metge, 1964). Much of the changes were due to the fact that, in the context of 150 years of colonialism, Māori were subjected to large-scale land alienation, as well as the at least partial assimilation to Western ways of life, often in stark contrast and conflict with Māori ways of life (Metge, 1964). In some cases changes were forcefully imposed upon Māori—e.g., land consolidation policies that undermined communal use of land—in other cases Māori chose to adopt new technologies and socio-spatial/spatial systems that they deemed would improve their lives in meaningful ways (Belich, 1996a).

In the decade before WWII 90% of Māori were rural (Walker, 1990; see also Spoonley, 1996) but, as Walker (1990: 197) notes,
According to Walker (1990: 198), “The major reasons for the urban migration were the ‘big three’ factors of work, money, and pleasure,” and of course government policies aimed at drawing Māori surplus labor into towns and cities to participate in the war effort (the Manpower Act mentioned by Walker above). The rural areas where the bulk of Māori resided prior to WWII were in a state of poverty resulting from Pākehā driven land alienation combined with Crown (state government) enforced land “incorporation” schemes that had mostly not been successful for Māori. Urban areas offered Māori more stable employment opportunities and, in general, a higher material standard of living. In other words, both push and pull factors stimulating Māori rural-to-urban migration were very much in place by the mid point of the 20th century (Metge, 1964; Belich, 1996a; Walker, 1990).

Throughout this period of Māori rural-to-urban migration the city of Auckland has received the overwhelming majority of Māori (Metge, 1964; Rowland, 1973; Johnston, et al, 2003 & 2008). This was due to “the city’s economic expansiveness as well as its favorable location in relation to Māori populated areas, particularly in the Far North” (Rowland, 1973: 253). Initially, in cities like Auckland, this migration was to inner-city areas where cheap, rundown housing was available, as well as “close to work on the wharves, in

76 As noted previously, “papakainga” as used here by Walker is best translated as “village,” marae are sacred/meeting spaces/places particular to Māori often associated with both whānau and hapū communities.
factories and the transport industry” (Walker, 1990: 198)). In more recent decades areas on the fringes of all the major cities have gained increasing shares of Māori population partly due to the construction of government housing (Rowland, 1973), and partly due to cheaper housing and rents found in the suburbs combined with on-going patterns of gentrification in and around the inner city. In Auckland these neighborhoods, often 40%-50% Māori, include areas in South Auckland and West Auckland, and other scattered settlements throughout this expansive city (Johnston, et al, 2003 & 2008). There is much more to this process of rural-to-urban migration, however, then just a shift in where Māori lived. This spatial/platial shift also created conditions that changed how Māori lived, and this change is importantly linked to the development of urban ways of life, or, Māori urbanisms.

3.6 Māori Responses to Rural-to-Urban Migration

During the 1950s Joan Metge (1964) did a detailed study of Māori life in a rural community and compared it to Māori life in Auckland. Metge’s main concern was the impact of urbanization on Māori society, but to do this effectively Metge rightly perceived that a profile of a rural Māori community was first needed as a means of comparison. Metge concluded that Māori rural communities exhibited a way of life that combined their traditional socio-cultural systems with Pākehā systems, recognizing that Māori had by no means escaped

---

77 Interestingly, a geographer at Auckland University, professor Hong Kee Yoon, made this same argument to me when I spoke with him about my research in 2007. He argued that if I wanted to really understand Māori in the urban context I needed to first understand them in their rural context.
the impact of colonialism by remaining a predominantly rural people. One hundred and fifty years of colonialism had, in other words, forced Māori to adapt their ways of life to fit that of the dominant socio-economic and socio-geographic systems regardless of whether they were rural or urban.

In the rural village studied by Metge there were 537 Māori representing approximately 78% of the population. These Māori lived in Western style homes (with a wide variation in quality), with electricity and phones, but little or no access to running water. The majority of Māori living in this village were tangata whenua; i.e., those individuals and families that could trace their whakapapa (genealogy) to the whānau (extended family), hapū (clan), and iwi (tribe) with the strongest claim (tūrangawaewae) to the territory within which this village was located. All other Māori living in this village were considered “immigrants” and generally did not have land or marae rights. The tangata whenua owned most land in the area, but very few of them made a living from the land. Many Māori in the village were employed in manual labor, trades, service industries, communication, and transport jobs located outside of the village. Even the few full-time farming families supplemented their income with cash earning employment. During times of recession employment opportunities for Māori decreased and hardship generally followed. Overall Metge argues that for the typical Māori villager there were many good economic reasons to migrate to towns or cities in search of better, and more reliable employment opportunities.

And yet many Māori chose to stay in the rural village where Metge did her research. The reason for this, Metge argues, is the attachment to the land and the community felt by these Māori. The sense of belonging that came from the knowledge of occupying ancestral lands, combined with the presence of several
marae that facilitated and mediated community relations, and created a high level of cultural comfort for the tangata whenua. However, despite these strong cultural forces encouraging Māori residents of this village to stay, there were also strong forces pushing them to leave (lack of job opportunities being a primary one). Ultimately, in this village, as in most rural villages, large numbers of Māori, predominantly young adults, did decide to migrate to urban areas with the demographic result being a vast majority of Māori now classified as “urban” by the New Zealand statistics bureau (Statistics New Zealand Website).78

At the time of Metge’s (1960s) study many Māori she interviewed in Auckland were recent migrants. Because of this, she argues, her profiles show a strong connection between the villagers who migrated to Auckland and their home village. There was also a clear understanding of the kinship and ancestral descent relationships shared with the village Māori, as well as a desire to return regularly to the village to maintain “rights” to the land and marae. However, there was also a general feeling among the urban Māori interviewed by Metge that life in the city was having a negative impact on basic aspects of Māori culture. For example, the aspects of communal living common to rural Māori were less evident in the urban setting. Accusations of increasing selfishness and abuses of kinship privileges were also evident. It was also noted that in the city formal recognition of rank was less evident than in the rural areas (although,

78 It is truly amazing how often this story of urban migration comes up when Māori tell their personal life and family stories. In a book titled Growing Up Māori (Ihimaera, 1998) this story of migration comes up again and again, especially among the Māori who were young adults or children in the two decades after WWII. In my discussions with Māori for this research this story also was omnipresent. I have yet to meet a Māori with even limited knowledge of his/her ancestry who can say that not only are they urban but also that their family has always been urban as far back as they can remember.
according to Metge, even in the rural areas this had less importance than in the past).

Metge notes that whereas in the rural areas there was a keen sense of iwi/hapū identity, in the urban areas this aspect of identity was less well developed. Although tribal identity did remain in the urban areas, the connection was with the rural area rather than a developing of tribal identity in the urban sphere. Metge writes, for example, that in the urban areas “the vague feeling of kinship which existed between members of the same tribe was not strong enough to provide a basis for consistent common action” (1967: 162). In general, the move to the city also caused many Māori to lose some degree of connection with both their iwi and the traditional land associated with that iwi, as well as with their home marae (Metge, 1967; Walker, 1979, and Maaka, 1994 also note this trend).

The timing of Metge’s study is significant because it marks a critical moment when Māori were beginning the process of forming Māori urbanisms. At the stage she is writing the urban context is still quite new for many Māori and large numbers of Māori born into the urban context had not yet developed. These second-generation Māori urban dwellers are a significant population because they represent Māori who are becoming increasingly adapted to urban ways of life. For the first generation urban dwellers (those that migrated) the change in physical location is also marked by a psychological and cultural change.

The rapid urbanization of Māori in the latter half of the 20th century has led in some cases to not just a physical separation from hapū and iwi, traditional land, and local marae, but also a psychological and cultural separation from
these groups and land-based identities (Rosenblatt, 2002; Borell, 2005; McIntosh, 2005; van Meijl, 2006). It is this type of impact that brings into the discussion issues of Māori cultural identity and the relationship between shifts in this identity and the transition to predominantly urban ways of life. It is also in this context that a discussion of Māori urbanisms beginning to form comes to the fore, since issues of identity are a critical component of urbanisms.

An important Māori concept that can shed light on why the development of these urbanisms was at times socio-culturally challenging is tūrangawaewae (Karetu, 1990: 117). This concept was discussed in Chapter 2 as one that comes closest to the phrase “sense of place.” Tūrangawaewae is fundamentally grounded in geography in the sense that it is profoundly about attachment to place and sense of place. From a Lefebvrian perspective tūrangawaewae can also be understood as a critical component of the Māori socio-spatial (platial) worldview—an essential manifestation of their social production of space/place. Through birthing rituals, generations of occupation, and cultural landscape literacy Māori established from the start a profound bond with a particular geographic region.

The intense nature of this bond reflects the importance of tūrangawaewae in the formation and maintenance of traditional Māori cultural identity. From a traditional Māori cultural perspective to lose one’s tūrangawaewae is to risk losing one’s Māori identity (Metge, 1967: 109). In traditional Māori culture one’s claim to tūrangawaewae is justified through their whakapapa. Karetu (1990: 112) argues that “in the final analysis, the only way one can have tūrangawaewae in the sense of the right to claim affiliation to a certain place or marae is through whakapapa.” It is only when Māori began migrating to cities in large numbers
that they began to live lives geographically disconnected from their traditional tūrangawaewae. For some Māori this meant difficult (in terms of time and money) efforts to maintain their tūrangawaewae bonds over great distances, and in other cases urban migration resulted in Māori that lost this connection all together.

This discussion points to why I have chosen to talk about Māori urbanisms (plural) as opposed to urbanism (singular). Some Māori were able to maintain their cultural connections despite geographic distance, others lost these connection either partially or completely, still others lived in cities that were within their tūrangawaewae boundaries (and some most likely lost their connection as a result of the legacy of colonialism regardless of geographic migrations). For those Māori that did move to urban areas it is these types of differences and divergences that begin the process of developing different responses to urban life and, thus, the development of different Māori urbanisms.

So what happens to individual Māori identities when, through processes of urbanization, these types of profound cultural ties are loosened? In the urban context Māori have had to adjust to urban ways of life that have stimulated changes in their traditional social, cultural, and spatial/platial systems. The first generation of Māori urban migrants brought with them Māori cultural identities that had been maintained in the face of 150 years of Pākehā colonization. Walker (1979: 33) argues that,

[w]hatever the route taken, the migrants arrived in the cities with an identity and cultural background that made them different from the Pakeha who dominated urban society. Although much traditional Maori culture had been lost in 150 years of European contact enough had survived to underpin the identity of the migrating Maoris. Maoris generally identified with a tribe and its territory. Kinship networks and the extended family still figured strongly in their lives. Certainly the
marae as the focus of community feeling, and the tangi with its rituals and oratory, remained the core of Maoritanga. Most Maoris took these traditions with them when they migrated to the city. They continued to feel an attachment for the community where the family or tribal marae was located.79

But the demands of urban life forced urban Māori to make “fundamental adjustments” (Walker, 1979: 33) in order to survive in the city. These adjustments involved both spatial/platial and social changes to the structure of traditional Māori culture. “For perhaps the first time,” Walker argues, “Māori came to face the possibility of total assimilation” (1979: 33).

One of the interesting aspects of the role of cities in the development of Māori society is the paradox of contrasting positive and negative experiences. On the one hand, as Walker points out (1990), city life fostered a generation of Māori in the 1960s and 1970s that led to political and intellectual fights for improving conditions for Māori in Aotearoa New Zealand (also see Spoonley, 1996). In this sense one could argue that cities created a context whereby Māori had access to greater levels of education and greater awareness, for example, of global trends (e.g., the civil rights movement in the United States) that were instrumental in initiating the Māori renaissance (see Rosenblatt, 2002 for a discussion of this renaissance). Many of the successes—political, economic, and cultural—that Māori can claim since these decades are, in other words, a direct result of the activities of urban Māori.

On the other hand, when Joan Metge (1964: 254) did her in-depth study of Māori rural-to-urban migration in the 1950s she was optimistically able to

79 “Tangi” is the Māori word to describe the three day process of “farewelling” the deceased that is an important part of traditional and contemporary Māori society and culture.
conclude that while Māori “showed many signs of maladjustment and insecurity on first arriving in the city...in most cases it was a phase from which they emerged.” But Metge’s optimism starkly contrasts with Collin James’ (1988: 26) description from the late 1980s of urban Māori socio-cultural conditions. James argues that many relevant social indicators reflect a process of widespread cultural and social decay occurring in the cities. For example, James (1988: 26-29) writes:

Maori are far more likely than Whites to be arrested. Some 32% of Maori males between 15 and 30 years of age are arrested for criminal offenses, compared with 5.5% of the corresponding non-Maori age group. Maoris are more likely to be convicted if caught and more likely to go to prison if convicted. 53% of the prison population in 1986 was Maori...In 1987, 5.7% of Maori boys and 5% of Maori girls stayed to the end of secondary school, more than twice the proportion of a decade earlier but only a quarter of the proportion of non-Maori. Some 53% of Maori school leavers had no formal qualifications. Relatively few Maoris go on to university and, consequently, they are badly under-represented in the professions. Compared with figures for non-Maoris, infant mortality is 50% higher, the proportion of Maori youth (15-24) hospitalised is double and the proportion of Maori youth admitted to psychiatric hospitals 50% higher...Maori make up 22% of the unemployed and of those, 70% are under 24. In some areas, more than 50% of young Maoris are unemployed. Thus, unemployment is not just a social issue, as in other countries; it is a racial issue as well.

The fact that nearly two decades later Tracey McIntosh (2005: 48) can describe almost the exact same socio-economic situation as James describes in the 1980s is both remarkable and alarming. This is the case because the consistency of these two author’s arguments, despite their chronological separation, suggests both the intractability of this discourse of the negative impact of urbanization on some Māori, and the fact that for some not insignificant percentage of Māori these statistics represent a harsh urban reality.

However, when one delves into the literature on the contemporary Māori relationship with cities it is the negative discourse that seems to dominate. The
negative portrayal of this relationship most likely goes back all the way to the policies developed in the nineteenth century to discourage Māori from living in cities (Hamer, 1995; see above). When I was in Aotearoa New Zealand I was always struck by how entrenched this discourse seemed to be, particularly, in the popular media. On my second trip in 2007 a story was dominating the news of a Māori family in Rotorua that had abused in horrible ways a young child who had subsequently died as a result of this abuse. What was remarkable was how this singular event seemed to so easily be extrapolated in the media to a discussion of the “urban Māori problem” (a phrase I heard often). Even more alarming to me was the way Māori I met seemed to respond to this event. I was with a Māori friend from Rotorua on one occasion when a Māori friend of his had just returned with his family from a trip overseas. My friend was the first to tell him and his family about this event and, being Rotorua Māori themselves, the pain and, more importantly, the shame that was felt when hearing this story was palpable. In this instance, and in general when I was around Māori discussing this event, there was a general sense of “here we go again, another negative story about Māori;” and the fact that this had occurred in an urban area was never far from the conversation.

80 This discourse was at its ugliest in an editorial in the Sunday Star Times (Michael Laws, August 12, 2007) titled “Meet Our Underclass.” Alongside this cover page was the picture of four of the family members alleged to be involved in the torture and murder of a small child. All four pictures were of Māori and the author of the editorial presented as truly “ugly” people demonstrating that “evolution is not necessarily progressive.” While the author never refers to these people as Māori, always assiduously referring to them as the “underclass”, he goes on to remark “if inbred Appalachian hillbillies were brown, then that is what they would look like” (referring to the photographs accompanying the editorial). Clearly he is talking about Māori and the urban context is a subtext that is never far from his commentary. A second article, this one in TIME magazine (Rory Callinan, July 16, 2007) and titled “Tribal Trouble”, looks at gang violence in Aotearoa New Zealand. This article, too, is centered on the urban context and the cover photo (the cover for the magazine) is of a Māori man with a face moku (tattoo). While both of these articles go on to make valid points, they nonetheless are excellent examples of how the negative “Māori urban problem” discourse is reproduced time and again in the media.
The reason I am bringing this up at the end of a chapter that has focused on the historical role of urbanization in the lives of Māori is to make the point that this negative discourse, while important to acknowledge and understand, is not a primary focus of this dissertation. And this in no way is a refutation of the fact that Māori are disproportionately represented at the bottom of many statistics that measure levels of overall wellbeing. Rather, the point here is that this negative discourse, because it so dominates popular consciousness in Aotearoa New Zealand, effectively masks the many positive aspects of Māori urbanisms that are a critical part of understanding the relationship between Māori and cities. Moreover, it seems important to begin to recognize and assert positive perspectives on Māori urbanisms as a way to more fully comprehend the full range of responses Māori have had to the urban experience.

3.7 Conclusion: Asserting Whakamanatanga-Based Māori Urbanisms

This chapter has explored the introduction of cities in Aotearoa New Zealand and the resulting relationship Māori developed with urban environments. This historical-geographical exploration brings this discussion of Māori urbanization up to the last half of the 20th century when generations of Māori were growing up in cities as their first experience rather than predominantly as migrants. And it is through these generations that Māori urbanisms begin to take shape.

These statistics, when coupled with attempts to define Māori urbanisms, begin to suggest how complex a discussion this really is. In the first place it is necessary to acknowledge that Māori reside in an urban hierarchy from small
town to massive global city, and as such the question of whether or not it is correct or logical to conflate these urban experiences into a single discussion of Māori urbanisms is merited. I would argue, based on my research and personal experiences while doing this research in Aotearoa New Zealand, that this type of conflation is highly problematic and would obscure more about the nature of Māori urbanisms than it would reveal. It can be legitimately argued, I believe, that the experience of growing up Māori in a city like Gisborne or Rotorua is meaningfully different from growing up Māori in Auckland. In fact, I would go even further and argue that the Auckland experience stands out as singular in terms of growing up Māori and urban in Aotearoa New Zealand.

Auckland far exceeds all other urban areas in Aotearoa New Zealand in all categories that define a place as urban. Its population of 1.4 million dwarfs the next largest city, Wellington with its 400 plus thousand people. In terms of areal extent Auckland covers an area that you could fit Aotearoa New Zealand’s other three largest cities within (Wellington, Christchurch and Dunedin). Its economic productivity far exceeds any other city on the North or South island, and it is by far the most culturally diverse city in Aotearoa New Zealand. This cultural diversity extends to both the presences of international migrants as well as to the diversity of Māori from Aotearoa New Zealand’s various iwi and hapū. Significantly, this last point marks Auckland as the epicenter of an urban-based Māori multi tribalism.

For the purposes of this research Māori living and working in Auckland represent the primary source for discussions of emerging Māori urbanisms. Māori urban experiences from other cities do come into the discussion occasionally, either anecdotally or comparatively. However, the focus here is
first and foremost establishing some theoretical foundations for an argument that asserts Māori urbanisms as a meaningful and important concept. In the next chapter this theoretical foundation will be more fully investigated. But the goal is to find within this discussion the basis for a whakamanatanga-based Māori urbanism. Once this has been done all of the pieces are in place for applying a space/place conceptual framework combined with whakamanatanga-based Māori urbanisms to an empirical investigation of Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga. First, however, the question of what it means to assert Māori urbanisms as a legitimate phenomenon must be addressed.
CHAPTER 4
TOWARDS A THEORY OF WHAKAMANATANGA-BASED
MĀORI URBANISMS

4. Māori Urban Geographies of Whakamanatanga in the Context of Māori Urbanisms

This chapter is dedicated to an exploration of what it means to argue from a Māori urbanisms perspective and, more specifically, from a whakamanatanga-based Māori urbanisms perspective. In the previous chapter processes of Māori urbanization from an historical and geographic perspective were discussed. This chapter picks up this discussion at the point when Māori begin to establish themselves in cities, (post-WWII) including generations of Māori born and raised into an urban way of life. To facilitate this discussion the definition of urbanisms is explored in-depth, as is a broader literature on indigenous urbanisms beyond just the Māori example of this process.

The discussion that follows is linked fundamentally to concepts developed in Chapters 1, 2 and 3. In Chapter 1 the notion of whakamanatanga was introduced as one way of understanding Māori notions of empowerment. In Chapter 2 a space/place conceptual framework was presented and, when coupled with Māori notions of whakamanatanga, led to the conceptual development of Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga. How these urban geographies came to be a part of Māori society was the subject of Chapter 3, and explorations of this process are continued in this chapter. In Chapter 3 the question of how cities based on a European model first came to Aotearoa New
Zealand, and how Māori responded to this new socio-spatial/platial system, was addressed. It was argued in Chapter 3 that cities were spaces/places that both challenged Māori and, simultaneously, offered opportunities culturally, politically and economically. From this emerging urban context, especially after the advent of large scale Māori urban-to-rural migration, distinct Māori urbanisms, or Māori urban ways of life, formed. These urbanisms are complex and diverse in character and represent a wide range of possible urban ways of life. However, as has been the case throughout this dissertation, the focus is on Māori urbanisms grounded in whakamanatanga rather than crisis or assimilation.

This chapter serves to begin the process of “coupling” whakamanatanga with the notion of Māori urbanisms. In doing so, an argument is made that one form of Māori urbanism involves the development of Māori living in an urban context, fully and productively engaged in an urban way of life, yet simultaneously profoundly Māori in identity. Although, as it is demonstrated in following chapters, despite the fact that Māori embodying this form of Māori urbanism are extremely diverse in background and occupation, it is argued here that they all share a basic sense of whakamanatanga that is linked to their urban experiences.

Throughout this chapter the space/place conceptual framework developed in Chapter 2 will inform my analysis of formations of Māori urbanisms. It was argued in Chapter 3 that the establishment of cities based on a European model represented one of the most profound insertions of a Western socio-geographic ideology into colonial Aotearoa New Zealand. The application of Lefebvrian theory to this process demonstrates the power of space/place in
the service of colonial domination. Simultaneously, the European colonial urbanization process is also about European urban space/place making, a process that involved notions of home, industry, and human-environment relationships. Wielding abstract space/place and ideologically-laden notions of space/place, European settlers in Aotearoa New Zealand effectively created cities that were increasingly alienating spaces/places for Māori and, as such, served to further processes of colonialism and the concomitant unequal power relations between Pākehā and Māori that were embedded in this process. Thus, it is important to keep in mind throughout this chapter that to understand the formation of Māori urbanisms it is critical to understand ways in which spaces/places were forged within a European model, and then look at ways in which Māori responded and, eventually, adjusted to this model.

The notion of ever-evolving Māori urbanisms is of preeminent concern in this chapter. This focus on emerging forms of Māori urbanisms, indeed the very notion of forms of Māori urbanisms, is one that has not directly been engaged by the existing academic literature. This is not to say that the issue of the relationship between Māori and cities has not been considered—it has and represents a growing literature. But it is my assertion here that by inserting the concept of Māori urbanisms into this debate a range of issues and perspectives are engaged that demand a very different “take” on what it means to be both Māori and urban in a contemporary Aotearoa New Zealand context. Furthermore, the insistence on an added “s” when discussing the application of the urbanism concept to Māori living in cities is strategic. By doing so an aggressive stance against a monolithic or universal definition of what it means to be both Māori and urban is maintained.
There are, in other words, many Māori urbanisms. At the same time, it is also argued that it is useful and instructive to develop general typologies of these urbanisms as a way to organize our understanding of what the city has meant to Māori. These typologies also allow this type of research to acknowledge that, despite the fact that every Māori can claim a certain unique relationship to the city, there are also important shared aspects of these experiences. This notion of shared experience is applicable across a wide range of social categories, with colonialism, gender, racism, and classism being of notable importance in shaping these experiences and, thereby, shaping the proposition of discernable Māori urbanisms.

Thus, in this chapter a framework is developed that allows for a more formalized discussion of different forms of Māori urbanisms. Stated briefly here this typology, based primarily on Tracy McIntosh’s (2005) typology of Māori identity (see below), is as follows: fixed Māori urbanisms, forced Māori urbanisms and fluid Māori urbanisms. Fixed Māori urbanisms are representative of those Māori, living a Māori urban way of life, but simultaneously still deeply connected to their traditional Māori whakapapa (genealogy) and tūrangawaewae (connection to a tribal territory); forced Māori urbanisms broadly attempt to characterize the significant percentage of Māori living a socio-economically impoverished urban way of life, with all of its attendant cultural, economic and political challenges; fluid Māori urbanisms is a category used to encompass a group of Māori living a diverse range of urban ways of life but, importantly, in ways that are infused with Māori values, worldviews and practices, but not always or necessarily based on traditional notions of what it means to be Māori. This typological framework is by no means perfect or finite. There are certainly
other ways to construct a typology of Māori urbanisms, but McIntosh’s arguments are compelling and the identity types she defines did come through strongly in my empirical research. By attaching McIntosh’s Māori identity types to notions of Māori urbanisms a useful and insightful typology of Māori urbanisms is developed in this chapter.

Given the multifaceted and complex nature of processes of Māori urbanization and the concomitant formation of Māori urbanisms, this chapter does not in any way claim to fully explore what it means to be Māori and urban in contemporary Aotearoa New Zealand. This chapter is an introduction to this topic, and one with a particular focus on, as with this research in general, ways in which Māori have made the city a positive place for themselves and, more importantly, have done so in such a way as to allow for the blossoming of their Māori identities (both individually and in a wider social context) as they engage urban spaces/places both socially and materially. Thus, this chapter steers a pathway through the myriad forms of Māori urbanisms to focus particularly on the confluence of space/place and whakamanatanga (empowerment). My goal is to achieve a better understanding of what it means to claim that Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga are one important form of Māori urbanism occurring in Aotearoa New Zealand.

The formation of Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga, however, has not been an easy one. The basic argument made to this point is that the initial development of cities in Aotearoa New Zealand was inherently a component of the colonial enterprise and as such these cities became sites of potential colonial domination. Cities have, throughout the colonial world, served as anchors and seed-banks of colonial power, as intensified expressions of
Western socio-spatial/platial activity, and as outposts of attempted military conquest (King, 1976; Alsayyad, 1992; also see Chapter 3). If the city has become a space/place of positive identity formation for Māori, through cultural, economic and political processes, then it has done so directly through the efforts of Māori to make this the case.

4.1 Theories of Urbanisms and the Māori Urban Experience

The question of what it means to assert Māori urban ways of life is evoked by the concept Māori urbanisms, and therefore it is useful to begin this chapter with a working definition of urbanism. Following Gottdeiner (1994: 102), urbanism is defined as a concept which “takes the city formation process as given and seeks instead to understand the ways of life that transpire within this container...Urbanism deals with culture, with meaning, symbols, patterns of daily life, adjustment processes to the environment of the city, but also with conflicts, with forms of political organization at the street, neighborhood, and city levels.” The study of urbanism, while both historical and comparative, is about understanding the relationship between cities and both individuals and socio-cultural groups, the impact that this relationship has on these individuals and groups, and the socio-cultural forms that emerge out of engagements with the spaces of the city (Gottdeiner, 1994). Thus, to speak of Māori urbanisms is to speak of the relationship between Māori and cities; it is to understand more clearly how Māori urbanization created a context within which Māori were able to develop new cultural forms, new symbols and forms of meaning, new patterns of everyday life; how this new environment created a context of adjustment that
led to possibilities of progress, conflict and crisis. In other words, and put as a question, how has the city created a context within which Māori have developed new ways of being Māori?

The argument being made in this chapter is that the city has created a context within which Māori have developed myriad new ways of being Māori, rather than just new ways of losing their “Māoriness” to forces of urbanization. This assertion is provocative because it is constructed in such a way as to connote a relationship between Māori and cities that is not narrowly defined by struggle, resistance, challenge, crises, or assimilation. Rather, this assertion is constructed in such a way as to suggest a broad range of possibilities for Māori developing urban ways of life that are as much or more dictated by Māori worldviews and cultural needs as by the demands that city’s put upon Māori. In other words, to invoke the term Māori urbanisms or Māori urban ways of life is to insist that Māori, from the moment European-modeled urban centers were imported to their shores, have been active members in the urbanization process, and as such had, and have, a critical role to play in the past, present and future development of these cities.

Given the intent of this discussion it is important that, as much as possible, sentences be constructed so as to not suggest a victimized or passive Māori urban population. To write, for example, “urban Māori,” as is the norm in the literature, is to suggest that the city is having a one-way impact upon Māori (i.e., they are passive victims to the processes and influences of urbanization). To write, on the other hand, Māori urbanization or Māori urbanisms, or even Māori urban ways of life is to open up the discussion to a myriad of possibilities regarding the relationship between Māori and cities in Aotearoa New Zealand.
ultimately, researchers are forced from this perspective to acknowledge and grapple with the possibility that Māori have had as much impact on Aotearoa New Zealand cities as these cities have had impact on Māori, and the nature of this impact is multifaceted and profoundly complex.

A deeper understanding of this perspective begins with a discussion of how Māori became a predominantly urban people (in terms of urban areas being the main space/place of residence for the majority of Aotearoa New Zealand Māori). The process and experience of rural-to-urban migration undertaken by Māori is certainly not unique. Arguably the phenomenon of rural-to-urban migration has been part of the human condition since cities were first developed 5,000 years ago. And certainly rural-to-urban migration, it can be argued, is one of the defining socio-demographic and socio-spatial processes of the industrializing world. The basic premise underlying the impact of this type of migration pattern is based on the idea that there is something different about life in cities, and that this difference challenges those that transition to an urban context to develop socio-geographic practices that are, importantly, distinctive from a non-urban context.

From a Lefebvrian perspective this argument makes sense because cities clearly represent radical shifts in the social production of space/place and, therefore, demand new ways of social being. Phil Hubbard (2006: 3-4) echoes this line of argument when he writes,

all too often the materiality of the city is overlooked in accounts that emphasise individual genius, collective endeavour or historical happenstance. In essence, the urbanity of urban life is effaced: cities are written of as spaces where innovation happens, for sure, but the city becomes backdrop rather than an active participant in the making of new cultures and economies. Again, to suggest the city plays an active role in innovation is not to imply it has a deterministic influence on the trajectory
of economy or society, but to argue we need to take the city more seriously if we are to articulate the importance of space in social, economic and political life.

Cities, then, must be taken seriously not just as radically different social entities, but also as radically different socio-geographic entities and phenomena. In other words, radically different constructions of space/place. Given this argument it follows that the transition from a non-urban way of life to an urban one poses certain adaptive challenges and opportunities to those doing the migrating.

The nature and impact of these adaptations has been a subject of Western scholarship for some time, and the development of these ideas has served as the foundation for theories of urbanism (Tonnies, 1887; Durkheim, 1893; Weber, 1922; Redfield, 1941; Simmel, 1950; Lewis, 1966; Lyon, 1987; Miles et al, 2000; Hubbard, 2006). When discussing the genesis of these ideas Hubbard (2006: 15) argues “the inevitable conflation of modernization, urbanization and industrialization served to establish some important ideas about urbanism as a way of life.” Inherent in this conflation was “the idea that cities were larger, more crowded and socially mixed than rural settlements, bequeathing them a social character which was less coherent and more individualized than that evident in the rural” (Hubbard, 2006: 15).

The basic framework for this debate was contrasting notions of the modern city as socially emancipatory spaces/places versus cities understood as “essentially cold, calculating and anonymous” environments (Hubbard, 2006: 15). Hubbard notes that this debate was being engaged as early as the nineteenth century with, for example, Frederick Toennies (1887) gemeinschaft versus gesellschaft thesis, one which viewed the city as having a negative impact on
traditional forms of community and sociality found in non-urban context. Around this same time Emile Durkheim (1893) argued in contrast that the urbanization process was one that created a context of social emancipation for newly urbanized people. Likewise, Max Weber (1922) introduced the notion of anonymity induced by city life but argued that this anonymity is liberating in that it created a context for individuals where they could escape the social constraints of traditional communities which often created restrictive social roles and identities.

Other twentieth century intellectuals such as George Simmel (1950) and Louis Wirth (1938) continued this debate as they wrote about the social psychological impact of life in cities. Hubbard (2006: 20) summarizes this debate as between “the idea that the anonymity of the city allows us to forge new identities unburdened by our histories and biographies...[which]...emphasises the liberatory potential of the city” versus the argument that “the flipside of this anonymity and freedom can be rampant insecurity and a profound sense of being alone even though we are surrounded by people.”

It is this idea of adaptations resulting in either positive or negative psychologies that linked discussion of rural-to-urban migration to the formations of urban ways of life (i.e., the development of distinctive urbanisms). However, certain issues embedded in the way this debate developed historically are worth noting. First, and very importantly, there are certainly limitations (following Hubbard, 2005) to the debate outlined above in terms of how the impact of urbanization on formerly rural people is conceptualized. In the first place, the dichotomy of positive versus negative impacts may be more problematic than revealing about the urban experience. The reality is that both positive and
negative outcomes of rural-to-urban migration are possible at any given time for any individual and/or group and, more importantly perhaps, is the possibility that both positive and negative aspects of this migration can occur in a single individual. In other words, the experience of transitioning from a rural to an urban context is incredibly complex and therefore a dualistic (e.g., positive/negative, liberating/constraining) framework does more damage than it does good in terms of comprehending this experience.

This is in no way intended to minimize the challenges city life poses for some individuals and groups (and certain possible negative outcomes or circumstances that may result from processes of urbanization), but rather to emphasize the idea that cities are created by people, and that even those that migrate to cities are part of this productive process, rather than just victims of the spaces/places that were created before they arrived. In this sense I follow Nigel Thrift (2003: 103) when he argues:

[w]hat is evident here is that while individuals seldom have much control over what goes on in cities, they creatively improvise to open up pockets of interaction in which they can assert and express themselves (no matter how fleetingly or inconsequentially).

An approach to urban studies that emphasizes ways in which individuals and groups creatively approach life in cities, and in doing so forge new forms of socio-geographic ways of being, is a critical component of a more dynamic and progressive urban geography. Equally important to this new urban geography, however, is an emphasis on the materiality of the city (Hubbard, 2006). According to Hubbard an emphasis on the material aspects of the urban “grants us purchase on what is truly urban about city life, and stakes out an agenda for
urban studies which takes the city seriously as an object of study” (Hubbard, 2006: 248).

The debates and models that came out of these 20th century urban theorists are useful mostly, I argue, in that they acknowledge that the transition to cities created a context for new socio-psychological formations induced by the relationship between individuals and groups and life amidst the spaces/places of the city. Through these adaptations to life in the city, in other words, new socio-cultural and socio-geographic forms are produced and it is through this process that urban ways of life or, forms of urbanism, are developed. An obvious example is the shift from typically culturally and ethnically homogeneous rural context to a more heterogeneous one in urban areas. If this shift results in individuals and social environments where this heterogeneity is negotiated, and if this leads to new forms of acceptance of cultural/ethnic difference than arguably a socio-cultural shift has occurred in the way groups and individuals perceive themselves vis-à-vis others (individuals and groups). This can occur at many scales, from the more local context of heterogeneous neighborhoods to civic leaders developing discourses of heterogeneity as a fundamental strategy of city marketing.

But this heterogeneous context takes shape in space/place as well through, for example, the formation of social spaces/places (cafes, pubs, clubs, sports leagues, public squares) that facilitate and reproduce this heterogeneous context. The point of this rather simplistic example is to suggest that the urban context does confront those migrating from non-urban areas with a complex set of differences (social, cultural, ethnic, political, economic, gender, built environment) and that these difference offer the possibility for new identity
formations and socio-spaces/places that facilitate, maintain and reproduce these changes.\textsuperscript{81}

This process is, no less evident as a result of Māori processes of urbanization as it is in any other case study of a historically and contextually specific people undergoing rural-to-urban migration. Any effort to develop a theory of Māori urbanisms, therefore, must take seriously both the notion that the city presented Māori with choices, opportunities and possibilities as well as the sense that the materiality of the city was (and remains) an essential component of this process. It is with this understanding in place that the question of what exactly is meant by the term Māori urbanisms can now be addressed.

\textbf{4.2 Towards a Theory of Emerging Māori Urbanisms}

The main question that emerges out of the above discussion is: \textit{how has the city created a context within which Māori have developed new ways of being Māori?} More specifically, in the context of this research, \textit{how has the city created a context within which Māori are living urban lives that are whakamanatanga-based rather than simply challenged or compromised by it?} And finally, \textit{how have Māori constructed spaces/places within an urban context that facilitate, maintain and reproduce a whakamanatanga-based Māori urban experience?}

\textsuperscript{81} See Hubbard, 2004 for a recent overview of ways in which geographers have approached these types of questions. See Allen, et al (1999) for a very accessible discussion of these ideas from a more direct “what is the city?” type of approach.
In this section, these questions are broadly addressed in terms of ways of constructing a contextually specific framework for understanding Māori urbanisms. This framework is organized as follows: the question of what evidence might suggest the existence of Māori urbanisms is first addressed. This is followed by a discussion of how Māori urbanisms are formed and how they can be understood from psychological/identity and organizational perspectives. I then turn to the question of what it means to think of Māori urbanisms within a space/place framework. In the final section a four-part typology of Māori urbanisms is proposed as one possible way to begin to organize and understand in a more systematic way what it means to claim the existence of Māori urbanisms.

Before getting into this framework, however, it is important to note briefly one study that comes close to asserting a distinctively Māori urban way of life. In a five volume set titled *Wellbeing and Disparity in Tāmaki-Makaurau* (Benton, et al, 2002: V) a group of researchers set out to answer one basic but critical question: “What factors contribute to cultural, social, economic and political wellbeing amongst Māori in larger urban areas, and how are these interrelated?” Inherent in this question is at least a tacit acknowledgment that for Māori there is something different about living in large cities, and that this needs to be addressed specifically as a component of understanding the broader context of life for Māori in Aotearoa New Zealand. I laud this study for its purposeful focus on wellbeing because of the positive connotations inherent in this term. In this sense, this study comes closer than any other I have seen to anchoring its perspective of the relationship between Māori and cities in whakamanatanga rather than socio-economic and cultural depravity and crisis.
This study is also important because of the way it allows Māori (specifically Māori living in Auckland) to tell their stories and define for themselves what it means to be Māori in the city, and how this is connected to living lives that have a high quality of wellbeing. In contrasting levels of perceived wellbeing with those of disparity and deprivation this study offers the most detailed examination of Māori urban ways of life. However, what this study does not do is acknowledge the importance of the materiality of the city when considering issues of wellbeing. In other words, while it is inferred that the city is important to this study, it nevertheless never treats the materiality of the city as a critical component of how Māori foster, maintain and reproduce wellbeing. This study also narrowly focuses on the whānau (extended family) in Auckland, and never explicitly extends its research out of the home to look at how Māori express and experience wellbeing in other spaces/places of the city (e.g., public spaces/places, commercial spaces/places and/or professional spaces/places).

Ultimately, this study concludes that the whānau remains the most important identity group for Māori living in cities, and that strengthening the whānau should be the main goal for those concerned with Māori urban wellbeing. More important to this research is their conclusion that (Benton, et al, 2002, V; Executive Summary),

[although there is great diversity among urban Māori (sic), there is a common miro or thread of ‘Māoriness’ which transcends social, economic and descent-related divisions.

I strongly concur with this conclusion and incorporate this perspective throughout the discussion of Māori urbanisms that follows. However, I also
argue that I am significantly contributing to and building upon this study by asserting an indigenized space/place conceptual framework into the discussion, as well as by looking at spaces/places of whakamanatanga-based urbanisms (or perhaps, alternatively, wellbeing based urbanisms) outside of the home and whānau context.

4.2.1 What evidence might suggest the existence of Māori urbanisms?

The question of evidence demonstrating the existence of Māori urbanisms is an important one. The first and most obvious evidence one can turn to is the very fact that significant percentages of Māori currently reside in Aotearoa New Zealand cities. The most recent statistics suggest that “Urban Māori”—defined by the New Zealand government as those Māori living in settlements of over 1,000 inhabitants—represent 81.5% of Aotearoa/New Zealand’s Māori population. However, since the Aotearoa New Zealand government sets a very low threshold for what is considered urban, in actuality the number of Māori living in the “main urban centers” is much lower (Statistics New Zealand, 2007). Māori living in cities of over 50,000 residents represent 55% of the Māori population, and for cities with over 100,000 residents the Māori percentage is 37.9% (Johnston, Poulson, & Forrest, 2003). Auckland by itself can claim approximately 24.3% of the North Island’s total Māori population, and the North Island population is over 80% of New Zealand’s Māori population (Statistics New Zealand, 2007). While on the one hand, these numbers are more modest than the often quoted 85% of all Māori live in urban areas, on the other, they still suggest that Māori are a predominantly urban people. However, demonstrating
Māori presence in urban areas and arguing that this has resulted in the formations of Māori urban ways of life are two different challenges.

To claim the existence of these urbanisms is easy, but to demonstrate their existence is quite another challenge. How can this be done? Having given this question quite a bit of thought throughout the course of this research I have come to the following tentative conclusions regarding an answer. I would argue that the presence of urbanisms (Māori or any other) can be demonstrated through an analysis of three factors: 1) a psychological/identity component whereby the researcher is able to demonstrate that the people living these urbanisms are aware of them and understand their relationship with the city as distinct and meaningful; 2) an organizational/group component whereby the researcher is able to demonstrate the existence of groups, institutions and organizations that have been created both as a result of these urbanisms and as means to foster and reproduce them; 3) a material component whereby the researcher is able to demonstrate, through analyses of the built environment and cultural landscape the existence of physical structures and urban environments that have been created both as a result of these urbanisms and as means to foster, maintain and reproduce them.

This interdependent confluence of psychological/identity, organizational/group and material factors involved in the genesis and reproduction of urbanisms can then be connected to the definition of urbanisms presented above (section 4.1). This definition emphasized the idea of urban ways of life that are understood through expressions of culture, systems of meaning and symbols, and practices of everyday life, all emerging as newly urbanized peoples adjust to life in cities. These urban ways of life also involve conflict and
the negotiation of power relationships at the street, neighborhood and city levels. Thus, the challenge of urbanisms focused studies, is to demonstrate how all the elements of this definition are manifested and actualized psychologically, organizationally and materially within a given urban context.

To do this is, of course, a massive undertaking given the scope of the urbanisms definition presented here. However, this task become more manageable when a particular urban group is focused upon, like Māori living in Aotearoa New Zealand cities, and if this is further narrowed down to look at just one aspect of this more specific phenomenon (e.g., whakamanatanga-based Māori urbanisms) as is being undertaken in this research it becomes more manageable still. Thus, to demonstrate the existence of Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga as one form of Māori urbanisms, is to demonstrate how a distinctly empowered Māori urban way of life has developed psychologically, organizationally and materially in Aotearoa New Zealand cities.

4.2.2 How are Māori urbanisms formed?

Whakamanatanga-based Māori urbanisms, like all forms of Māori urbanisms, formed as one possible response to the relationship Māori developed with cities. As was noted earlier in this chapter, the move to cities by non-urban peoples led to necessary adjustments socially, economically and culturally, as well as spatially/platially. The outcome of these adjustments is multifaceted with both positive and negative aspects of urban ways of life emerging. One way to approach this issue of how Māori responded to urbanization by creating distinctively Māori urban ways of life is to put it into a simple
challenges/opportunities framework. For example, under challenges faced by newly urbanized Māori (especially during those early days of large-scale rural-to-urban migration post WWII) I would suggest the following tentative list:

**Challenges:**

1. **Poor non-urban arrivals finding suitable housing** (more crowded built environment, poorer quality of housing, or housing less suited to whānau-based communal living)

2. **Adjusting to a new socio-economic and socio-spatial/platiation systems** (emphasis on the separation of work place from home place, exposure to landscapes of mass production, need to survive in an entirely cash-based economy that demands steady wages)

3. **Coming from a communal context into an individualistic, capitalistic context** (living in neighborhoods not dominated by the papakaainga (small rural village) context—i.e., not consisting primarily of whānau and hapū and associated sense of tūrangawaewae)

4. **More intense context of class difference** (living in neighborhoods with concentrations of poverty starkly contrasted with other areas of wealth; exposure to commercial landscapes of wealth; living in neighborhoods where Māori poverty is more starkly evident as contrasted with Pākehā wealth)

5. **Entering into another tribe’s tūrangawaewae** (loss of sense of having rights to land within place of primary residence)

6. **Entering into a multtribal context** (access to social spaces/places where tribal affiliation is not dominant factor leading to a sense—both real and imagined—of lost community)

7. **Entering into a culturally heterogeneous context** (varying dramatically depending on the city—an experience of culture shock and development of feelings of alienation and anomie)

8. **Being for the first time separated geographically from tribe and marae** (economic burden of having to travel back and forth from urban residence to tribal lands; loss of sense of community and loss of community-based social security, loss of easy access to ancestral marae and its socio-geographic function as a space/place of meeting, negotiation and/or farewelling of the dead)

9. **Entering into a Pākehā dominated space/place** (coming into contact with Pākehā socially produced space/place and the challenges this may entail, particularly in the context of the psychological dimensions of colonialism)

10. **More exposure to negative cultural forces of globalization** (e.g., consumerism/materialism—thereby potentially eroding traditional cultural knowledge and practices)

On the other hand, a list of opportunities may include the following:
Opportunities:
1. **New economic opportunities to earn steady wages** (For those that found employment, access to steady wages and the ability to build capital)
2. **Potential access to better education** (exposure to larger and better educational institutions)
3. **Potential access to better health care** (exposure and access to larger, more advanced healthcare facilities)
4. **Release from social constraints of small scale, culturally traditional communities** (e.g., gaining a sense that tūrangawaewae and whakapapa responsibilities are no longer as relevant thereby creating more social freedom)
5. **Potential access to better housing** (this one is debatable, and may have occurred over time rather than right away, although in some cases state housing built in the cities certainly was of better quality than rural housing)
6. **Exposure to heterogeneous society** (varying in degree depending on the city—gaining access to spaces/places of heterogeneity—e.g., CBD, public parks, cafes; positive exposure to different cultures and ways of life)
7. **Exposure to multtribal context** (varying in degree depending on the city—access to social spaces/places where tribal affiliation is not dominant factor; development of pan-tribal identities and associated organizations and/or political movements)
8. **Improved access to urban innovations and technologies** (allowing Māori as individuals and in groups to be more economically competitive both locally and globally)
9. **Improved access to positive forces of globalization** (e.g., improved awareness of and links to other indigenous groups with shared experiences/legacy of colonialism; access to global imports and exports)

Although I am in no way claiming that this set of lists are complete or entirely unproblematic, nevertheless I am arguing that this sort of challenges/opportunities approach is important because it suggests that the urban experience is one full of possibilities, rather than one that inevitably determines the urban ways of life that will form (e.g., that urbanization inevitably leads to loss of Māori culture). It also reinforces the need to speak of Māori urbanisms in the plural rather than singular because such a wide range of possibilities (challenges and opportunities) will inevitably lead to a broad range of Māori urban experiences and distinctive Māori urban ways of life.
The seeds of these experiences and ways of life are forged, I argue, predominantly by two factors, which I refer to as **demographic intensification** and **generational longue durée**.\(^8^2\) Demographic intensification is intended here to refer to the sheer number of Māori that ended up living in an urban context, and the impact this demographic gathering had on the formation of Māori urbanisms. As was noted earlier 80% of the Māori population lives on the North Island, and of this 80%, nearly a quarter live in Auckland. What I am arguing here is that when this type of demographic shift occurs, the process of being urban moves away from being solely an individual experience and begins to suggest shared experiences through, for example, the formation of Māori neighborhoods and social and political groups of Māori all simultaneously being urban on a day-to-day basis.

This assertion of simultaneity intertwined with a growing demographic intensification is a critical point. At the heart of what it means to claim Māori urbanisms is the idea of shared urban experiences that are, importantly, different from the experience of growing up and living in non-urban Māori areas. But demographic intensification also leads to a growing number of Māori with these shared experiences along with a greater potential for interactions during which

---

\(^8^2\) In using this term I am borrowing a concept from the French Annales School of History to designate their approach to the study of history. In this approach historical processes were considered over long periods with an eye to structural consistencies that could be identified and then linked to recurring patterns and cycles. My use is not intended to adhere strictly to the way this concept was defined by this school of thought, but rather to loosely imply that the formation of Māori urbanisms has occurred gradually over multiple generations and that this is linked to long term multi-generational presence in urban environments. It is also intended to imply that Māori urbanisms have come to be expressed through structures of urbanisms simultaneous to their expression in individual Māori who have developed a meaningful relationship with an urban way of life.
these Māori can build identities partly grounded in this sense of experience-based commonality. These shared differences may include, for example:

1) Family histories of urban migration

2) Shared experiences of adjustment to an urban industrial capitalist economic system that emphasizes individualism over communalism, especially as this is linked to functioning successfully in a cash economy, as well as the availability of a narrow range of industrial jobs—especially to the early post WWII urban manuhiris.

3) The shared experience of living around and working with Māori from multiple parts of Aotearoa New Zealand and therefore experiencing a truly multi tribal social context; one of the possible outcomes of this mixing was the formation of a greater pan-Māori political movement and identity formation.

4) The shared experience of a multi ethnic context through living around and interacting with people from non-Pākehā and non-Māori cultures

5) The shared experience of an urban educational system and legal system that was both more sophisticated and better resourced, as well as possibly more alienating.

The notion of shared experiences/memories is an important component of the psychological/identity component of urbanisms mentioned briefly above (and dealt with in more detail below). To suggest an urban way of life and to link this to a particular ethnic group must include a sense of shared understandings, and these shared understandings are deeply penetrated by experiences and memories of the transition from non-urban to urban environments. This penetration becomes increasingly profound, but arguably at the same time

83 I have mentioned the book Growing Up Māori (Ihimaera, 1998) previously in reference to Māori rural-to-urban migration (see chapter three) and once again here it is also relevant. The stories in this book consistently reference the rural-to-urban experience, and one cannot help but be immediately struck by the recurring theme of the profound impact that movement to the city had on individual Māori, either from their own experience or the experience of their parents or grandparents.

84 For example, many of the Māori I spoke with in Gisborne, a medium sized city on Aotearoa New Zealand’s east coast (North Island), had parents or grandparents that worked in Gisborne’s freezing works (freezing meats and preparing them for global export).
operates unselfconsciously as generations of Māori begin to be born and raised within an urban context.\(^85\)

These shared urban experiences and memories also lead, therefore, to what I refer to here as generational longue durée. What I mean to infer with this concept is the identity impact (at both the individual and group level) of life in urban areas over successive generations. The first generation that came to the city was the one that faced the greatest amount of socio-geographic adjustment, having known both a rural (or even small town or village) existence and then a transition to an intensely urban one. For these Māori an urban identity may have become an important component of how they viewed themselves, but most likely they were also able to access and relate to a non-urban identity. But after this first generation of Māori urban manuhiri a second generation is born in the city and then third, fourth, fifth and so on generations of Māori whose primary experience an urban one. It is these successive generations, I argue, that become the most creative producers of Māori urbanisms. In a sense these generations not only become increasingly “literate” in an urban way of life, they also importantly begin to produce new ways of being both Māori and urban—ways that were not yet, or at least not yet fully, conceived or lived by the Māori that first made the transition from a rural to an urban context.\(^86\)

---

\(^85\) Importantly, the point here is to argue that a critical part of what it means to be urban for Māori is the sharedness of the urban experience. However, this does not in any way discount or minimize the character of the experience itself, and in fact it is the combination of shared experience and the character of the experience, including critically the materiality of the experience, that holistically combines to inform a distinctively urban way of life.

\(^86\) It is important here, however, to emphasize that these are general patterns I am pointing out rather than hard and fast rules. Many Māori that I spoke with who would in general fall into the category of demographic longue durée spent time growing up traveling to rural marae to be among their iwi and hapū relatives. Others spent substantive time traveling outside of the city as adults, and others lived lives that incorporated both rural and urban residences.
An interesting and useful analogy that can help in understanding what I mean by “new ways of being both Māori and urban” comes from Steven Pinker’s (1994) writings about the evolution of language in humans. In making his arguments concerning language evolution Pinker spends some time discussing the formation of Creole languages. He demonstrates that this generally occurs when groups of people speaking distinct languages are brought together in a social context where communication is paramount but no formal language education is available. In these circumstances, if contact and engagement is intense and extended enough, a language emerges (is actively formed) that, while simplistic (grammatically and in terms of vocabulary), allows for basic communication and is made up of bits and pieces of all the different languages represented by the different groups. This process is, of course, interesting enough, but even more interesting is what happens in the next generation (the children of these initial Creole speakers). In this next generation the children not only quickly pick up the Creole created by their parents, but much more importantly they begin to turn it into a more grammatically sophisticated language (Pinker would say they do this instinctively).

So perhaps, based on this linguistic analogy, it is appropriate to argue that the initial Māori that came to cities were like the people involved in creating a Creole language. Thrown into a context where functioning and surviving was necessary despite the unfamiliarity of the urban context, they were able to take on aspects of urban life, to function and survive in an urban context, but were not yet totally literate in what it means to live and express a fully Māori urban way of life. But their children, those generations that grow up knowing the urban context as their primary socio-space/place existence, then begin to add
“grammatical” sophistication to their understanding and ability to live an urban way of life. Fully developed Māori urbanisms, then, begin to be formed as generations of Māori are born and raised into an urban context and become increasingly sophisticated (socially, culturally, economically, materially) at functioning within and interpreting the signs and symbols that are part of life in the city. It is also these generations that begin to manifest and actualize truly Maori forms of urbanisms through their increasingly “literate” urban sociality and materiality. Put into the framework of the urbanism definition proposed above, it is these generations of Māori that become productive psychologically, organizationally and materially of distinctive forms of Māori urbanisms.

4.2.3 Psychological/identity production of Māori urbanisms

So what does it mean to argue that Māori living in urban areas have developed a psychology/identity of Māori urbanisms? One way to approach this question is by linking it to discussions of the relationship between colonialism and identity. This is the case because forces of colonialism have influenced so much of the Māori experiences of the 19th and 20th centuries, and many of the perceived negative changes to Māori culture and society (e.g., loss of land, loss of language) are directly linked to the colonial legacy. Writing about the impact of colonialism on the identities of those being colonized, Patrick Hogan (2000: 9) argues:

> [f]or many people...[colonial contact]...renders traditional ideas uncertain and ends the easy performance of traditional practices. In doing this, it makes cultural identity a problem—an issue on which one almost necessarily takes a stand. While questions about one’s relation to tradition may arise at any time, in any context, they arise with unique force and scope as colonial contact intensifies, the degree of severance
And where, given this argument, does the most intense “region” of contact occur in a colonial context? I would argue that this occurs in the urban setting because it is in this environment where opportunities for contact between Māori and non-Māori increase significantly, where a capitalist economic system is most intensely present, and where the built environment is most radically different from a more traditional non-urban Māori material landscape. The result is that it is in cities where indigenous peoples like Māori are faced with the greatest challenges to maintaining a non-colonized sense of identity, both in terms of individual identity and in terms of perceptions of oneself as part of a group. Given this argument, then, the development of a psychology/identity of Māori urbanisms that is grounded in whakamanatanga is that much more remarkable when it occurs in an urban setting.

However, before turning to the issue of whakamanatanga-based Māori urban psychology/identities, it is necessary to address recent arguments concerning contemporary Māori identities. Two authors who have added considerably to an understanding of contemporary Māori identities are Belinda Borrell (2005) and Tracey McIntosh (2005). Borrell’s research focuses on the issue of identity amongst young urban Māori, with a particular emphasis on those that have little or no connection to what she refers to as “cultural markers.” These markers are those that suggest relative levels of “Māoriness” in individuals and are “based on the notion that a person may be considered more or less Maori not...
only as a result of their genealogy but also through their engagement and participation in a range of cultural activities that generally have their origin in pre-European tribal society” (2005: 194; e.g., language studies, participation in kapa haka, being actively involved with a marae). The problem with these markers, she argues, is that they do not take into account alternative ways that young Māori from, for example, economically disadvantaged areas of Māori urban concentration, construct their identities. These alternative forms of Māori identity, while not based on traditional Māori worldviews and practices, are, Borrell suggests, equally relevant to their lives and represent logical responses to the urban condition within which they are raised. She concludes (2005: 203-204),

[t]he opinion that urban Maori in general and urban young people in particular are somehow ‘lost’ as Māori and do not possess the connections to land and community that exist in the tribal heartlands simply denies the reality for many Māori as evidenced by this study. What is highlighted here are strong and meaningful associations to the local land, environment and community that engender the same feelings of security, belonging and connection that some may claim as the sole domain of Māori in tribal communities. Rather than defining urban Maori (sic) in terms of their deviance from the more conventional markers of Māori identity, affirmation and support of these very real connections can only contribute to more positive and embracing perspectives of what is a strong Māori identity.

Borrell’s research offers evidence of developing positive and culturally constructive Māori urban identities despite not being strongly connected to traditional Māori values, worldviews and/or practices, and this even in the

---

87 “Kapa haka” is a dance form unique to Māori culture; “marae”, as has been mentioned several times previously, are sacred spaces made up of buildings and open areas that are used for meetings, negotiations, funerals and other social activities. It is worth noting here that this use of cultural markers to determine levels of “Māoriness” comes from both non-Māori and Māori. My research and field experience certainly suggests that it is often Māori who apply these rigid standards of how ones “Māoriness” is defined and determined. While within a colonial framework Pākehā may have been strong purveyors of this type of attitude for much of their time in Aotearoa New Zealand, it often seemed to me that they are less likely to do this individually now than some Māori are.
context of urbanization and low socio-economic conditions. Importantly however, Borrell is not arguing for a dismissal of traditional views, rather she is urging those concerned about issues involving Māori urban identity to expand their view of what, among Māori living in an urban context, constitutes a positive identity. More importantly, in terms of discussions of Māori urbanisms, is the way Borrell’s research suggests forms of Māori urban identity formation that are profoundly linked to the differences created through the generational identity production of Māori living in an urban context. This is critical because her research inserts empirical evidence into discussions of Māori urbanisms and as such gives further weight to the argument that the urban context allowed Māori to forge new ways of understanding themselves as individuals and as part of groups and urban geographies.

Mcintosh (2005) builds on Borrell’s thesis through her proposition of a three-part typology of contemporary Māori identity formation: fixed, fluid and forced. Her typology is based first on the argument that all Māori identities are fundamentally marginalized as a result of the legacy of colonialism, but that how this marginalization is internalized and actualized in everyday life contrasts significantly. She describes these three types of Māori identity in the following manner (2005: 40):

[t]he robust traditional identity [fixed] is able to capture and politicize that marginality. In other words, it is able to draw on the marginal experience as a site of resistance and use that status to challenge the status quo and change that experience. The fluid identities also acknowledge a marginal status but seek to redefine it under their own terms. Their marginality allows them to attempt to position themselves socially in a place to grow a unique and authentic fusion identity. The third identity [forced] is characterized by a marked marginalization
where deprivation due to social, economic and political factors is entrenched and far-reaching.\textsuperscript{88}

As part of my discussion of a typology of Māori urbanisms (see below), McIntosh’s typology of Māori identity is critically important. While all three of these identity types can productively be linked to formations of distinctive Māori urbanisms, it is the forced and fluid that are the most clearly products of the Māori urban experience. This is the case because the urban experience has to some degree exacerbated, concentrated and/or created an environment that stimulated the formation of these identity types. This does not mean fixed, fluid and/or forced Māori identities do not have expression in a rural context (in fact the fixed is arguably more intensely concentrated in the rural context), but rather that the urban experience encompasses a socio-geographic context that has allowed for unique formations of these three types.

Forced identities, for example, have their most prominent expression in the formation of significant (geographically and demographically) pockets of Māori urban poor found in cities like Auckland. It is certainly the case that smaller pockets of these poor can be found in Aotearoa New Zealand’s medium and small towns as well as in rural areas, but what I am arguing here is that the intensity and perhaps even form of these is significantly different in larger cities like Auckland, and that these differences lead to uniquely urban expressions of forced identities. Typical of these forced identities are the negative socio-}

\textsuperscript{88} It must be noted here that McIntosh is very clear that she in no way intends to reify these categories thereby forcing all Māori to “fit” one of these three identities. She states early on that these categories are intended to help develop general principles and patterns of Māori identity, but that individuals not only can simultaneously exhibit combinations of these, but can also pass through life stages where one of these identities is dominant but then transition into a new stage where a different one is dominant.
economic statistics associated with urban Māori (Maaka, 1994; McIntosh, 2005; see Chapter 3), but also a higher degree of social distance from groups outside of their geographic context.

Although my research was not focused on Māori based in this forced identity context, I did on occasion come across Māori that, at least from my perspective, were at the time I met them, exemplar of this identity category. Meeting these Māori was important for this research because it gave me a point of contrast to those Māori living whakamanatanga-based Māori urbanisms. For example, one woman I met early on in my research was a prep-cook in a trendy café in Downtown Auckland. In conversations with her it was clear how difficult it was for her, both logistically and psychologically, to maintain steady employment in this inner city café. She had to take long bus rides from South Auckland, often at the crack of dawn, in order to get to her job on time (mirroring the migration of poor inner city residents in the United States to low paying service jobs out in the suburban malls). But seemingly more difficult than this was being employed amongst Pākehā and other non-Māori in an environment that was radically different (socially, culturally and economically) from what she was used to in South Auckland. From our conversations it was clear that she was aware of these difficulties (i.e., she was able to reflexively discuss this with me). Also remarkable was the awareness on the part of her co-workers about the difficulty of her situation. Few of these co-workers thought

---

89 I met this particular young Māori woman early on during my first pre-proposal field work in Aotearoa New Zealand. Unfortunately, at the time I was still getting my field work “legs” under me and did not have the wherewithal to either take notes on our conversations or, even better, record any of them. My recollection of our conversations is accurate only in terms of general content and meaning, but I am not able to resuscitate any direct quotes.
she would be able to last at this job and, as it turned out, they were correct. Examples of Māori linked to this forced identity context come up in the following empirical chapters as well, and they all point to the greater difficulty Māori coming out of the forced identity context face when trying to make the urban setting one that is whakamanatanga-based (greater than those coming from a fixed or fluid background).

The point here is to not only note the presence of forced identity Māori in areas outside of the socio-economically isolated urban zones like South Auckland (the area focus of Borrell’s and McIntosh’s research), but also to note the movement of some of these Māori into inner city Auckland (one of the main zones of my research) and the impact this movement had on them. Several of the Māori featured in interviews in later chapters came out of forced identity contexts, and yet were able to move into fluid identities through their activities and interactions in inner city Auckland. This, importantly, suggests that McIntosh’s three-part typology is at best a highly generalized guide to understanding contemporary Māori identities, and that there is the opportunity for movement from one identity category to another in an individual’s lifetime (or even simultaneous, overlapping identities). Some of the Māori I met that began in a forced identity context were able, through life experiences and circumstances, to develop life-styles and perspectives that represented the notion of whakamanatanga-based Māori urbanisms being proposed here. However, it is also clear based on my research that whakamanatanga-based Māori urbanisms are much more likely to emerge out of those Māori whose background (family, social, geographic, etc.) were more influenced by a fixed and/or fluid Māori identity context.
Fluid identities, perhaps even more so than forced identities, have a unique expression in the urban context and also form a critical component of Māori urbanisms. McIntosh (2005: 46) argues, “In the urban setting, it is a...[fluid]...Māori identity that embraces its geographical setting and in many cases privileges that setting over tribal settings.” Formed as a “response to the social/material world as well as an accommodation, manipulation and gentle rebuff of the traditional [Māori] identity,” she further argues, fluid identities play with cultural markers such as language, custom and place and reconfigures them in a way that gives both voice and currency to their social environment. Often this means the fusing of different ideas and practices from a diversity of cultural backgrounds to articulate a Māori identity that is strongly grounded in its particular social landscape.

On the one hand, McIntosh’s development of the fluid Māori identity category comes across as extremely dynamic and innovative. On the other, however, her descriptions of this type of Māori identity often seem to assume that fluid identities emerge out of conditions of not just psychological marginalization, but also socio-economic and political marginalization. In other words, there is a sense that fluid identities are a response to economic hardship and the psychological burden of being a member of an historically oppressed group (the legacy of colonialism being the main factor in both of these). She particularly associates fluid identities with the “relatively young” and argues that people who exhibit this type of identity characteristic are often viewed as “dysfunctional,” “lost,” “disaffiliated” and “confused” (McIntosh 2005: 46).

---

⁹⁰ It must be noted, however, that on the following page she also notes, “fluid identity is not just an urban phenomenon” (2005: 47).
While she does offer alternative ways to perceive those exhibiting these identities (alternative, for example, from those in the forced category), she does so still assuming that the underlying characteristics from which this type of identity is formed are marginalization and socio-economic deprivation.

It is this last aspect of her development of the fluid identities concept that I believe leaves room for important additions, and in explaining why this is so I am able to connect this to the idea of whakamanatanga-based Māori urbanisms. Many of the Māori I met, spoke at length with and/or formally interviewed fit McIntosh’s description of a fluid Māori identity, and yet many of these same individuals did not present themselves as dysfunctional, disaffiliated or confused, and many of them were certainly not young. Rather, many of the “fluid” Māori I interviewed and spoke with were highly functional both socially and professionally, often had high levels of affiliation with both family and professional organizations, and certainly did not come across as confused about their identities or activities. It is important to acknowledge this broader definition of fluid identities at this point because it suggests the possibility of developing understandings of Māori identity that add considerably to McIntosh’s three part typology. Most significantly for this research on whakamanatanga-based Māori urbanisms, it suggests the formation of Māori

91 The category of Māori identity is extremely important here because in chapters six, seven and eight a place known as Mana Moko-Te Karanga is featured as a primary example of fluid Māori identities occurring in inner city Auckland. It is argued that this place represents a primary example of the potential of individuals embodying this type of Māori identity to create spaces/places of whakamanatanga in the urban context.

92 In fact, after a long discussion with Dr. McIntosh concerning her research on Māori identity I asked her if she felt marginalized and her answer was an emphatic “No!” Suggesting that she is as good an example of a Māori whose identity is grounded in whakamanatanga as any I met.
identities that are not grounded in marginality, a core characteristic of whakamanatanga-based Māori urban identities.

Moreover, and very importantly, I would argue that many of the characteristics of Māori fluid identities are exhibited in individuals coming out of backgrounds that would be considered either fixed or forced identities as defined by McIntosh. There are, for example, Māori with deep knowledge and ties to their whakapapa and tūrangawaewae that are simultaneously redefining what it means to be Māori in an urban context and in so doing attempting “to position themselves socially in a place to grow a unique and authentic fusion identity” (McIntosh 2005: 40; some of these individuals are featured in the following four chapters). The same is true for some Māori coming out of a context of socio-economic marginalization that clearly fall into the “forced” category of Māori identity in terms of their upbringing, and yet have managed to forge identities much more in line with the fluid identities, as well as potentially moving towards knowledge of Māori culture that is more suggestive of those in the fixed category (some of these individuals are also featured in the following chapters). This flexibility of movement between McIntosh’s identity types suggests that Māori coming out of all three of these identity backgrounds have the potential to develop whakamanatanga-based Māori urbanisms.

What I am arguing here, in other words, is for the emergence of a fourth element—whakamanatanga-based Māori urban identities—that potentially informs individuals coming out of all three of McIntosh’s identity groups. This fourth type is characterized by Māori, whether fixed, fluid or forced, that all share the most progressive and culturally productive aspects of a fluid identity, but simultaneously are coming out of very different urban context both in terms
of their socio-economic backgrounds and their links to traditional Māori worldviews and value systems. It is, in other words, these types of Māori identities, connected to the influence of Māori living in an urban context, that form the basis for Māori urbanisms grounded in whakamanatanga. In line with my research I am proposing here that we add this fourth element of identity to McIntosh’s thesis and label it whakamanatanga-based Māori identities.

Whether originating out of a fixed, fluid or forced identity context, Māori living in urban areas that are constructing whakamanatanga-based identities share one critical characteristic: they have all moved beyond, or are in the process of moving beyond, identities grounded in marginalization. As a result these Māori are beginning to develop urban identities that are no longer consumed with resisting the psychological legacy of colonialism. Rather, these individuals are in the process of actively constructing identities—through their professions and everyday lives—that are socio-culturally productive rather than reactive. It was interactions with Māori that exhibited this type of whakamanatanga-based identity that forced me to re-evaluate some of the primary assumptions I brought into this research. The primary one being that the vast majority of Māori are still either mired in the negative influences of the legacy of colonialism or actively resisting this legacy. This perspective became increasingly untenable as I met Māori in inner city Auckland and elsewhere who no longer seemed to be handicapped by this legacy, and in fact had moved powerfully and profoundly beyond it. It forced me to not only reassess my assumptions but, more importantly, develop a new way of understanding how Māori were going about the business of reproducing their values and worldviews in a contemporary urban environment, and doing so in a manner
that suggested that there needed to be a way of recognizing a moment when a colonized people truly enter into a decolonized social and cultural context.

4.2.4 Organizational/group production of Māori urbanisms

This linkage between whakamanatanga-based Māori identities, regardless of whether fixed, fluid or forced, and whakamanatanga-based Māori urbanisms is finding expression beyond just individual identities. This linkage is also finding expression in the formation of Māori urban organizations and groups—another critical component of Māori urbanisms. When Māori first migrated in large numbers to cities they formed social organizations in the form of church groups, sport clubs, political and economic organizations, women’s groups and university Māori studies departments (Walker, 1979 & 1990). These groups and organizations played (and continue to play) a critical role in affording Māori living in urban areas a sense of community as well as a source of networking. While only some of these organizations were uniquely urban, they were nonetheless all an important part of how Māori adapted to life in cities.

Manuhuia Barcham (1998: 303) refers to these types of Māori organizations when he argues, “Maori have shifted in increasing numbers into the urban environment, and in doing so they have created new forms of social networks, and institutions in order to fulfill their new social needs.” Barcham further writes (1998: 307),

Maori have developed new forms of social institutions and forms of social interaction in response to exposure to a new foreign environment in which the effectiveness of former traditional structures was lessened. The development of these new forms of social structure does not necessarily need to mean that Maori have ‘given in’ to the West, instead it is a signal
that Maori are proactively responding to the forces of social change to which they as a group have been exposed.”

The development of social organizations in the urban context was a logical response by Māori to create an environment that better served their cultural, social and economic needs. Maaka (1994: 318) argues that the creation of Māori organizations with distinctively urban, non-tribal or pan-tribal identities suggest the need for “cultural practices that reflect the realities of a group’s new environment.” These organizations, however, should not be viewed as part of a process of assimilation but rather, following Jonathan Friedman (1996:132), “the assimilation and use of Western categories and processes by indigenous culture does not need to result in the alteration of indigenous society beyond recognition but instead should be viewed as a question of processes of active articulation that re-organise foreign cultural categories in terms of local logics.”

Although many types of Māori urban organizations have formed, one type in particular developed—Māori Urban Authorities (UMAs)—that are both uniquely urban in formation as well as in organizational identity and political agenda. UMAs serve as an excellent example of ways in which the process of Māori urbanization and formations of Māori urbanisms have resulted not only in unique urban identities, but also unique organizations. UMAs represent an important expression of Māori urbanisms in that they clearly would not exist if large-scale Māori rural-to-urban migration had not occurred, and as such they represent a profound expression at the organizational/group identity level of Māori urban identity and sociality.

UMAs are Māori organizations that were created as a direct response to the unique challenges brought on by the rapid urbanization of the Māori people
beginning in the 1950s. Prior to this period of urbanization the vast majority of Māori lived in rural areas on ancestral lands where they were linked to both the land and to the full hierarchy of ancestral lineages associated with that land (i.e., they could both whakapapa and claim tūrangawaewae). As has been noted previously, one of the more socio-culturally and socio-geographically challenging aspects of urbanization was the collection of large numbers of Māori in urban areas where they were psychologically and geographically separated from their ancestral lands. Not only did this seriously challenge the ability of these Māori to stay socially connected to their whānau, hapū and iwi, but it also (often for the first time) placed them into a multi-tribal context. Over generations some of these Māori, for various reasons, lost their connection to, and even knowledge of, their ancestry. Many of these Māori were also living in an urban context characterized by poverty and the higher rates of negative social conditions that often go hand-and-hand with this poverty. UMAs emerged as a response to these new multi-tribal and tribally disconnected circumstances. They took on the role of an iwi or hapū by organizing urban Māori socially and politically. They also often organized the building of urban marae as symbolic and functional cultural anchors for the building and maintaining of these communities (e.g., Maaka, 1994; Barcham, 1998; Meredith, 2000; Rosenblatt, 2002).

However, since their early inception, some UMAs have further developed into significant players in Aotearoa New Zealand’s cultural and resource politics, and have in at least one case gone so far as to make legal claims to having iwi status (WAI 414). More importantly, however, is the link between these types of organizations and the development of Māori urbanisms. UMAs developed as a
response to the new demands of an urban context for Māori, and then, once created, became significant players in the reproduction and even flowering of Māori urbanisms. They were, in other words, both products of these evolving urbanisms and subsequently significant reproductive agents of their on-going presence and development.

While UMAs are a primary example of how the urban context has created the potential for unique Māori urban social formations, numerous other Māori groups have developed that, if not entirely unique to the urban context, certainly have been influenced by this context. UMAs arose to meet the needs of Māori with little or no affiliation with traditional Māori organizations, and as a way to advocate for these Māori in their dealings with the Crown (New Zealand government; WAI 414). As a result of this genesis UMAs are more likely to cater to Māori coming out of a forced identity urban context. Other Māori organizations found in urban areas are made up of Māori from a more mixed variety of backgrounds (fixed, fluid and forced), while others are more associated with Māori that share genealogical ties and therefore come out of a more fixed identity background. In the following chapters Māori associated with several urban organizations are featured.

The main point here, in concluding this section on theorizing Māori urbanisms, is that Māori urbanisms are actualized through both individual and group identities and, as a result, exist in a complex diversity of forms and possible permutations. Many of the Māori I met during my fieldwork were living whakamanatanga-based urbanisms without associating with a Māori organization, while others were significantly involved with Māori organizations. In both cases these Māori were deeply implicated in, and actively productive of,
Māori urbanisms. Simultaneous to this socio-cultural production and active participation in Māori urbanisms, however, was a space/place context that played an ontological role in the production of these urbanisms. In the following section this aspect of Māori urbanisms is the main focus.

4.3 The critical role of space/place in the production of Māori urbanisms

To this point it has been demonstrated that Māori urbanisms are manifested both through a psychological/identity component at the level of the individual as well as through an organizational/group component. In this section, it is argued that Māori urbanisms have a third component made up of the material expressions of Māori urban ways of life. This third component represents the critical link between Māori urban sociality and Māori urban materiality, a link that serves as one of the main theoretical foundations for the empirical research undertaken for this dissertation (see Chapters 5 through 8). This section is one of the most important in this chapter because it points to the dynamic way in which Māori urbanisms are expressed materially. It is argued in this section that the material expressions of Māori urbanisms can be found not only in Māori urban built environments, but also in Māori urban sacred spaces, in Māori urban land ownership, and in Māori urban businesses. A critical assertion that comes out of this discussion, one that is reinforced empirically in the following chapters, is that the material expressions of the Māori urban experience play a fundamental role in fostering, maintaining and reproducing Māori urbanisms.
In developing a material geography of Māori urbanisms a handful of categories are immediately apparent. The most obvious of these is the development of Māori marae in urban areas (generally referred to in the literature as urban marae). It is these spaces/places of Māori urbanisms that are most often referenced in the literature, both because of the overt Māori cultural landscape embodied in the marae (visually evident to the most casual observer), and because of the intense symbolic and functional importance of marae to Māori culture. Less obvious material representations of Māori urbanisms are the on-going and growing reality of Māori hapū and iwi land ownership in Aotearoa New Zealand cities, the presence of Māori built environments (other than the marae) ranging from Māori kitsch in tourist and commercial landscapes to heavily symbolic Crown representations of Māori culture in the form of, for example, state buildings, to more seemingly “authentic” expressions of Māori culture and society through art, architecture and the design of buildings.93 Geographies of Māori urbanisms also exist in the form of the ever growing number of Māori owned and operated businesses in a range of creative fields that, although not always visually obvious, nevertheless represent a network of Māori living and working in an urban context and inserting Māori urban

93 The judgment of authenticity here is, for a diversity of reasons, not a simple one. It was quite common during my fieldwork to find that my own assumptions of authenticity—particularly a lack thereof—were not always accurate. I learned from these experiences to reserve my judgement and wait until I had the opportunity to speak with Māori about a specific Māori influenced built environment. What I found was a wide diversity of opinions among the Māori I spoke with about the relevance of and authenticity of Māori design in the landscape. However, in general I also found that one of the main considerations of authenticity was based on whether or not process of designing and producing urban built environments was “done right”. In other words, was the design/production process done in such a way as to respect Māori values, protocol and worldviews? If the answer to this question was “yes”, than the urban built environments were much more likely to be judged authentic was much more likely to be judged authentic. While this consideration was not a main focus of my research, it nonetheless is worth noting here.
perspectives and values into cities. Through these business activities Māori are creating spaces/places of Māori urban capitalism that contribute to the material expressions of Māori urbanisms. There are also, throughout most Aotearoa New Zealand cities, sacred and historic Māori landscapes that, while generally not products of urbanization, nevertheless become important components of Māori presence in cities. In the following chapters some of these geographies of Māori urbanisms will be given substance through the voices of Māori who are creating and living these urbanisms—with a particular focus on examples of whakamanatanga-based Māori urbanisms. Substance will also be given through some of my own interactions with, and observations of, Māori urban spaces/places. In the following sub-sections the purpose is to broadly describe and visually demonstrate some examples of these geographies as a precursor to the empirical data that follows in the next four chapters.

4.3.1 Urban marae

An obvious starting point for any discussion of the material expressions of Māori urbanisms is the Māori urban marae. Much has been written about the Māori marae both rural and urban. Here the focus is on marae located in urban...
areas and the role marae play in the formation, maintenance and reproduction of Māori urbanisms. To explain this role it is necessary to understand the profound place of the marae in Māori culture. The marae itself evolved out of notions of Polynesian sacred spaces and the Māori version is one manifestation of this broader Polynesian cultural landscape phenomenon. The most visible component of the contemporary Māori marae is a large and elaborately carved structure referred to as either the whare nui (big house), whare runanga (ancestral house) or whare whakairo (carved house). These structures have both sacred meaning and functional use for Māori. The entire structure itself is considered to metaphorically represent the body of an ancestor and the carvings both outside and inside the structure tell the story of an iwi, hapū or, in some cases, several of these at once. Everything about these structures is considered deeply spiritual and they are often referred to as the “heart” of a Māori community. Functionally these structures serve multiple purposes, with the three-day Māori funeral process (tangi hanga) being probably the most culturally profound (the dead are housed in the structure for three days before being buried). These structures are also used for meetings (hui), most significantly as ritualized spaces/places for important negotiations and the coming together of disparate groups. They can also be used as spaces/places for education and other assorted social gatherings and celebrations. In front of the whare nui is the marae atea, a traditionally open area with space to welcome guests onto the grounds of the work of a Māori carver and his thoughts and ideas about one particular marae he designed and built in Auckland. For an excellent starting point for understanding marae the following resources are helpful: Metge, 1967 & 1976; Salmond, 1990; Simmons, 1997; Rosenblatt, 2002 & 2003.

96 See Patricia Grace’s (1986) book Potiki for a stirring fictional account of the deeply emotional and spiritual relationship between a Māori community and its marae.
marae and areas for seating during meetings between hosts and guest. Other buildings generally found on a marae include one designed for feeding large numbers of people (\textit{te whare kai}), bathroom facilities, and sometimes a graveyard (more common on rural marae). Generally speaking, marae are enclosed by some sort of wall or fence, although generally this is much less substantial a boundary in a rural context than in the urban.

It is difficult to put into words the importance of the marae, both historically and in a contemporary context, to Māori society. They serve as an anchor for a Māori worldview deeply connected to ancestry and territory; they are, in other words, the material manifestation of these two components of Māori society and identity, and the space/place where these two cultural ideas are materially expressed and, importantly, reproduced. Marae have also served increasingly as anchors for a Māori renaissance during the second half of the 20th century and as such can be viewed as intensely culturally political Māori built environments (Rosenblatt, 2002 & 2003).

Given the significant role of the marae in Māori society it is no surprise that they became a critical built environment feature of Māori urbanization and urbanisms. In some cases cities in Aotearoa New Zealand developed where marae already existed and as a result these marae became urban by default.\footnote{See Stokes (1980) for a study of this type of marae.} A more common occurrence, however, was (and still remains) the development of marae in cities to serve the needs of manuhiri Māori who were now living in cities that were outside of their hapū or iwi territories. Often these rural-to-urban manuhiri Māori lived prohibitively far from their ancestral marae making
funeral services difficult and expensive and making it difficult for them to maintain connection to their marae through regular participation in marae functions (regular participation is considered essential to maintaining socio-cultural legitimacy among the group associated with a particular marae). In response to these challenges Māori began building marae in cities, in a wide range of variations, thereby effectively transferring a traditionally non-urban socio-sacred built environment into cities. A more recent phase of urban marae development has involved the building of marae on university campuses, many of which are found in urban areas.

Just as Māori had to adapt to the opportunities and challenges of urbanization, so too did marae, and this occurred in both form and type. For example, marae in cities often occupy smaller grounds than the typical non-urban marae and they generally have much more substantial walls surrounding them. The urban environment also provided the context for new types of marae in terms of their group representation. In particular, the multi-tribal or pan-tribal marae became a new type of marae in Māori society as a direct response to the needs of growing Māori urban communities made up of Māori from a wide range of hapū and iwi groups, some of who no longer had significant connections to their whakapapa (genealogy) or tūrangawaewae (right to occupy a particular territory and/or marae). These types of marae often became significant anchors for the development of Māori urban communities and were also often connected to Urban Māori Authorities (see section 4.2.4 above). Other types of marae found in urban areas are (following Metge, 1976 & Salmond, 1990):
1) **Tangata whenua marae**: these are marae established on ancestral land by a hapū or iwi that occupied the area before the city was built. As cities were created and expanded some of these marae were able to be maintained by the local Maori community and consequently still exist today. In other cases tangata whenua have built new marae in urban areas.

2) **Manuhiri tribal marae**: established and run by tribes whose territory does not extend to the city in which the marae resides. Urbanization for the first time divorced large numbers of Maori from their ancestral lands and their ancestral marae. As a response when a critical mass of a particular tribe migrated to a city an “expatriate” marae would, in some cases, be established. This type of marae is a uniquely urban incarnation.

3) **Church sponsored marae**: supported and used by the members of a particular church. These types of marae often have a more informal quality in terms of adhering to the strict built environment standards of a traditional marae. Church marae are also much more common in urban areas and were a response to the need for marae by communities that had, due to rural-to-urban migration, found themselves without easy access to marae.

4) **The local-community marae**: these are marae open to all Maoris living in one town or one sector of a city regardless of tribal or church affiliation. This type of marae marks a unique response to Maori urbanization. In general, traditional marae are affiliated with one tangata whenua. The unique circumstances brought on by urbanization in some cases demanded a new form of marae that was affiliated with a coalition of iwi. Similarly, the association of a marae with a part of a city can be seen as a new form of urban Maori cultural identity that focuses more on the local community than it does on tribal affiliation. Some marae in this category, for example Hoani Waititi marae in West Auckland (see Rosenblatt, 2003), have become very prominent both politically and socio-culturally.

5) **Combination marae**: marae which are “open” to the whole community but have a particular association with one or more tribes. Again, as with the local community marae, this opening up of the marae can arguably be interpreted as a response to the new demands placed on Maori culture in the urban sphere.\(^98\)

---

\(^98\) Joan Metge (1967) was the first to propose this typology of urban marae, Salmond then added to it at a later date.
The University marae needs to be added to this list as a type that has become quite prominent since the 1970s. It seems to be established at this point that any university of any importance currently has, or is planning to build, a marae. These university marae serve as important (both symbolically and functionally) spaces/places that demonstrate a commitment to the university’s Māori community, as well as the university’s commitment to the principles of biculturalism adopted by the New Zealand government.

The point here is, however, not to engage an in-depth description of any particular marae found in an urban area. Daniel Rosenblatt (2004) has, for example, already achieved this goal in his seminal Ph.D. dissertation focusing on Hoani Waititi marae in West Auckland. The key here is, instead, to emphasize in more general terms the important role of the marae in the formation and reproduction of Māori urbanisms. Urban marae are profound because they represent a totally Māori cultural space/place, even when surrounded by the most intensely urban environment one can imagine. Moreover, marae are uniquely inviolate built environments; unassailable by the forces of capital (no contemporary developer or politician would dare try to forcefully remove one regardless of surrounding land value) and unassailable by the forces of non-Māori socially produced space/place (no urban planner could, for example, wield Lefebvrian abstract space in a manner that would compromise an existing marae).99

99 I searched long and hard for an appropriate word to describe the way marae seem to exist in a space/place that is invulnerable to, for example, forces of urban capitalist development. The word “inviolate” finally came to me via my iMac computer’s screen saver. The definition given in this screen saver is “free or safe from injury or violation” and I think this neatly summarizes what I am arguing about marae. It is worth noting that this has not always been the case, and
The permanence of marae and their role as inviolate spaces/places mark them as powerful geographies of Māori urbanisms and Māori urban identity, as well as anchors for the development of Māori organizations and communities.\(^{100}\)

Speaking to this function at Hoani Waititi marae in West Auckland, Paul Tapsell writes (2002: 157; original emphasis):

> since [Hoani Waititi marae’s] dramatic opening, the Sharples nontribal response to the Crown’s historical imposition of land alienation and consequent urban relocation has undoubtedly assisted many Maori in bridging their traditional sense of community with the everyday metropolitan reality of individualism. Waititi [the marae] not only fulfills the educational aspirations of its leaders, but it has also successfully focused an urban Maori cultural revival in West Auckland at a time when Ngati Whatua, because of Crown intervention, were unable to extend hospitality to the thousands of incoming tribal manuhiri settling on their lands. Over the past two decades, Waititi has made a positive contribution to eviscerated tribal manuhiri by providing them with an in lieu Maori identity built primarily on a sense of community.

Tapsell’s description of the impact of Hoani Waititi marae brings together the three components of Māori urbanisms asserted in this chapter: psychological/identity, organizational/group, and material spaces/places. And it is critical here to acknowledge the interdependent relationship between these three in terms of their combined role in forging productive whakamanatanga-based Māori urbanisms.

It should also be noted that not all Māori urban individuals and/or communities are anchored by a marae, and that in some research this disconnect between some Māori and marae in urban areas has served to alienate these Māori from being involved in more traditional forms of Māori community building.

---

\(^{100}\) I have to point out, however, that in my experience non-Māori often seem to value marae in extremely profound ways as well.
This being noted, however, the urban marae is still unquestionably an important socio-material response to Māori urbanization and has, as a result, become a space/place that serves to foster, maintain and reproduce Māori urbanisms in Aotearoa New Zealand cities. Moreover, in most cases that I came across (see Chapter 5 for empirical examples) Māori marae represent unequivocally a concrete manifestation of Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga both because of their inviolate presence, and because of the empowered sense of identity many urban Māori draw from the marae they are involved with. Without exception the Māori and non-Māori I spoke with, when asked to give examples of a Māori urban built environment, would first and foremost suggest the Māori marae.

### 4.3.2 Māori land ownership in the city

One of the more exciting aspects of Māori urbanisms is the growing success Māori are having reclaiming land in Aotearoa New Zealand’s urban areas. This process of Māori urban land reclamation is happening in cities such as Christchurch, Wellington, Hamilton, Gisborne and Auckland. At this point the main potential of these land reclamations seems to be as a source for revenue generation, the money going into the coffers of whichever iwi or hapū is involved in the land reclamation process. More importantly, however, is the undeniable materiality of this process. Māori are not only through this land

---

101 In van Meijl’s article this ends up coming across as a clash between Māori with fixed identities attempting and failing to culturally engage Māori with forced identities.

102 More abstractly, many Māori I spoke with seemed to value the presence of marae whether or not they were associated with a particular one.
ownership gaining access to economic power in cities, but also reestablishing control of land, buildings, ports and even in one case a mall (in Hamilton), and this leads to at least the potential for a re-imagination of urban space/place, one that embodies a Māori sense of urban space/place. It was clear from my discussions with Māori involved with urban land reclamation that Māori considered this process important, although simultaneously there was often a sense that what to do with this land other than garner rent from it was still a very open question. More importantly, from a Māori urbanisms perspective, the process of imagining how these Māori owned urban lands could be transformed into truly Māori expressions of urban space/place seemed as yet not to be seriously considered. However, my conversations with Dr. Merata Kawharu (see Chapter 5) suggest that this potential is at least being recognized and imagined and may come to material fruition in the future. Regardless, the ownership of significant urban tracts of land can only serve to strengthen and, perhaps, even redefine Māori urbanisms.103

4.3.3 Māori urban built environments

The most overtly Māori urban built environment is, of course, the Māori marae (see above). There are, however, many forms of Māori urban built environments that, while less obvious or staunchly traditional as urban marae are, nevertheless, symbolically and functionally significant. These Māori built

103 The information on Māori land ownership in urban areas discussed in this section comes mostly from my conversations with Māori while in Aotearoa New Zealand. I have yet to find an academic article or book that deals definitively with this issue. However, in every city I spent substantive time—Gisborne, Hamilton, Rotorua, Wellington and Auckland—this issue of Māori urban land ownership came up.
environments can be seen in tourist landscapes that incorporate Māori cultural symbols in kitsch and popular forms of cultural commodification as well as in building and art elements found throughout Aotearoa New Zealand cities that attempt to incorporate Māori culture into the urban built environment.

The important question when considering these built environments is whether or not they play a significant role in the fostering, maintaining and reproducing of Māori urbanisms. More specifically for this research the question must focus on whether or not these Māori urban built environments foster a whakamanatanga-based Māori urban identity. Certainly, with the urban marae the evidence is quite strong that in fact this is the case (Metge, 1976; Salmond, 1990; Rosenblatt, 2002 & 2003). But does Māori art or a Māori bilingual landscape (e.g., road signs in both English and Māori) also do this? These questions are addressed more fully in the following empirical chapters, but I think it can at least be suggested here that there is the potential for the answer to this question to be in the affirmative. Conversely, does the commodification and cultural appropriation of Māori cultural landscapes and built environments undermine this sense of empowerment? While these questions were not central to my research, they did come up in ways that suggested they were a significant component impacting the experience of Māori in cities.

104 For example, one of the Māori I interviewed, a young woman associated with an organization featured in chapters six through eight, stated that bilingual signage would be a significant feature in the creation of a positive Māori urban environment.

105 Sometimes answers to these questions came up in surprising ways and suggested that these answers are quite complex. For example, I came across a carved waka (Māori canoe) that was in the lobby of Sky City, a tall viewing tower, hotel and casino complex that dominates Auckland’s downtown skyline. When I saw this waka I interpreted it as an obvious exploitation and appropriation of Māori culture. However, when I later interviewed a Māori carver I found out that he was the artist that produced this waka and considered it anything but
For example, during my interviews with two architects and with an artist involved in urban projects the issue of Māori urban built environments came up. Each of these individuals expressed ideas and opinions that reinforced the notion that a Māori urban built environment had the potential to impact Aotearoa New Zealand cities in profound and positive ways. In the case of the architects this impact began the moment a design process was undertaken and had as much or more to do with the socio-cultural process of designing and creating the built environment as it did the impact of the final product. The artist I interviewed was involved in the redesign of a major plaza in downtown Auckland. He expressed great frustration with this process because he recognized early on that the main designers wanted Māori artists to create a façade that was superficial; it did not, in other words, honor Māori values and worldviews (particularly through the design process), but rather appropriated Māori symbols to legitimize urban space/place in the service of state controlled urban planning. Both of these examples demonstrate that, on the one hand, Māori involved with designing urban space/place are keenly aware of the inherent cultural politics involved with this process. On the other hand, they also believed passionately that there was the potential for Māori design and art to profoundly and positively impact the way Aotearoa New Zealand cities were imagined and, potentially, produced.

Ultimately, the main point here is two-fold. First, that my discussions with Māori suggests that they acknowledge both intellectually and emotionally the idea of a Māori urban built environment. Second, that how this built
environment is conceived and produced plays a major role in whether or not these expressions of Māori urban space/place result in appropriative urban landscapes, or alternatively landscapes that represent Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga.

4.3.4 Māori urban businesses

Equally important to the notion of Māori urban built environments is that of Māori-owned urban businesses. Although less obviously an expression of the materiality of Māori urbanisms, these businesses are in fact as much about the occupation of urban space/place as they are about socio-economic activity. Throughout cities like Auckland Māori are developing businesses that not only function successfully within an urban capitalist environment, but simultaneously do so in a way that asserts/inserts Māori perspectives into this process. But these businesses do more than just assert/insert Māori perspectives, they also “carve” out spaces/places in cities that are infused with Māori values and worldviews. One of these businesses is featured in Chapter 5 (*designTRIBE*), and one (Kfm) is the topic of an in-depth socio-space/place analysis in Chapters 6, 7 and 8. These featured businesses are examples of a broader phenomenon that I am arguing is occurring in cities like Auckland. This phenomenon is, on the one hand, extremely important to the development of whakamanatanga-based Māori urbanisms because it suggest both progressive economic and cultural productivity by Māori within the urban context. Psychologically, organizationally and materially these businesses reinforce and reproduce a sense of urban belonging. They are also productive of a Māori modernity that serves
as a counter to the dominant discourse and material landscapes of urban industrial modernity.\textsuperscript{106}

On the other hand, this phenomenon is often the least visually evident in that most of these businesses occupy locations and create spaces/places, at least from a street perspective, that are not particularly Māori looking (i.e., they are less likely to have obvious symbolic markers of their “Māoriness”). In some cases, when entering into these businesses, the Māoriness becomes much more apparent due to the presence of Māori and the way the interiors are designed, while in other cases one will find a space/place that is difficult to differentiate from a more Western or Pākehā use of space/place. But in either case Māori economic landscapes are literally being inscribed into urban environments in ways that suggest they are an important component of Māori urbanisms, as the Māori establishing and working in these businesses are actively producing these urbanisms.

I came across examples of Māori owned urban businesses on many occasions, both through discussions with Māori and by experiencing these businesses first hand. One woman I interviewed, a film producer and director, told me that there are a growing number of Māori owned and operated businesses involved in the film industry in Auckland. She noted that as a professional Māori involved in the film industry she had a very different experience of her work when associating with these businesses. She noted a feeling of greater comfort and satisfaction and ultimately preferred these types of establishments when producing her films. The architects mentioned above were

\textsuperscript{106} See Friedman (1996) and Dirlik (2001) for discussions of indigenous modernities.
partners in an architecture firm, designTRIBE, which is dedicated to the production of Māori design and to the proliferation of artists and designers trained in Māori design protocol. A business on Karangahape Road near downtown Auckland, Aotearoa House, is owned and operated by a Māori couple and sells products produced by Māori and other indigenous peoples. This couple owns several of these stores and, as I was told by people that know them well, believe that capitalism and the ownership of businesses is one of the main routes for Māori to improve their situation in Aotearoa New Zealand. That these types of businesses are growing in number and in variation in cities like Auckland was a theme that was reinforced during my discussions with many Māori. This theme also was evident through my viewing of Māori TV (another owned and operated Māori business, one with considerable and growing power), and readings of Māori oriented magazines.107

The main point here, in concluding this section, is that the presence of Māori owned and operated businesses in cities like Auckland is an important component of what it means to argue from a Māori urbanisms perspective. These businesses not only give economic strength to Māori living in cities but also create spaces/places where, much like the urban marae, Māori have a stronger sense of their Māori identity and a stronger feeling of belonging and comfort. As a result the presence of these businesses further fosters, maintains and reproduces whakamanatanga-base Māori urbanisms. This last point can be

107 While in Aotearoa New Zealand in ’08 I watched the Mana Māori Business Awards on Māori TV and most of the people garnering awards were from cities. I came across an article while reading a local magazine about three Māori brothers in Aotearoa New Zealand who had established their own business. Each was trained in a different area of business—one in marketing, one in design and the other in computers—and they had used these different strengths to build a successful business (sadly, I have not been able to recover this source).
extended to all the examples in this section. Whether discussing marae, Māori land ownership or Māori businesses the outcome is a continued and growing presence of Māori in urban areas that goes beyond just their corporeal presence. These examples have all highlighted the fact that Māori are doing more than just populating urban areas, they are literally carving their presence into urban space/place and in doing so creating Māori urbanisms that go beyond the social, cultural and economic through the production of Māori urban materialities.

4.4 A Tentative Typology of Māori Urbanisms

So far in this chapter it has been shown that a Māori urbanisms perspective incorporates psychological/identity, organizational/group and material space/place components all interdependently interacting and manifesting in Aotearoa New Zealand’s urban environments. Based on the discussion to this point it is now possible to propose a typology of Māori urbanisms, one which attempts to grasp some of the dominant themes that run through the interviews and case studies that are the subject of the following chapters. The typological categories proposed here—fixed Māori urbanisms, forced Māori urbanisms and fluid Māori urbanisms—are closely aligned with Tracey McIntosh’s typology of Māori identities (see section 4.2.3 above). In this section I further propose a fourth typological category—whakamanatanga-based Māori urbanisms—that has the potential to emerge out of all three other types of Māori urbanisms being proposed and links critically to the notion of Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga.
The typology being offered here is not definitive, but rather one way to approach a typological construction of Māori urbanisms based on the empirical data I collected and the experiences I had while in Aotearoa New Zealand. My goal in proposing this typology is to give some structure to the empirical analyses that is the subject of the following chapters, and to inspire other researchers interested in this subject to add to this typology or propose alternative ones. Having said this, however, I begin by criticizing the very act of typology formation.

The problem with a typology of Māori urbanisms like the one being proposed here, and it is a problem I would argue that is inherent in all typologies, is that it does not acknowledge the level of complexity embedded in issues of identity (within an urban context or elsewhere). Many Māori I met, quite frankly, did not fit neatly into any of the categories I am proposing. One issue that came up repeatedly, for example, was the fact that many Māori are of both mixed heritage and mixed tribal background—i.e., both their ethnicity and Māori whakapapa (genealogy) are mixed. These mixtures created much more nuanced, and sometimes conflicting, identity issues then can be captured in a simple three-part typology of Māori urbanisms. In this respect constructing a typology of Māori urbanisms runs the risk of implying incorrectly that Māori urban identities are straightforward and unproblematic when this is not always the case (maybe even rarely the case). At the same time, however, the typological categories I am proposing did come through as relevant in my interviews (see Chapter 5 through 8). Some of the Māori I spoke with and/or interviewed expressed urban identities that were profoundly intertwined with their tangata whenua identities, while others demonstrated characteristics that
were clearly indicative of forced or fluid urbanisms. The point here is that, on the one hand, a tripartite typology of Māori urbanisms does not easily reflect the complexity of what it means to be a Māori living an urban way of life; and yet, on the other, my research suggests that there are many Māori that would at least to a certain extent relate to these categories.

This seeming contradiction is better understood when one considers that in reality Māori identities are often dynamic and layered; they can be simultaneously urban and rural, Māori and non-Māori, and they can emphasize different aspects of a complex layered identity within different situations and/or life periods. This is one of the reasons the plural “urbanisms” is maintained in these typological categories in order to imply that even at this level of categorization there is great variability in how these urbanisms are expressed by individuals and groups.

My critical fourth category—whakamanatanga-based Māori urbanism—becomes important here both because it reinforces this notion of variability (it can emerge out of any of the three), but also because it points to a possible convergence among Māori (living a broad range of urban lifestyles) whose Māori urban identities are characterized by moving beyond resistance, and by progressive forms of socio-cultural productivity in the urban context. It is critical to note at the onset of this section, however, that these progressive forms of Māori urbanisms seemed, based on my research, much more likely to emerge out of the fixed and fluid Māori identity types. Yet, my research also suggested that it is certainly possible for Māori coming out of a forced identity context to develop whakamanatanga-based Māori urbanisms. While perhaps less likely, it is still possible. In the following sub-sections fixed, forced, fluid and
whakamanatanga-based Māori urbanisms are discussed. Despite the important criticism of constructing typological frameworks noted above, I believe them to nonetheless be useful as a starting point for developing a deeper understanding of the historic and ongoing relationship between Māori and cities in Aotearoa New Zealand.

4.4.1 Fixed Māori urbanisms

Fixed Māori urbanisms encompass those Māori living in cities that have maintained strong ties to their Māori whakapapa (genealogy) and tūrangawaewae (cultural “right” to a particular territory). In some cases these Māori reside in cities whose urban boundaries overlap or are fully within their hapū or iwi boundaries. In others they are represented by Māori who reside in cities outside of these boundaries, but have maintained their hapū and/or iwi connections despite the challenges of geographic distance. In this sense, then, it is useful to distinguish between tangata whenua fixed Māori urbanisms and manuhiri fixed Māori urbanisms.\(^\text{108}\)

All cities incorporate tangata whenua fixed Māori urbanisms because no city occupies land in Aotearoa New Zealand that is not claimed by one or more Māori hapū and iwi. Some cities have multiple hapū/iwi territories within their

---

\(^{108}\) The English translation of manuhiri is “visitor” or “guest”. When speaking to staunch tangata whenua in particular, this term was used to refer to non-tangata whenua Māori residing within their tūrangawaewae (territory they can legitimately claim as having a right to occupy based on their connection to a hapū and/or iwi). I have chosen to use manuhiri here because the overriding characteristic of individuals fitting this sub-category of fixed Māori urbanisms is a strong knowledge of, and connection to, traditional Māori culture despite the reality of residing in cities outside of their tūrangawaewae. Because of this knowledge/connection these Māori, based on my experience, tend to acknowledge their status as manuhiri when outside their tūrangawaewae.
boundaries while others may have only one. The reason tangata whenua merit being designated a distinct sub-type of fixed Māori urbanisms is based on the unique relationship and responsibilities Māori claiming mana whenua (right to claim tūrangawaewae) have both socially and territorially with the urban environments they reside within.

Tangata whenua refers to the Māori that can, through ancestry, claim a particular piece of land as legitimately their rightful place to occupy and care for. These Māori, and the organizations that represent them, can claim mana whenua, which roughly translates to spiritual and/or cultural mana (power) over a designated territory. Importantly this mana is reciprocal in the sense that it involves responsibilities as hosts as much as it does tangata whenua rights. Hapū/iwi that can legitimately claim mana whenua are generally recognized by other Māori groups and by state governments (with some exceptions) at all levels. At the urban scale, these groups and government organizations/agencies will generally make an effort to include tangata whenua hapū/iwi in important ceremonies and urban land decisions.

The host/guest relationship inherent in tangata whenua status is, of course, made more complex in the context of urbanization. Cities introduce

---

109 This is not to imply that there aren’t conflicts and disputes between Māori and non-Māori as well as between different Māori groups concerning these boundaries and rights. In some parts of Aotearoa New Zealand hapū and iwi boundaries are quite clear, but in others there are disagreements that are either under negotiation or a source of on-going tension.

110 Much of my knowledge about the relationship between tangata whenua and city governments comes from my discussions with Dr. Merata Kawharu (a featured Māori in the following chapter). Dr. Kawharu has done extensive research on this topic and is deeply involved in negotiations between her iwi (Ngāti Whātua o Ōrākei) and the Auckland and state government. The extent to which state and/or city governments fully include tangata whenua in urban governance as is intended under official bicultural protocol is certainly open to debate, as is the question of whether or not tangata whenua are equal power sharers in the urban process. My research suggests that it varies considerably from city to city, although I also suspect that all tangata whenua with urban areas within their territories are working to make this power sharing more equal.
physical spaces/places that are much more easily entered into by non-tangata whenua (Māori and non-Māori alike) then may be the case with smaller more homogeneous communities in more isolated rural areas. Moreover, the bigger the city the more intensely permeable these environments become. In a traditional Māori context traveling from one tribal area to another generally involved invitations and other protocol (unless, obviously, the purpose of the traveling was conflict). The development of cities created a network of spaces/places that allowed Māori a greater, and culturally easier, mobility around Aotearoa New Zealand than they had prior to the creation of urban centers. Thus, the traditional host/guest protocols are more difficult to maintain or even to recognize in the large cities due to their permeability and due to the overlap of non-Māori laws allowing Aotearoa New Zealand citizens to reside wherever they desire.

Another challenging aspect of cities for tangata whenua is the shear presence of so much concrete and steel literally covering many of their sacred landscapes. Cities represent hyper modifications of the original landscape, a landscape that the tangata whenua’s oral histories detailed intimately. In many cases whole topographies have been radically changed due to the development of cities and certainly the basic ecosystem is significantly, if not entirely, transformed. Thus, individuals and groups who are simultaneously intensely connected to the urban landscape, yet also deeply challenged by the impact of

\[\text{\textsuperscript{111}}\] I came upon this idea through conversations I had with Māori both in formal interviews and informally. I would ask Māori if they would feel more comfortable traveling from (for example) Auckland to Wellington without any sort of invitation from the tangata whenua of the destination city than they would traveling to a more rural area. Several stated that they would be more comfortable traveling from large city to large city, whereas in a more rural context a letter of invitation would be more appropriate and create a more comfortable social context.

\[\text{\textsuperscript{112}}\] See Park, 1995 for a fascinating approach to this subject
this landscape represent tangata whenua fixed urbanisms. As a form of urbanism, tangata whenua urbanisms represent an urban way of life and urban identity that has been forced on many hapū and iwi and has accrued them both benefits and challenges. But more importantly the confluence of tangata whenua and cities has created a significant population of Māori who are fully urban in terms of their way of life, but simultaneously deeply connected in the most traditional sense of their Māori identity.

Tangata whenua fixed urbanisms are all about negotiating and incorporating the urban context within the framework of mana whenua rights. Manuhiri fixed Māori urbanisms, on the other hand, encompass the large number of Māori (and their offspring) that left their ancestral territories and moved to urban areas outside of those territories, but still have knowledge of, and strong connection to, their ancestral group(s) and land. These are the Māori that are one of the by-products of the dramatic post WWII rural-to-urban migration that so radically reshaped Māori demographic patterns in Aotearoa New Zealand (see Chapter 3). In cities like Auckland Māori individuals and groups that embody this category are a significant demographic presence, and in some cases far outnumber the main tangata whenua group (Ngāti Whātau o Ōrākei being the main tangata whenua group in Auckland).\(^{113}\) It is also through the movement of these Māori outside of their tūrangawaewae that uniquely urban demographic patterns—particularly multi-tribal urban populations—first began to form.

\(^{113}\) For example, Te Arawa, an iwi to the east of Auckland have 12,000 members living in this city. In comparison, the Ngāti Whātau o Ōrākei iwi has only 4,000 members despite their tangata whenua status in Auckland.
However, and very importantly, as this category is being defined here Māori who embody these types of fixed urbanisms have maintained both knowledge and meaningful connection to their ancestral hapū/iwi. Knowledge here is defined by their ability to recite to a certain degree of proficiency their whakapapa. Meaningful connection is defined through their ability to regularly move back and forth between city and ancestral territory, as well as through active association with their home marae (they can, in other words, still claim tūrangawaewae through this association). In many cases these Māori represent highly mobile individuals with both deep urban and rural connections. These Māori effectively disrupt any notion of a rural/urban dichotomy through their ability to negotiate both urban and non-urban spaces/places in a way that suggest strong cultural and identity characteristics. These Māori are also often important players in the construction of manuhiri Māori marae in cities outside of their ancestral territories. This usually happens when a significant enough population has relocated to a particular city whereby the building of a marae to service their needs becomes merited.\textsuperscript{114}

Certainly long before Europeans showed up in Aotearoa New Zealand, as well as before cities began to take shape, Māori were a mobile people. Their initial arrival marked them as brilliant explorers and migrants at an epic scale. Hapū and iwi boundaries changed over time through population growth, migration and conflict, and Māori moved between hapū/iwi through marriage, 

\textsuperscript{114} The building of manuhiri marae, however, is often political rather than just functional. In one case I came across during my interviews, a middle aged Māori woman described how, despite a large contingency of her iwi in Auckland (non-tangata whenua), the leaders of the home iwi decided not to let them build a marae in Auckland. This was done in order, she suggested, to encourage these manuhiri Aucklanders to maintain strong geographic connection to their home iwi.
slavery and most likely through other means as well. But the creation of cities opened up a new kind of mobility and Māori, due to both push and pull factors, took advantage of this new geographic flexibility. As I am defining this typological category here, these manuhiri Māori effectively and productively constructed urban lives that are deeply connected to their (often rural) whakapapa and tūrangawaewae, while simultaneously developing manuhiri Māori urbanisms that are equally connected to an urban way of life. In the following chapter, for example, one of the featured Māori—Keri Wikitera—speaks eloquently about her identity encompassing both a Te Arawa component (an iwi east of Auckland) and an urban Auckland component. Her ability to successfully combine these identities speaks to both the resilience and adaptability of manuhiri Māori, and to the importance of recognizing this category within a typology of Māori urbanisms.

Within both the tangata whenua and manuhiri fixed Māori urbanisms categories are individual Māori and group organizations that are at the cutting edge of redefining the connection between Māori and their ancestral territories, and doing so within an intensely urban context. The key characteristics are identities still deeply connected to traditional ways of organizing and understanding what it means to be Māori both socially and culturally, and yet simultaneously fully living urban ways of life, and doing this despite being geographically separated from their tūrangawaewae. While Māori representatives of this category occupy a wide range of professions and socio-economic conditions, they nonetheless share this critical characteristic of maintaining whakapapa knowledge and strong claims of tūrangawaewae. Following McIntosh’s (2005: 40) definition of fixed Māori identities, the
individuals and groups embodying this category exhibit what she refers to as “robust traditional” identities and as result are often at the forefront of socio-economic and socio-cultural struggles to create greater representation and equality for Māori in general and, more specifically, in urban areas.

4.4.2 Forced Māori urbanisms

While on the one hand, fixed Māori urbanisms (whether tangata whenua or manuhiri) are defined primarily as individuals and groups with a strong connection to Māori cultural values, worldviews and protocol, forced Māori urbanisms, on the other hand, are defined primarily by socio-economic factors (following McIntosh’s, 2005, definition of forced Māori identities). All Māori living in urban areas are tangata whenua, manuhiri or some combination of these whether they have knowledge of this connection or not.\textsuperscript{115} However, lack of knowledge about this connection is considered by McIntosh (2005: 40) to not be a necessary defining characteristic of forced identities. Instead, she argues that this group is “characterized by a marked marginalization where deprivation due to social, economic and political factors is entrenched and far reaching.”

There are, in other words, some Māori that have become so geographically and socio-economically isolated in Aotearoa New Zealand cities as to merit urbanisms category. For McIntosh, Māori that fit the characteristics of this category are understood primarily through the lens of identity (i.e., from a social psychological perspective), but she does not specify them as necessarily urban

\textsuperscript{115} A combination would occur when, for example, an individual living in a city had one parent from the tangata whenua group and one from a manuhiri group. This type of whakapapa is not uncommon.
(although she does imply that it is in the urban context where this type of Māori identity is more prevalent). The typological category that I am proposing here—forced Māori urbanisms—moves beyond identity to include the urban experience, both socially and materially, as a critical component of the forced urbanisms experience. Moreover, it is being argued here that the urban experience creates a context whereby socio-economic deprivation is experienced in ways that contribute to unique forced Māori urban ways of life. These are the Māori that books/movies like *Once Were Warriors* and *What Becomes of the Broken Hearted* have attempted to depict, and these are the Māori—through higher occurrences of gang violence, drug abuse, dysfunctional families, high unemployment and reliance on state welfare, low levels of education, high rates of crime, imprisonment and recidivism, and unequal and/or unfair treatment by social and judicial services—are the subject of media attention and academic literature (see for example James, 1988; McIntosh, 2005; Martens, 2007).¹¹⁶

Forced Māori urbanisms are characterized by both social and geographic isolation. In every city I spent time in during my research there are parts of town that are considered “Māori neighborhoods”. In the smaller cities, like Gisborne and Rotorua, these neighborhoods were often dominated by Māori who were predominantly of one hapū and/or iwi. In larger cities like Auckland and Wellington there was a greater chance that areas of Māori concentration were more likely to encompass individuals from a wide range of hapū and iwi. In all these cases, however, there were clear indications in both the visual landscape

---

¹¹⁶ Alan Duff wrote *Once Were Warriors* in 1990 and it was later made into a movie in 1994 (directed by LeeTamahor). *What Becomes of the Broken Hearted* was the sequel to *Once Were Warriors* written by Duff in 1999, the same year it was released as a movie (directed by Ian Mune).
and through the descriptions of these neighborhoods (given to me by Māori and non-Māori alike) of lower socio-economic status. In some of the interviews in the following chapter references to these areas of Auckland, and to Māori fitting the description of forced urbanisms, come up. In all these cases higher levels of social and geographic distance are evident, and in at least two cases it is clearly indicated that a very different urban experiences are engendered as a result.

Ultimately, the point of including a forced Māori urbanisms category in this typological framework is to acknowledge an unfortunate confluence of urbanization and socio-economic marginalization in Aotearoa New Zealand. This is not to say that forced Māori identities and geographies do not exist outside of the urban context, but rather to argue that the urban context creates an intensification of these identities combined with very different materialities. While this form of Māori urbanisms is not the focus of this research, it must be acknowledged that this is an important component of the Māori urban experience for many Māori, and certainly this has become the main image and discourse of the relationship between Māori and cities in Aotearoa New Zealand. While one of the main intentions of this research is to disrupt this dominant discourse and interject a more positive understanding of the Māori urban experience, nevertheless the reality of forced Māori urbanisms serves as an important counterpoint to the whakamanatanga-based urbanisms that are the focus of the following chapters.
4.4.3 Fluid Māori urbanisms

In McIntosh’s (2005) description of fluid identities the main type of people articulating this identity are young urban Māori. These Māori are generally characterized as having little or no tie to their whakapapa and tūrangawaewae, and are often seen by the establishment as representing a social problem. Yet despite these negative stereotypes, McIntosh makes the point that those Māori representing her fluid category are responding to their environments, socio-economic conditions and loss of traditional knowledge by creating equally viable ways of being Māori or, in her own words, “[t]hese formations can be seen as an attempt to find meaning and cultural anchors under difficult, sometimes oppressive, conditions” (McIntosh, 2005: 46). She further argues (2005: 47) that,

[t]he fluid identity can be seen as part and parcel of the dynamics of identity formation. It borrows and transforms many of the more fixed elements found in the traditional identity. It also challenges notions of authenticity and lays out new forms of claims making. Over time, it is likely that many of the elements of this identity will be seen as part of an established Māori identity.

Although McIntosh argues that those embodying fluid identities can be both rural and urban, I would argue that it is clearly in the urban context that this type of identity formation is occurring in the greatest concentration, and more importantly that the urban context itself has played an important role in forging fluid Māori identities. In other words, there are elements found in the urban environment—for example, greater levels of heterogeneity—that serve as a foundation for Māori identities that are, according to McIntosh (2005: 46), able to fuse “different ideas and practices from a diversity of cultural backgrounds to articulate a Māori identity that is strongly grounded in its particular social landscape.” While this perspective is certainly not meant as a rejection of a more
traditional view of what it means to be Māori, it certainly represents a broadening of this view. It is in the urban context where this broadening is most clearly articulated in the form of fluid Māori urbanisms.

McIntosh’s definition of fluid Māori identities focuses particularly on young adult and teenage Māori, although her definition is less clear in terms of where these Māori are to be found. She seems to imply that these identities are coming from a range of social and geographic backgrounds (both forced and fixed), but argues that in general those in this category are perceived as “lost, disaffiliated and confused” (McIntosh, 2005: 46). Countering this perception McIntosh argues that fluid identities are, rather, dynamic and adaptive. She further notes that “[i]n the urban setting...[a fluid identity]...embraces its geographical setting and in many cases privileges that setting over tribal settings” (McIntosh, 2005: 46), and in so doing, I argue, fluid Māori urbanisms are formed. The spaces/places of fluid Māori urbanisms are found in the clubs where Māori urban hip hop and club cultures are defining what it means to be a young Māori in the city. They are found in the urban gangs that are territorial by definition and have dominated much of the debate on “the Māori urban problem.” They are found in the form of graffiti, and urban street art and in any other way that Māori urban youth attempt to make a space/place for themselves in cities. I came across many of these types of fluid identity Māori at Mana Moko-Te Karanga (Kfm), the organization featured in Chapters 6 through 8, and I agree with McIntosh that, despite the negative discourse that dominates how these Māori youth are characterized, there is a lot more going on that is positive than ever gets reported in popular media.
But it is at this point that I diverge from McIntosh in defining fluid Māori urbanisms. My research suggests that a broader range of possible Māori backgrounds characterize this group than McIntosh’s description suggests. While some of the Māori that fit this category are indeed predominantly young and coming out of a context of socio-economic deprivation, others are a wider variety of ages and/or coming out of less disadvantaged Māori backgrounds. Fluid Māori urbanisms are developing in many professional Māori, as well as in Māori coming from a staunch tangata whenua perspective. The main commonality among these seemingly disparate groups is an identity that is increasingly comfortable with a flexibility and mutability in how their Māoriness is defined and expressed. Perhaps this is what McIntosh means when she writes, “[o]ver time, it is likely that many of the elements of …[fluid identities]…will be seen as part of an established Māori identity” (2005: 47). It may also be that it is this shift towards fluid identities becoming an accepted core element of mainstream Māori identity that my research tapped into, and it is not surprising that it is in urban areas where this shift is initially taking place.

To a certain extent we can reach all the way back to the arguments made by Weber and Durkheim (see section 4.1 above) that movement to cities resulted in a certain level of emancipation by freeing up the Māori rural-to-urban migrants from cultural and communal systems that restricted them to narrowly defined socio-cultural roles and expectations. And, importantly, this is in no way meant as a critique of traditional systems, but rather is meant to suggest how extremely dynamic and flexible cultural identities and practices can be when faced with extreme disruptions and radically alternative socio-geographic circumstances. While my broader interpretation of fluid Māori identities has
allowed for a more dynamic and socially diverse definition of fluid Māori urbanisms, what is truly remarkable is the ability of many of the Māori I met that seemed to fit this category to construct strong Māori identities despite their loss of knowledge and territorial connection. Some have worked hard to rediscover these connections while others have forged strong Māori identities without doing so, but all of them have constructed a strong sense of being Māori. As much as I learned about Māori from those deeply connected to their whakapapa and tūrangawaewae, I learned just as much about what it meant to be urban and Māori from those that fit the fluid Māori urbanisms category.

4.4.4 Whakamanatanga-based Māori urbanisms

It is from the discussion of a broader interpretation of fluid Māori urbanisms that a transition to discussing Whakamanatanga-based Māori urbanisms makes the most sense. In McIntosh’s construction of fluid identities there is the suggestion, albeit a qualified one, that despite difficult conditions Māori are able to develop positive identities even if they are not necessarily grounded in traditional whakapapa and tūrangawaewae. What I am arguing is, in the first place, I agree with McIntosh that this is indeed happening in the Māori populations she is focusing on, but I go further by arguing that this development of positive identities is occurring in urban areas across a wide spectrum of Māori—regardless of class, gender, access to whakapapa/tūrangawaewae and/or level of education.

In fact, whakamanatanga-based Māori urbanisms are by far the most flexible typological category of the four presented here. By this I mean that
Māori from any of the other three typological categories can simultaneously express whakamanatanga-based urbanisms. In other words, this category is less about describing a particular type of Māori urbanism—e.g., based on level of access to cultural knowledge—than it is an identity mindset that is capable of developing in any of these other types. One of the main points of the following empirical chapters is to demonstrate this flexibility through the perspectives of Māori from a broad range of urbanisms. It becomes evident from these case studies that Māori from both fixed and forced backgrounds are developing urban identities that are progressive rather than reactive to the legacies of colonialism.

Whakamanatanga-based Māori urbanisms are simultaneously interwoven into the materiality of the city, and the geographical expression of these whakamanatanga-based urbanisms is equally diverse. The most obvious physical manifestation of whakamanatanga-based urbanisms is the Māori marae (see section 4.3.1 above) but, as the empirical examples in the following chapters demonstrate, this is not the only urban spatial/platial form that has the potential to foster, maintain and reproduce whakamanatanga-based Māori urbanisms. Ultimately, whakamanatanga-based Māori urbanisms—or, alternatively Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga—are those that creatively and progressively adapt Māori worldviews and ways of doing things into the urban environment. This can be found in successful efforts to reclaim Māori land in urban areas, in the construction of marae in urban areas, in Māori infused architecture and design processes, in the proliferation of Māori-owned businesses in cities, and in the formation of unique Māori urban organizations and institutions. All of these examples and others are featured in the following chapters and all of them suggest that a truly broad range of individuals and
organizations producing Māori urban space/place in Aotearoa New Zealand represents whakamanatanga-based Māori urbanisms.

4.5 Conclusion: Whakamanatanga-based Māori urbanisms

The typology of Māori urbanisms proposed here begins the process of understanding the relationship Māori have developed with cities in Aotearoa New Zealand—a relationship that has resulted in Māori urban ways of life, or to put it another way, a diverse range of Māori urbanisms. It is important to not let this fairly simplistic typology mask the complexities found in these ways of life, but rather to use it to develop a basic framework and starting point for beginning to understand issues involving Māori urban identity, Māori urban organizations and groups, and Māori urban geographies.

As this chapter and the previous one have shown, the development of cities based on a Western, capitalist model created both challenges and opportunities for Māori. Originally Pākehā were able to establish cities in Aotearoa New Zealand because Māori leaders perceived advantages to be gained by their presence. Later, as colonialism began to take hold, cities increasingly became spaces of alienation for Māori, and it was not until government policies encouraged movement to cities and socio-economic conditions in rural areas worsened that Māori migrated to cities in large numbers post WWII. And it was from this moment on that Māori began the process of becoming predominantly an urban people adapting to an urban way of life.

From a completely relativistic, idiographic perspective one could argue that how Māori did this is as varied as the number of Māori living in urban areas.
After all each person has his/her own unique life story that converges with the formation of an urban way of life. And yet as one reads about and listens to these life stories in the following chapters it becomes increasingly apparent that the urbanization process did in fact create shared experiences, and that these shared experiences led to similarities in responses resulting in recognizable Māori urbanisms: identities at both the individual and group level and patterns of everyday life that are both recognizably Māori and urban.

The formation of these Māori urbanisms was clearly a socio-cultural process but, as has been argued throughout this dissertation, it was also a process grounded in urban materiality. As Māori urbanized they not only adapted to the social conditions of the city, they also adapted to its material conditions. And in so doing they began to create uniquely Māori urban geographies. These geographies, in the form of their very presence in cities, in the urban built environments and cultural landscapes produced by or influenced by Māori, and in the formation of urban organizations catering to Māori urban ways of life, all of these geographies not only were forged within an urban context, but also were fundamentally a part of creating and reproducing Māori urban geographies.

It is important, however, to not wax overly idyllic about this process. The fact remains that for many Māori the urban experience has been rife with more challenges than opportunities. It is also true that significant pockets of Māori urban poor, with all the potential associated ripple effects stemming from this poverty (higher rates of poor health, crime, drug use, violence, etc.), exist in cities like Auckland. Disentangling these negative socio-economic conditions from the legacy of colonialism is, of course, difficult. It seems fair to argue that the
combination of the challenges cities posed for migrating Māori combined with many of the negative legacies of colonialism has resulted in a difficult transition to urban life for many Māori with not surprising results.

Recognition of the difficulty of this transition has been overemphasized, however. A discourse of the urban Māori “problem” has been around for decades reaching a high point with the publication of Alan Duff’s (1990) *Once Were Warriors* and its subsequent production into a major motion picture (Tamahori, 1994). One does not have to spend too much time perusing New Zealand’s major newspapers to notice this negative discourse running through articles about Māori living in an urban context focusing on gang violence, domestic abuse, crime and drug addiction. Often this discourse seems to reproduce time and again the classic tropes of urban areas and indigenous societies not being compatible.\(^{117}\) Unfortunately, the power of this discourse is such that it overshadows the many Māori that are living urban lives that do not fit this negative discourse of Māori urbanisms. In fact, many Māori are living what I refer to as Whakamanatanga-based urbanisms, an urban way of life that is antithetical to the negative discourses of Māori urbanisms that have dominated both popular and academic discourses. In each of the typologies of Māori urbanisms discussed above and inspired by McIntosh’s (2005) fixed/forced/fluid Māori identities thesis, the potential exists for urban ways of life that are grounded in whakamanatanga as much as those mired in poverty and the legacy of colonialism. It is the stories, activities and perspectives of these Māori that are the main focus of the following chapters.

\(^{117}\) See Lobo & Peters, 2001 and Thrush, 2007 for similar discussions regarding stereotypes of Native Americans in urban areas
Whether these Māori are deeply connected to their whakapapa and tūrangawaewae, or attempting to reconnect to Māori knowledge lost through generations, or living Māori urban lives despite not having this knowledge base, there are Māori in all of these categories, I argue, that are practicing whakamanatanga-based Māori urbanisms. I would further argue that this is an emerging phenomenon that has been building momentum over the last several decades in cities like Auckland. And I would go even further and argue that there is something about the materiality of cities that has allowed for a unique flowering of whakamanatanga-based Māori identities and groups.

In the following chapters Māori from a broad range of backgrounds give voice to these urbanisms through their life stories, opinions, and views on what it means to be Māori and urban. What is revealed by these stories are the beginnings of a positive discourse of Māori urbanisms, one that does not discount the plight of many poor Māori living in cities, but one that certainly reveals pathways that some Māori have taken to make the city a progressive space/place. The production of progressive urban space/place by Māori has allowed them to powerfully express their Māoriness, and in so doing push back against the legacy of colonialism, and against the assimilative forces of industrial capitalism, by asserting/inserting a Māori way of interpreting and shaping urbanization in Aotearoa New Zealand.
I have often found [geography] wanting in humanity. Human beings are present in the aggregate—in settlement patterns, migrations, or conflicting forces shaping contemporary urban landscapes—but not as individuals with faces, personalities, psyches, and life experiences in the places where they live and on the roads they travel.

Edmunds Valdemars Bunkse

We forward in this generation, triumphantly.

Bob Marley (Redemption Song)

5. Living Māori Urban Geographies of Whakamanatanga

The previous two chapters were dedicated to both telling the story of how Māori came to be a primarily urban people in Aotearoa New Zealand, and to understanding the impact this urbanization process had on Māori society. In Chapter 4 this discussion led to the proposal of a theory of Māori urbanisms, or, to put it another way, of the formation of uniquely Māori urban ways of life. A four part typology of Māori urbanisms was proposed as part of this theoretical discussion, drawing on Tracey McIntosh’s (2005) typology of Māori identities to develop the first three: fixed Māori urbanisms, forced Māori urbanisms and fluid Māori urbanisms. A fourth category of Māori urbanisms was further proposed—whakamanatanga-based Māori urbanisms—that encompassed the notion of Māori urban ways of life that are socio-culturally progressive rather than in crisis or primarily reactive. These ways of life are representative of Māori making the
urban experience a positive and empowering one. It was further argued in Chapter 4 that a critical part of all Māori urbanisms is the formation of urban space/place, and at its most progressive this has resulted in the formation of Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga.

This chapter continues the focus on Māori urbanisms and Māori urban geographies through the voices of individual Māori who are actively living these urban geographies through their professional and personal lives. Urbanisms are, after all, meaningless without actively recognizing the individuals and organizations creating and participating in the production of these urbanisms. Each of the individuals (and in one case a specific space/place) focused on here embody one of more of the three main urbanisms highlighted in Chapter 4: fixed, forced and fluid. However, the stories told by these Māori are all further linked in that they all represent the ability of whakamanatanga-based urbanisms to develop out of multiple identity and life contexts. Thus, in this chapter the goal is to reveal the myriad ways in which Māori are “going about the business” of living and creating Māori urbanisms, with a specific focus on how they are actualizing urban geographies of whakamanatanga. Each of the Māori featured in this chapter are, in their own unique ways, “carving out” or claiming spaces/places in the city and transforming them into sites of modern Māori urban life. And while each of these individuals is going about this process in unique ways, there are simultaneously important similarities and shared understandings based on their “Māoriness” which reinforce the notion of this
broader phenomenon I am referring to as Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga.\textsuperscript{118}

The Māori I focus on in this chapter are representative of emergent Māori ways of life that no longer need to concentrate solely or even primarily on resisting the legacy of colonialism, or on rebuilding or “resusci- tating” Māori culture. While these struggles are on-going (and many of the people featured here would consider themselves part of these struggles), there comes a point when certain benefits are accrued from these struggles, one of which is a moment for some Māori whereby they are no longer beginning from an identity grounded in marginality. These are not isolated elitist individuals, but rather individuals connected to many people from all classes and walks of life. In other words, these Māori got to where they are through a variety of paths and socio-economic contexts. And where they are is seen through their having constructed lives and spaces/places in the city that are grounded in opportunity rather than crisis or oppression, that are forged through whakamanatanga rather than (or just) resistance, struggle or mere survival.

This chapter, then, highlights the multiple ways in which Māori have acquired and applied knowledge and skills in an urban context in order to better their lives and the lives of people around them. There are many common themes that run through the stories told by each of the people interviewed. But perhaps the most important of these themes is that, despite the multiplicity of paths taken

\textsuperscript{118} Benton, et al, (2002) recognize this commonality when they argue, “Although there is great diversity among urban Māori (sic), there is a common \textit{miro} or thread of ‘Māoriness’ which transcends social, economic and descent-related divisions” (Executive Summary, V; this quote was already used in chapter four, but it is worth reproducing it here because of its relevance to the specific arguments being made at this point).
to make the city work for them, all of the Māori interviewed express a strong sense of being Māori in ways that cannot be understood as merely superficial cultural remnants within the context of processes of assimilation and/or acculturation. Rather, the worldviews and ways of life exemplified by these individuals suggest ways of re-imagining and re-interpreting what it means to be a Māori living in a contemporary Aotearoa New Zealand urban context, as well as reinforcing the importance of space/place to the production of Māori urban cultural creativity and productivity.

It is worth restating here, in concluding this introduction, that the point of this chapter is to highlight ways in which Māori are going about, through their everyday practices and professions, actualizing and embodying Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga. The goal here is to find a critical confluence between how Māori are expressing their sociality and how this expression is infused with, is critically connected to, urban materiality. In other words, how are these Māori, not just metaphorically but actually, carving out and claiming spaces/places in the city that are infused with a sense of Māoriness. In answering this question it becomes clear that there are many paths to achieving the production of Māori-imbued urban space/place. For example, in the case of an architect like Rau Hoskins or a carver/artist like Lyonel Grant (see below), this “carving out” process, and the resulting human geographies, are as concrete as possible because the end product is the built environment. Whereas, in the case of the artists such as Brett Graham and Rachael Rakena, the Māori infused space/place that they are “carving out” is in the form of pieces of art, as well as in the temporary occupations of museum and gallery spaces during their exhibits.
Yet, despite these variations in ways of carving out and claiming urban spaces/places, the argument here is that these all share the essential aspects of what is meant here by the term Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga: the appropriation of the social and material in order to assert a Māori human geography in urban spaces/places, even when these spaces/places were initially forged within a quintessentially Western socio-geographic urban context. The result is something different, something special, and something that is moving Aotearoa New Zealand cities, especially Auckland, away from its original colonial urban model, its Western or Eurocentric urban model, towards a model that incorporates Māori values and worldviews in socially and culturally meaningful ways. This chapter, and the three that follow are an attempt to demonstrate in empirical terms how this is actually happening.

5.1 “The whole city is like our marae”: Maintaining Mana Whenua in an Urban Context, an Interview with Dr. Merata Kawharu

Dr. Merata Kawharu is the Director of Research at the James Henare Research Center at Auckland University. She is an anthropologist by training and is a member of the Ngāti Whātua o Ōrākei iwi, an iwi that claims mana whenua (territorial rights and responsibilities) over large portions of Tāmaki Makaurau (Auckland), including the main part of Auckland City, parts of the North Shore, and other mostly contiguous parts of Auckland. She is also the daughter or Sir Hugh Kawharu, a prominent Māori in his day, and elder of Ngāti Whātua. Merata is involved in the treaty negotiations between the Crown and her iwi, and as such she represents a tangata whenua point of view in terms of a
Māori relationship with, and conception of, Tāmaki Makaurau. The tangata whenua fixed Māori urbanisms described in Chapter 4 are illustrated at an empirical level through Merata’s descriptions of and perspectives about Tāmaki Makaurau, although all of the complexity of this category noted in the previous chapter should be kept in mind when applying this typology to Merata’s perspectives. This serves as an important counter perspective to those Māori that live and work in Auckland as non-tangata whenua. It is a view that is deeply rooted in a Tāmaki Makaurau whakapapa and tūrangawaewae, and it is a view that has a very different (although not necessarily conflicting) cultural geography as compared to other non-tangata whenua I interviewed in Auckland. It is also a perspective that demonstrates the intense relationship between Ngāti Whātua Māori and much of the area known today as Auckland; and this intensity exists regardless of how much steel and concrete is layered on top of the traditional and sacred landscapes that Ngāti Whātua’s oral histories recognize (see Figure 8, p. 258).

I begin this section, indeed this chapter, with Merata’s kōrero at least in part because of her Ngāti Whātua connection. It seems correct and sensible in the context of Māori values and worldviews to do this as a way to honor the important place the Ngāti Whātua people have as Tāmaki Makaurau’s principle

---

119 I switch to referring to Auckland as Tāmaki Makaurau at times in this section because it better reflects the Ngāti Whātua geographic perspective of this area. Mana whenua is the term used by Māori to connote the right of a particular iwi or hapū to claim and occupy a particular territory. A whole series of rights and responsibilities are connected to mana whenua including, for example, kaitiakitanga (stewardship over the land), tūrangawaewae (the cultural and spiritual right to occupy a particular territory), marae (their construction and maintenance), and host/guest responsibilities.

120 Korero means many things in Māori, with language being the most common translation. It is often used, as it is here, to mean an individual’s spoken point of view; often this would be more formally in the form of a speech or, as in this case, an interview.
iwi. Importantly, this is in no way intended to lesson or undermine the views of those Māori that follow in this chapter who are not tangata whenua, and yet are deeply and profoundly connected to Auckland as a Māori space/place (nor is it meant, for that matter, to lesson or under represent the mana of other iwi and hapū that can legitimately claim mana whenua in other parts of Auckland). For most Māori living fixed Māori urbanisms in the tangata whenua or manuhiri categories this does not seem to be a difficult perspective to uphold or understand, since it fits well into how they themselves understand their urban geographies. For those Māori living an urban life more disconnected from a traditional Māori socio-geographic and socio-cultural context acknowledging Ngāti Whātua’s tūrangawaewae status may be more complex or less meaningful, although this is not the focus of this research so it does not constitute a major discussion in this or any other chapter. The point here is simply about a choice on the part of the author to delegate Ngāti Whātua’s perspective to that of a foundational Māori Tāmaki Makaurau urbanism, one that all others can be juxtaposed, compared, and contrasted.

This section is based primarily on a formal interview I did with Merata in August of 2008. However, I also spoke with Merata more informally in 2007, as well as several times informally in 2008 and 2010. Merata has also contributed significantly to this research through email correspondences. In all of these discussions and correspondences Merata steadfastly asserted a Ngāti Whātua perspective vis-à-vis my research. Even when discussing her more personal ideas about moving to and living in Tāmaki Makaurau, she never wavered from this viewpoint. In this sense Merata truly represents a living embodiment of what it means to incorporate a tangata whenua fixed urbanisms perspective.
From this perspective the Western urban geography that has come to dominate a city like Tāmaki Makaurau has not erased the Māori geography that constituted the original human geography of this area. While urbanization certainly has created many more challenges to this original human geography, it has not in any way undermined the Ngāti Whātau sense of connection or responsibility to this space/place. This point is captured in the following conversation:

_Serge: If I were to ask you if you consider Auckland to be an important part of your identity how would you answer?_
Merata: Well, I would say that Auckland is part of my Ngāti Whātua identity...Ngāti Whātua is important...Tāmaki Makaurau is part of me...I am part of Tāmaki Makaurau...

It is important to first recognize the significance of the phrasing used here by Merata: Tāmaki Makaurau is part of Merata’s Ngāti Whātua identity rather than the reverse. In other words this identity encompasses far more than just Tāmaki Makaurau both geographically and metaphorically; this sprawling urban area does not dominate or define this identity, but instead is absorbed into it. And when this happens it no longer becomes Auckland, but instead transforms into Tāmaki Makaurau. This sense of identity is profound; it suggests a fundamentally embodied sense of space/place (it is part of me and I am part of it). In this simple but important statement the Māori nexus of spiritual and material connection to territory is invoked, and is done so in a space/place (Tāmaki Makaurau) that, especially to the non-Māori observer, seems as far from what would typically be considered a “traditional” Māori cultural landscape as possible. This theme continued as our conversation unfolded:

Serge: Is Auckland as a city relevant in that sense of identity?

Merata: Yeah, it’s no different from any other...except for the number of Pākehā...but what is different is how we look at the city from a Ngāti Whātua perspective and...that’s where...we were talking about this the other day...mana whenua...what that means...it’s the right to the land, but it’s the obligation of the land and obligations are getting passed down from those who lived before us...to invite those into our area that now encompasses this great big city and to look after them and to...which is the flip side...you’ve got the rights, the mana aspect...but then the other side of that is the manaaki...which I think is kind of summarized really well here: “go and pick the best part of the land...” Not just any part of the land...the best part! You know, we’re honoring you...

In the quote previous to this one Merata invoked an intensely personal sense of space/place connection to Tāmaki Makarau as an extension of her Ngāti Whātua
identity. In the above quote she then extends this out to a more group-oriented viewpoint that encompasses what it means to be part of Ngāti Whātua, a group involvement that entails certain rights and responsibilities. This issue of rights and responsibilities can be understood in the context of reciprocity and is an absolutely essential part of a Māori perspective. Manaaki means to look after, and in this case specifically to look after those people that enter into Ngāti Whātua territory peacefully. The Ngāti Whātua leaders offered Pākehā some of their best land as a gesture of this responsibility. From the Ngāti Whātua perspective it was an act of generosity, but also one designed, as Merata notes, to build mutually beneficial relationships.

Yeah...its, um...an expression I suppose...a practical expression of kaitiakitanga...yeah...that’s how we see Auckland and those who are in it...they’re in our patch so to speak, or in our tribal territory...so that gives us certain rights to enjoy that are different from anyone else here...but that gives us obligations also...particularly to other Māori...so that when they come to the city, the migrants perhaps that you’re talking about...and there have been many since the 50s and 60s...concerned to ensure that they can have places that they can come together at, whether they are urban marae or other things, and support them in those initiative...in a broad sense...

This culturally understood relationship between Ngāti Whātua and all others considered outsiders occupying Ngāti Whātua lands is one that was not historically honored by Pākehā. As a result, by the beginning of the second half of the twentieth century, Ngāti Whātua’s land-base in Auckland was relegated to

---

121 The Māori concept that represents this notion of reciprocity best is “utu”. According to the Auckland University of Technology online Māori dictionary utu is both a verb and a noun. As a verb it is defined as “to repay, pay, make a response, avenge, reply”, and as a noun it means “revenge, cost, price, wage, fee, payment, salary, reciprocity”. This same source goes on to further explain this concept: “an important concept concerned with the maintenance of balance and harmony in relationships between individuals and groups and order within Māori society, whether through gift exchange or as a result of hostilities between groups. It is closely linked to mana and includes reciprocation of kind deeds as well as revenge” (http://www.maori dictionary.co.nz/index.cfm).

122 Kaitiakitanga is a very complex Māori concept, but its most basic definition is stewardship over a designated piece of land.
a small patch of land in an area called Ōrākei, and their political status was marginalized. Since that low point the struggle to regain their land, both physically and in terms of acknowledgment of their tangata whenua status, has dominated the politics of Ngāti Whātua (as it has for most Māori groups) for much of the twentieth century and on into this century (Kawharu, 1979). Along with these land re-acquisitions struggles has also come a growing political clout in terms of Ngāti Whātua’s ability to assert their mana whenua at both the city and state levels of government.

The successes that Ngāti Whātua has experienced in regaining significant tracts of land in Tāmaki Makarau is, without a doubt, an amazing accomplishment based on hard work by people like Sir Hugh Kawharu—a legacy that is being carried on by Merata and others. Certainly many Māori groups throughout Aotearoa New Zealand are engaged in similar struggles to regain control of their ancestral territories. However, this struggle takes on particular challenges, I would argue, when engaged in an urban context. How do members of an iwi only 4,000 in number (small compared to many Māori iwi populations), metaphorically “swimming” in a sea of other people and a massive build-up of concrete and steel, not only hold onto their own sense of identity, but assert this identity in the very real terms of land claims and government acknowledgement? While this is not the subject of main topic here, it is certainly worth noting the substantial achievements made by Ngāti Whātua (this is dealt with in more detail below). But when you meet a member of this small but well organized iwi it becomes easier to understand how this has been achieved. These meetings also help to better understand that these successes have been forged in a powerful sense of geography, grounded in whakapapa and
tūrangawaewae and representing a true embodiment of what is meant by the term tangata whenua fixed urbanisms.

The strength of this conviction is evident in the following statement by Merata:

*It’s a different framework...it’s a different lens to look through...to see the world...the lens for me in looking at the city is the one we’ve been talking about...and it’s no different really to what these people spoke of one hundred and fifty, one hundred and sixty years ago...the difference is now you got these buildings and a changed landscape, but that landscape has the same meaning...the opportunities today are greater, of course, in the city versus a small town or a rural area...that also from a Ngāti Whātua perspective...the flip side of that which has come about since 1840 when these lands here were deemed to be sales and not transactions and we lost our ability to control our resources and take what we could to survive from those resources and everything else...but we’re now in the stage of having those land grievances addressed so that we can put back into the city our cultural footprint...which is defined through mana whenua...*

And indeed, as has been noted, Ngāti Whātua has made significant strides in regaining some of their land and their mana through their ceaseless political, economic and cultural efforts. In these efforts the city has afforded both challenges and opportunities. Even more importantly, however, is the idea that Ngāti Whātua has the ability, as it continues the process of reclaiming land in Tāmaki Makaurau, beginning to “put back into the city” their cultural footprint. This idea comes up in many of the following interviews in this chapter.

What does it mean for Māori to assert/insert their cultural footprint onto the city? This is a critical question when considering any type of Māori urbanism because it is a term that in essence combines sociality (cultural) and materiality (footprint); it speaks of a Māori urban cultural landscape that goes beyond the superficial and instead demands a much deeper engagement between Māori values/worldviews and the physicality of the city. Ngāti Whātua, as it turns out, is in a unique position to play a major role in creating this “footprint” because of
its direct ownership of land in several areas around Tāmaki Makaurau. Some of this land, for example, is in a coastal zone near the CBD (an area of very high property value). Ngāti Whātau is also currently negotiating to purchase back from the Crown a coastal area in Davenport that includes a defunct naval base.

The main Ngāti Whātau o Ōrākei marae is in an area around the famous Bastion Point and occupies land with a stunning view of Downtown Auckland. When I asked Merata what it meant to insert/assert a Ngāti Whātau cultural footprint in an urban context such as Tāmaki Makaurau her answer was detailed and complex. The development of formal relationships with institutions and organizations to insure that “things are done the right way” was one way that this cultural footprint was actualized (the “right way” being one that honors and acknowledges mana whenua as well as Māori values, worldviews, and protocol). Land acquisition was another way that this could be done (although in most cases the Māori component in the cultural landscape often seemed to come down to plaques and artwork that recognized historically and presently the Māori presence in that part of the city). The building of marae was emphasized by Merata as one of the most important aspects of this footprint. If a marae is built within Ngāti Whātau land then it is essential that, as the tangata whenua, they be meaningfully consulted at all stages of its conception and construction.

---

123 Bastion Point became famous because of its central role in protests by Māori and their supporters over the honoring of the Treaty of Waitangi (the principle treaty signed between Māori and Great Britain in the nineteenth century). Ngāti Whātau had a marae on this site that was forcibly demolished by the Crown in order to open this land up for urban development. The protests lead not only to this land being returned to Ngāti Whātau, but also served as a pivotal moment in the Māori civil rights movement. An excellent source for understanding the importance of Bastion Point is the documentary Bastion Point: Day 507 (Mita, et al, 1980).
At a more personal level Merata also acknowledged the role of the James Henare Māori Research Center and the adjacent Waipapa marae (see Figure 9). As will be seen in many of the interviews in this chapter, marae play a critical role in the formation and maintenance of a Māori sense of space/place, and this is as true in urban areas as it is in the rural context. When I asked Merata “what activities in place reinforce your sense of being Māori” she had this to say,

Yeah, well…the values…I mean our landscape…you’ve got an idea about the poetry in our landscape and the city…and so, what we do in that landscape, what’s important, how we relate to that landscape, which are those examples I gave…how do we relate to this particular place? There’s the example of James Henare and how we relate to the north through this place…but the whole city is like our marae, but the physical place of the marae, the building is where we actually apply those values and exercise those responsibilities mainly…but it applies everywhere in our rohe…which is why this place in particular, and right next door is so important to Ngāti Whātua and what it does and how it provides the vehicle to apply those things…in relation to people…yeah, we don’t…the marae is our core, our central focal point…it defines who we are…I guess that’s the best way to put it.

In this complex answer are some of the keys to understanding the characteristics of a tangata whenua fixed urbanisms perspective. First and foremost is the profound statement that “the whole city is like our marae.” This statement captures succinctly the very essence of what it means to embody a Ngāti Whātua tangata whenua fixed urbanisms perspective. The link between values and landscapes, the link between Ngāti Whātua and other iwi/hapū, and all of this filtered through the marae both as an intensely physical presence anchoring

---

124 As an example of this link, the James Henare Māori Research Center is named for a Māori of Nga Puhi ancestry who, as Merata explained, “helped us significantly in our treaty claims in the 1980s.” As a way to honor his assistance and to create and maintain meaningful ties to Nga Puhi the research center was named after Mr. Henare and a portion of the research done in that center focuses on Nga Puhi issues.

125 But as was suggested in chapters three and four, there is a literature that argues convincingly that there is a significant population of urban Māori that do not have strong (or any) marae connections.

126 Rohe is best defined here as “area” or “rightful territory.”
Ngāti Whātua cultural values and worldviews, and as a metaphor from which all other relationships are based—all of these inform Ngāti Whātua’s tangata whenua fixed urbanisms perspective.

![Figure 9: Marae at Auckland University with the Māori Studies building directly behind it](image)

In all of my discussions with Merata a sense of tangata whenua fixed Māori urbanisms came through as she outlined for me her and, by extension, Ngāti Whātua’s understanding of Tāmaki Makaurau’s urban geography and the relationship her people have with this urban space/place. Along with this came a strong sense of the importance of the material aspects of urban space/place—through land acquisition, establishment of marae, and the development of Māori organizations—that resulted in formations of Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga. While this space/place anchored consciousness of whakamanatanga is still developing, and has been earned through fierce political struggles to regain what was lost, it is still evident in the way Merata is able to not only describe, but embody these geographies. It also is expressed both
through her everyday life experiences and through her sense of being a part of an identity group. Even more impressive is her ability to “see through” the concrete and steel that is Auckland and envision a Māori urban geography (Tāmaki Makaurau; in doing this Auckland does not become any less urban, but it does become more Māori, and as such reveals a Māori urban geography who’s presence is manifested in the built and social environment. It is manifested, in other words, in the socio-geographic context of urbanization and is expressed through unique forms of Māori urbanisms.

Having said this, however, I would also argue that Ngāti Whātua, perhaps more than any other group in Auckland, is in a position to establish their cultural footprint in ways that have as yet not been achieved. The land that they own on Auckland’s waterfront is set to become, in the next few years, a major revenue generating resource for them, but there is little there that suggests this to be a Māori space/place; its Māori urban geography is through land ownership alone that, while certainly a very real source of power, does not represent a cultural footprint in any kind of overt Māori cultural landscape sense. It is instructive here to conceive of what an overtly Māori urban cultural landscape would look like. Can we imagine, for example, an area that once entered was clearly denoted as a Māori urban space/place in the way, perhaps, that many Chinatown’s so clearly reflect their ethnic heritage? It would certainly have to be a multi-lingual landscape, and one that encourages Māori oriented and/or owned businesses and organizations; Māori art would be obviously present, and Māori protocol in building and street design would be the dominant
landscape “discourse.” In each of the following interviews it is useful to consider, within this framework of what it means to invoke the notion of a Māori urban landscape, how the individual stories and perspectives all contribute to an understanding of what it means to think of the city as a Māori space/place.

5.2 Carving the Urban into the Traditional: A Meeting with Master Carver Lyonel Grant

Lyonel Grant is a master carver and artist of Ngāti Pikiao and Te Arawa descent. He was born in Rotorua, a medium sized city south east of Auckland, but raised in a rural context. While on the one hand, Lyonel’s knowledge of his whakapapa and tūrangawaewae mark him as representing a tangata whenua perspective, and his presence for a long period of time in Auckland suggest a manuhiri perspective (temporarily), his artwork and marae design and construction indicate that he also embodies and is producing fluid Māori urbanisms. In this sense then, Lyonel serves as an example of how multiple identities/urbanisms can be part of a single individual’s everyday life simultaneously, and thus further emphasize the flexibility and mutability of these categories. Also, as was the case when discussing Dr. Kawharu’s tangata whenua fixed urbanisms perspective (above), the fluid urbanisms being produced by Lyonel are simultaneously Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga.

These types of urban areas, owned by indigenous groups on high value urban land, have parallels elsewhere, both in Aotearoa New Zealand and in other parts of the world. For example, a large shopping mall in Hamilton (a medium sized city southeast of Auckland) is on land owned by the Tainui iwi. In Waikiki, Hawaiian trusts own large tracts of land that generate significant revenues for these trusts (Marek, 1997; McDonald, 2006). In Milwaukee the Potowatami have reclaimed land in the downtown (Lobo, 2001).
I was introduced to Lyonel Grant in 2007 during my first major period of fieldwork in Aotearoa New Zealand. Several people I had spoken with had suggested I meet him and see the whare nui (Ngakau Mahaki) he was building at the Unitec Institute in Auckland (see Figure 10). I was given this opportunity when a local DJ named Oliver, who was also a Unitec professor and member of the board that oversaw the organization of the marae project, invited me to “drop in” on Lyonel. I was told repeatedly that Lyonel was extremely busy and we would be lucky to a) find him, and b) find him at a time when he could speak with me. Despite these warnings, however, I was fortunate to both find Lyonel in his carving workshop and be given some of his precious time to talk about his marae project.

Figure 10: Location of Unitec and Te Noho Kotahitanga marae (source: base map from Google Maps).

128 “Unitec” is a term that refers to universities in Aotearoa New Zealand that are focused on applied fields. “Whare nui” refers to the carved meetinghouse that is generally the most prominent visual feature of a marae complex. The marae itself (the open space, or *atea*, in front of the whare nui) is referred to as Te Noho Kotahitanga.
Despite the fact that no formal interview was requested or engaged during my brief time with Lyonel, I have included his work here simply because I was literally “blown away” by not only the quality of the work being done, but, more importantly here, by the way he was so masterfully able to combine deeply traditional Māori practices with profoundly urban elements and thereby exemplifying some of the most basic aspects of fluid Māori urbanisms. Both in the conception of this marae and in the carvings that were intended to structurally support and adorn its interior Lyonel was able to demonstrate materially and spiritually the relationship between urban space/place and Māori worldviews and values. Moreover, he was able to do this in a way that showed this relationship to be one that was grounded in whakamanatanga rather than crisis or resistance.

One of the most striking visual elements of marae is their elaborate carving. These make up parts of the exterior façade and cover much of the interior, and they are deeply symbolic and tell a story about ancestry and important relationships to the space/place where the marae is situated and the people and groups involved with the marae. Patricia Grace (1986: 104) captured the complex meaning of the marae and its intense relationship to the community that builds it when she wrote:

> our main book was the wharenui which is itself a story, a history, a gallery, a study, a design structure and a taonga. And we are part of that book along with family past and family yet to come.\(^\text{129}\)

\(^\text{129}\) “Taonga” is defined by Williams (2002: 381) as “property, anything highly prized.” However, my experiences suggest that this word has become highly charged politically and is used to refer to all things Māori that are considered important to their cultural integrity and perseverance (including people).
Only master carvers and builders are tasked to design and construct buildings of such massive significance and symbolic weight, and it is a task filled with honor and responsibility—probably as much or more than any other task assigned within Māori society.\textsuperscript{130} The Unitec marae was special from a contemporary perspective because Lyonel was given the power not only to create the carvings for the marae, but also to oversee all of its design and structural elements. This level of involvement by the master carver, I was told, was uncommon and marked this project as significant in that it was returning the carver to the position of master builder/designer rather than just master carver.\textsuperscript{131}

My time at Te Noho Kotahitanga marae consisted of walking around and photographing the still unfinished exterior of the whare nui (see Figure 11) and then meeting with Lyonel in the carving workshop where he showed me several of the main carvings being prepared for the interior. I also spoke with Lyonel about his carvings both in terms of their intended meaning and the inspirations from which he drew in order to produce these carvings. We also spoke about how he first envisioned the site and situation of the marae in terms of how it would sit on the piece of land put aside by Unitec for its construction.

\textsuperscript{130} Having written about marae, having been welcomed on to one and studied and sung songs in it for a period of time, and having discussed marae with countless Māori and non-Māori alike, this assertion seems, if anything, an understatement. Yet, despite the seemingly inherent truth in this argument, Lyonel argues that there are many marae that, from a design perspective, are not maintaining the necessary standards based on carving traditions. He argues: “Here I am alluding to the accessibility gained by making a box (rather someone else making a box) and carvers coming along and applying the wall paper. In essence anyone can be a meeting house carver and furthermore the country is littered with horrible McDonald whares - integrity must reign supreme – it’s time for carvers to put up or shut up” (email correspondence, January 27\textsuperscript{th}, 2010). Clearly there is a politics to marae building and design, even if marae, once built, are spiritually and logistically significant to the people that use them.

\textsuperscript{131} See http://www.unitec.ac.nz/?F1214451-5886-4372-8972-F943922E558B for an overview of how this marae was constructed and the meaning it has for the Unitec whanau. See Lyonel Grant’s official website, http://www.lyonelgrant.com/index.htm, for a virtual tour of the inside of the marae.
Writing about the production of a marae from an academic perspective is challenging. This is the case because this production process is one that manifests through a cultural/spiritual process whereby the master builder “taps into” the mauri of a particular site where a marae is to be constructed, and through this “tapping in” is able to establish a mauri for the marae.\textsuperscript{132} From this perspective marae are not socially or culturally constructed—or at least not entirely. Instead they are a product of the marriage between the socio-cultural production of the marae and the essential aspects of the space/place where the construction is situated. The term “essential” is, of course, highly problematic from the perspective of contemporary social theory in that it proposes an absolute state of being (i.e., one that is not subject to endless interpretation). For various political and intellectual reasons this is seen by many academics as dangerous in that it creates the potential to privilege one person’s or group’s interpretations over others; in other words, to essentialize is to exercise power, and sometimes this power may be exercised in such a way as to subordinate one individual or group’s interpretations over others.

And yet having stated this academic critique of essentializing it is difficult to listen to a Māori master builder and carver such as Lyonel Grant and not accept the “essential” spiritual component implicit in how they experience the

\textsuperscript{132} Barlow (1991: 83) defines mauri thusly: “[m]auri is a special power possessed by Io [supreme being] which makes it possible for everything to move and live in accordance with the conditions and limits of its existence. Everything has a mauri, including people, fish, animals, birds, forests, lands, seas and rivers; the mauri is that power which permits these living things to exist within their own realm and sphere. No one can control their own mauri or life essence.” Speaking specifically about the role of mauri in marae construction, Barlow (1991: 83) writes: “While a person cannot control their own mauri, it is possible for someone to establish a mauri for some creation, such as a house. When a house is built, the mauri is established as the sacred heart of the building. This mauri is the power obtained through a covenant with the gods to take care of the house and to fulfill the wishes, desires and hopes of the people who will use it for noble purposes.”
carving and building process. Lyonel explained that one of the first things he did when envisioning the marae was to walk around the land to get a “feel” for it, and then he looked at it from aerial images. As he did this he began to “see” images of Māori spirits and symbolic forms that inhabited and informed this piece of land, and it was from these images that he began to understand the layout and organization of Te Noho Kotahitanga marae.

As part of this discussion and story he also noted that he was not from Auckland, but rather was raised in a rural area outside of Rotorua, a much smaller city to the southeast of Auckland. Lyonel told me that coming to Auckland was always a challenging experience for him because he was not used to the overwhelming intensity of buildings, people, traffic, etc. He told me this to relate how difficult it was for him, at first, to imagine a marae within this type of urban context. And yet, as he allowed himself to experience the space/place and land where this marae was going to be built, and as he adjusted to his life in Auckland, he began to understand that no matter how much concrete and steel overlay the land, there were still Māori spirits and landscapes present. This understanding of Māori landscapes persevering within the context of the urban was inspired, interestingly enough, by time Lyonel spent in Honolulu. He told me that once, while looking at Honolulu from a highpoint (Tantalus/Roundtop), he had a vision of peeling back the urban “fabric” and seeing the Hawaiian spirits and landscapes emerging from underneath all the concrete and steel—buried perhaps, but not gone.

133 As Lyonel describes it: “Hadn’t considered an urban space to be part of my identity, as my formative years were more rural in essence. We would frequent the town, Rotorua, but always felt that we were products of a rural community (Taheke, Okere Falls)” (email correspondence, February 3rd, 2010).
From this vision one of the main carvings he was working on emerged, and it is one that became a metaphor for how I began to understand my research. This carving depicted a stylized map of Auckland, complete with roads organized on a grid and little cul de sacs. But dramatically bursting out of various parts of the map were Māori spirits and images. These images represented, according to Lyonel, the power and resilience of Māori landscapes and spirits regardless of the weight of a Western built environment that had been imposed since the coming of Europeans. To me, when I looked at these images, I saw Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga. The power and resilience of a people to, despite seemingly impenetrable material and social forces, assert their human geographies through their physical presence, through their re-
interpretation of the urban built environment, and through their active sociality within this urban context, and to do this in a way that was whakamanatanga-based rather than embroiled in crisis or even resistance.

A second carving shown to me by Lyonel was envisioned while he was walking down a railroad track in Auckland. He came upon a graffiti burn that struck him as both beautiful and meaningful. He decided to incorporate this image into one of his carvings and, in so doing, managed to demonstrate the ability of even the most traditional forms of Māori cultural production—marae carvings—to appropriate images and symbols from the urban context and turn them into powerful components of a Māori cultural landscape. This is a critical point, because it demonstrates one of the most important characteristic of fluid Māori urbanisms: the ability to incorporate non-Māori socio-cultural and socio-spatial elements and transform them into profoundly Māori ones; and in doing so not compromising what it means to be Māori, but rather demonstrating the power of Māori to not only withstand the impact of outside forces, but to absorb them and re-interpret them in ways that acknowledge and further Māori worldviews and values, while simultaneously allowing for progressive growth and change in these views and values.

Since my time at Te Noho Kotahitanga marae, Lyonel Grant finished the carvings and the marae’s construction and it was officially blessed and opened on March 13, 2009. While I have not had the honor of seeing the finished marae yet, from all accounts it is a truly special building—even as compared to other marae. While certainly not the first urban marae, Te Noho Kotahitanga is the first to so explicitly acknowledge and incorporate its urban context into the story that it is telling those that enter into and use this sacred yet functional Māori
space/place. In doing so this marae marks a critical aspect of what it means to claim the emerging presence of Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga in cities like Auckland.

These geographies demand three essential components: 1) that they be derived wholly or at least significantly from a Māori perspective and way of doing things (i.e., Māori are meaningfully connected to these geographies), 2) that the urban be an essential component of their production, and 3) that they are able to foster, maintain and reproduce whakamanatanga in those that interact with them. That the marae embodies the first and third of these components is an obvious claim, but the inclusion of the urban adds a new dimension to this discussion. The ability of Māori to take a cultural form linked so intensely to their traditional culture and incorporate it into Western urban space/place is remarkable enough (see Chapters 3 and 4), but to then allow the urban context to begin to “talk back” to the marae in a manner that influences design elements, but in no way compromises the basic cultural and spiritual integrity of this Māori built form speaks volume to the relationship between Māori and cities. And, more importantly, it speaks to the potential for Māori to not just adapt their worldviews and values to the urban context, but to adapt the urban context to their worldviews and values.

This shift marks a process of Māori cultural production that has reached a seminal point in a journey through the legacy of colonialism and urbanization; a point that allows individuals like Lyonel Grant (and all those involved in the production of Te Noho Kotahitanga marae) to “take possession” of urban space/place and turn it into Māori urban space/place. Once built, these structures are not just passive symbols of whakamanatanga-based Māori
space/place, but rather are active forces in the fostering, maintaining and reproducing of Māori whakamanatanga. As Lyonel so eloquently states it (email correspondence, January 26th, 2010):

[...]he new whare Ngakau Mahaki has served a multitude of functions as you can well imagine—Ae [yes], as Grace notes a gallery, a repository of knowledge, whakapapa, history, symbolism, cosmology etc, etc, but there are subtle forces that rekindle the latent forces within urban Māori who have suppressed their culture almost to the point of being intimidated by it. So not only does Ngakau Mahaki whakamana [empower] all that is Māori, it genitally insights those who thought it was uncool to be Māori, or chose to ignore their culture in pursuit of success on a material european scale; 'to arms' as it were.

Rather than just a space/place of staunch resistance to the forces of modernity and the legacy of colonialism, the marae, from this perspective, serves as a force for change and whakamanatanga; and this is true even for those most disconnected from their whakapapa and tūrangawaewae.

From a more academic and theoretical perspective, it is truly fascinating how the production and emplacement of marae so quintessentially encompasses my indigenized space/place conceptual framework. Lefebvre’s argument that individual societies secrete their own socially produced space/place is nowhere more apparent than in the existence of the marae. In fact I would go so far as to argue that, despite the influence that European building techniques had on the evolution of marae design, marae represent Māori socially produced space/place; a space/place that is almost, if not entirely, free of the dominance of Western space/place that so ubiquitously came to dominate Aotearoa New Zealand, particularly in its urbanized areas. Moreover, as an inviolate space/place (see Chapter 4), marae represent Māori space/place in the contemporary context that is able to confront and withstand the wielding of
abstract space/place by forces of capitalism and the Crown (the State). To enter onto the marae is to enter into a totally different articulation and manifestation of Lefebvre’s double-layered trialectic. This argument extends to time as well in that, more times than I can recount here, Māori have spoken to me of how time is different within the confines of marae, and that this is often difficult for non-Māori to adjust to or even understand.

Simultaneously, the marae is the most fundamental material manifestation of the Māori sense of being-in-the-world. It is space/place as dwelling where Māori spirituality, sociality and materiality come together profoundly and harmoniously. This harmony of the spiritual, social and material is articulated through the process of the master carver putting his/her knowledge and skills to the task of creating the marae. Lyonel Grant describes this in the following manner (email correspondence, January 26th, 2010):

> [w]hen one’s accrued knowledge of the esoteric, is in sync with one’s ability to manipulate material or one’s physical dexterity (skills), only then can you speak, create art of any worth, make tongues protrude from wooden faces—command authority in ones given vocation, discipline or specialist area—at that point you are literate, or at least achieved a level of ability or proficiency.

In this sense the very design and creation of a marae is a performance in space/place and of space/place that results in a formative Māori cultural landscape. Once completed the marae serves as a space/place within which Māori (and outside guests) literally enact and articulated through performance, ritual and mundane day-to-day use Māori cultural values and worldviews.

Ultimately, this ability that marae have to act as conduits for, and reproducers of, Māori culture and society is true for all marae. In concluding this section it is important, however, to emphasize that Te Noho Kotahitanga marae,
and especially the carvings inhabiting the whare nui (Ngakau Mahaki), not only manifest this ability, but more importantly for the discussion here, manage to fuse contemporary urban themes with this traditional Māori built environment. In this way Lyonel Grant has physically articulated McIntosh’s (2005: 46) definition of fluid Māori identities by “playing” with cultural markers such as language, custom and place and reconfiguring them in a way that gives both voice and currency to their social environment. Often this means the fusing of different ideas and practices from a diversity of cultural backgrounds to articulate a Māori identity that is strongly grounded in its particular social landscape.

I repeat this quote here (see Chapter 4) because it so clearly matches what has occurred at Te Noho Kotahitanga marae. Through his willingness to take seriously Auckland’s urban landscape and fuse aspects of this landscape into his carvings Lyonel has created a structure that embodies the most progressive elements of whakamanatanga-based fluid Māori urbanisms. The true measure of this will be the impact this structure has on Māori and non-Māori faculty, staff and students at Unitec, but this will be a matter for further research.

5.3 “So I’m Te Arawa who lives in Auckland”: Manuhiri Māori Urbanism in Auckland, an Interview with Keri Wikitera

Keri Wikitera is a forty-something Ph.D. Candidate at Auckland University of Technology in the Faculty of Applied Humanities. Keri was born and has grown up in Auckland, but is a member of Te Arawa, an iwi that claims and occupies land located in and around Rotorua (a popular tourist city to the

134 Her dissertation working title is “Maori spaces in foreign places: The case of Hinemihi o te Ao Tawhito,” and focuses on a Māori meeting house that was relocated to the United Kingdom and has become the anchor for expatriate Māori identity formation in that part of the world.
southeast of Auckland). Keri has full knowledge of her Te Arawa whakapapa and has maintained strong connections to her iwi and hapū. Te Arawa in general has strong ties to Auckland in that there are presently approximately 12,000 members of that iwi residing in this urban area. Through her children Keri is also affiliated with Ngāti Whātua, the iwi that claims much of Auckland as its tūrangawaewae. She has two children (a 25 year old daughter and a 18 year old son) that have ancestral ties to both Te Arawa and Ngāti Whātua. Keri and I sat for one formal interview, but I have had many informal conversations with her on the subject of Māori urbanisms, as well as through on-going email correspondences.

Keri is an excellent representative of the manuhiri fixed Māori urbanism defined and discussed in Chapter 4 (those that have maintained knowledge of their whakapapa, but are living in cities removed from their iwi/hapū tūrangawaewae) and yet, like all of the case studies in this chapter, has developed whakamanatanga-based urbanisms through her professional and personal activities. As was noted in Chapter 3, Māori urbanization resulted, particularly initially, in this type of socio-geographic context for many Māori. Throughout all of our conversations a tension was evident between Keri’s sense of having an Auckland-based urban identity and her sense of having a Te Arawa-based tangata whenua identity. This tension represents the legacy of Māori urban migration that created for the first time large populations of Māori living outside of their whakapapa-based territories (see Chapters 3 and 4 for a historical discussion of this process). The ways in which Keri has come to terms with, and even overcome, this tension serves as an excellent example of the challenges faced by manuhiri fixed Māori urbanisms. Keri’s personal story and
her perspectives on being urban also demonstrate one way to “live” whakamanatanga-based Māori urbanisms, as well as how to participate in the creation of Māori urban geographies of whakamantanga through everyday life activities.

Keri was born in Auckland as a result of her Māori mother and Pākehā father (of Welsh ancestry) moving to Auckland in the 1960s. Yet, significantly, unlike some Māori born and raised in an urban context, Keri grew up with a strong sense of connection to her Te Arawa whakapapa in large part because of her mother:

(my mum took us back ’home’ all the time for tangi, weddings, birthdays and our grandparents lived there. So us moko [grandchildren] were sent down there for school holidays etc. Sat at my Nannies’ feet and listened to all the family stories and business ideas as they did their weaving, etc. for the tourists trade.

As a result of this strong Te Arawa connection, Keri often expressed during our discussions a Māori space/place connection that maintained a strong sense of being a migrant in Auckland:

(you know from my perspective I’m proudly Te Arawa, I’m born in Auckland, growing up here, and I still don’t feel it’s my place to make any decisions about…you know…Māori stuff in Auckland…

And yet despite this migrant sense of space/place in Auckland, Keri has also managed to develop a strong sense of space/place in Auckland both through her connection (via her children) to Ngāti Whātua, as well as to other Auckland-based Māori identity groups.

Keri’s primary identity groups can be roughly divided into 1) her successful efforts to stay connected to her Te Arawa iwi despite geographic separation, 2) her association through her children with Ngāti Whātua, 3) her
associations with AUT’s Māori studies program and its marae (Nga Wai o Horotiu), and 4) her work in her upper-class Pākehā neighborhood (St. Heliers) and her children’s school as a Māori cultural ambassador. In each of these examples Keri evokes ideas of Māori identity that are both socially and materially expressed and experienced.

Despite being profoundly connected to her Te Arawa roots, Keri has experienced some challenges with maintaining her sense of membership to Te Arawa while living in Auckland. Despite the large presence of Te Arawa in Auckland (12,000 strong), no Te Arawa-affiliated marae has been constructed in Auckland. Despite the fact that migrant tribal marae are well established in several Aotearoa New Zealand cities, this process has not been undertaken by the Te Arawa leaders. This sense of separation between Te Arawa’s tūrangawaewae and Auckland is captured in the following story told to me by Keri:

Keri: Yeah, well you know I’ve been challenged quite a lot in my lifetime about the right to speak in an iwi sense...that kind of thing...from people at home, the kaumatua elders. An example (I think I might have told you about it) they used to have something called papatakaro which is sub-tribes of Te Arawa used to have a big sports competition (Papatakaro o Te Arawa); so me and my sister who were staunchly netball players about fifteen years ago (probably more), decided that we would like to play for our hapū [one of the Te Arawa sub-tribes], so we rang up the cuzzies [cousins, relatives] in Rotorua to let us know when they were having the muster [netball team practice] so we could play for you guys...for the sub-tribe. So they rang us up at ten o’clock on a Sunday morning and said, yeah, the muster was at twelve o’clock today, and it takes 3 hours to get there [inaudible...but the idea was that they did not give them enough time to get to Rotorua even if they wanted to)...and we were like “oh great!” So we missed out. So the following year we just thought we’d put an Auckland Te Arawa team together, and there’s twelve thousand Aucklanders...Te Arawa in Auckland, so it wasn’t hard to bring a team together...I think we got one hundred and forty people signed up...lol...from Auckland alone! And we went back to the Te Arawa sports board...they're all kaumatua...and said we'd like to bring some teams down to compete in the Papatakaro from Auckland and they said “no, you are not a sub-tribe,” and we explained why we were not able to get to our own respective hapū for practices etc. they said “no”, the following year we went back to them and they said “no to competing” but they allowed us to play non-competitively...we were allowed to participate but we weren’t allowed to
win any prizes or anything, not that we would’ve! So, you know, we did that for three years and slowly but surely they accepted that we were all right to compete.

Serge: I think that is such an amazing story…

Keri: But actually what I’d like to say too was “you guys have got to acknowledge us.” And even when we go to the marae like for a tangi [funeral], or for a wedding, or something like that, you know, they don’t…um…they don’t…well I feel like they don’t actually acknowledge us as much as the cuzzies that live down there, and to a degree I agree with that because the cuzzies, you know, that live down there service the marae, they look after it, do the different things to keep the home fires burning. But in the same breath there are twelve thousand Te Arawa in Auckland, you know!  

I quoted this part of my interview with Keri at length because it so clearly relates the type of tension those in the category of manuhiri fixed Māori urbanisms experience. In a Māori cultural context where being physically in the territory connected to your whakapapa plays such an important role in not only the identity of an individual, but also the way others in the group “judge” your level of group affiliation, living outside of the territory creates significant challenges. But here, in response to these challenges, Keri and her teammates asserted their right to be acknowledged. The name they gave to their team—Te Papatakaro o Te Arawa ki Tāmaki Makaurau—said it all. Tāmaki Makaurau is the Māori name for the Auckland area, and this team name asserted the development of an identity that was proudly Te Arawa but also acknowledged an Auckland connection. And indeed this is a critical issue for Māori cultural politics: how to

135 Keri spoke more about the reason for this in a follow-up email: “Te Arawa marae are not in existence outside of the Te Arawa region for many reasons but primarily to ensure integrity of Te Arawa kawa [marae protocol], that’s one reason. Secondly ‘the leaders’ are reluctant to encourage ‘townies’ affiliating more to their urban communities and thus ‘encourage’ us to return ‘home’ to our own hapū groupings. This is to pursue stronger hapū linkages I think.”
interface harmoniously manuhiri Māori urban groups with traditionally territorially based iwi and hapū socio-geographic and socio-cultural identities.¹³⁶

As important as this issue is, it is not the only Māori group identity that Keri has been challenged to incorporate. Keri’s Ngāti Whātua connections, through her children, have also come to form an important part of her lived Māoriness. As a result, on the one hand, Keri describes her Māori identity in terms that seem to leave her disconnected from her Auckland history, and yet at the same time Keri has developed profound connections to Ngāti Whātua:

Serge: So how would you characterize Auckland in terms of your identity?

Keri: well…it’s my home…but if I am referring to home in a Māori context then Rotorua is my home. When I go home I go to Rotorua…so I’m Te Arawa who lives in Auckland…place of residence…regardless of where I was born and brought up. Having said that I had Ngāti Whātua tamariki [children]…

Through her children Keri has developed an association with Ngāti Whātua that, on a day-to-day basis represents more substantial time than is possible with her Te Arawa side:

[y]eah, you know when someone dies up in Ōrākei, you know, I’m up there doing dishes…I do all the stuff that all the Cuzzies [extended family] do. And if I need to provide a cultural experience for any of my guests that come…international guests, or the local primary…they come up to Ōrākei…

This dual connection to two iwi is not unique to Keri by any means. Through marriage and other cultural mechanisms, Māori have been forging multiple tribal connections long before Europeans showed up on the scene. But the urban context certainly intensified the opportunity for these multiple tribal connections

¹³⁶ For an excellent example of this cultural politics see the Waitangi Tribunal Report #414 (WAI 414, 1998).
by creating a space/place where Māori from many different hapū and iwi resided and interacted on a day-to-day basis.

Figure 12: Location of Auckland University of Technology and Nga Wai o Horotiu marae (source: base map from Google Maps).

The urban context, however, has the potential to create even greater complexity than this multi-tribal interaction and sense of identity. Keri’s experience with the AUT Māori studies program has also evolved over the years to one that reinforces her sense of Māoriness. Importantly, this experience has also been anchored in the built environment through the physical presence of the department itself, but even more importantly through the AUT marae—Nga Wai o Horotiu (see Figure 12).\(^{137}\) Horotiu marae was built as part of a growing trend

\(^{137}\) Nga Wai o Horotiu is a marae I was formally welcomed onto as part of a six week Māori language course in 2007 (thanks to an invitation from Keri the first time I met her). It is one of the most quintessentially urban marae in terms of its juxtaposition to the intensely urban built environment that surrounds it. Its design is quite symbolic, as is the case with all marae, but particularly in terms of an umbilical cord-like bridge connecting it to the architecturally
in Aotearoa New Zealand that saw most major universities building marae (see Figure 13 and 14 below). University marae, as a result, have become one of the accepted “types” of marae in Aotearoa New Zealand (see Chapter 4). In a follow up email with Keri I asked: “can you speak about the impact of AUT’s Māori studies program on your experience as a student? What I am looking for here is some discussion about the impact of having a space dedicated to Māori knowledge and values on your sense of Māori identity.” Her response was as follows:

*I did my bachelor of Māori development (final year) at Te Ara Poutama [the AUT Faculty of Māori development] and it was more about the people rather than the dedicated space. As time has gone on, however, and me being part of the dishes crew, and now I also have a role in the formal traditional encounters, the marae is more important to me in the place and developing relationships with new and upcoming students. It also is a place I can take non-Māori for a kai [to eat] and show them a bit of Māori history (in the marae carvings, etc.), which helps contextualise Māori development research work and gives them some idea about Māori worldviews and difference.*

Thus, we see that over time the physical space of AUT’s Faculty of Maori development, and especially the marae, became an important component of Keri’s multi-layered Māori identity. Grounded in the material, Nga Wai o Horotiu has increasingly created an empowering space/place of Māoriness for her.

The final story told to me by Keri is perhaps the most profound one. It involves the process Keri and several other Māori went through in asserting/inserting a Māori sense of space/place into an urban upper income

Western-styled building, which houses the Māori studies department. It is difficult to put into words the profound impact that the addition of a marae to a university Māori studies program has on the people associated with that program. This comes up in other sections of this chapter (e.g., Lyonel Grant and Merata Kawharu, above), and it is something that I was deeply moved by when I was taking classes at this marae. As a point of comparison I would conjecture that the building of the Hawaiian Studies Center on the University of Hawai‘i, Mānoa campus has had a similarly profound impact.
Pākehā environment—St. Heliers (an area of Auckland about 8.76 kilometers from Auckland’s CBD). Keri was born and raised in this area and stayed there to raise a family when she became an adult. Her daughter was involved with a kōhanga reo from her earliest education at a time when kōhanga reo were first getting started in cities like Auckland. Her son has gone on retreats designed to teach Te Arawa boys about their heritage and whakapapa. In other words, Keri has worked hard to instill a Māori identity in her children.

Figure 13: The AUT Māori studies building is in a classically Pākehā-styled building (left): Nga Wai o Horotiu marae from the front—the quintessential urban marae with AUT Māori studies building behind (right)

Figure 14: The Māori studies building is attached to the marae (Nga Wai o Horotiu) by an umbilical-like bridge (left & right)

138 Kōhanga reo are Māori language immersion pre-schools. They are often referred to as “language nests”.
I asked Keri to discuss the impact of kōhanga reo and her work in the St. Heliers schools and neighborhood to promote a Māori sense of space/place (see Figure 15):

My daughter was a baby when the kōhanga movement started, so we were involved at the very beginning stages; it was all new, and te reo wasn’t sexy back then. To me it was just a day care within a Māori context. Now, of course, it is far more than that. Working at the local school, the [Pākehā] people there were very worried about having to incorporate Māori in the school—part of their legal obligation under New Zealand laws. We (my sister and friend were the only Māori community at the school back in 1996) made some big demands on them to ensure our kids were getting the cultural food, or allowed to be Māori without feeling marginalized. My classes ended up improving this situation as most of the kids loved doing Māori stuff (e.g., waiata [songs], action songs, games, etc.). The spin-off was that our kids couldn’t wait until I got there every week to show off their ‘Māoriness,’ unusual as kids of teachers usually dread their parent’s school involvement (I know as my mother was my teacher briefly). We also involved parents and invited them down to Rotorua to ‘meet the whanau’ wananga. Without fail if I go to St. Heliers (a very elite Pākehā area) I get a ‘kia ora!’ or child hugging me! Little baby steps, but amazing how attitudes change with a bit of understanding. How has this influenced my identity? Well, as I said, 23 years ago it wasn’t cool to korero. Now it is and I guess me and my family are proud to be Māori and show it—reinforcing our cultural identity in everyday life.

This story, related to me on several occasions by Keri, never ceases to impress me. It suggests to me both the power of the Māori renaissance to “raise up” Māori to a point where they are able to assert/insert their values and worldviews in an urban context, and do this even in the most Pākehā neighborhoods, as well as the importance of the kōhanga reo in creating a cultural anchor for the de-marginalizing of identity.
Importantly, it also suggests the underlying role of space/place implicit in stories such as these, even if this role is not necessarily being consciously acknowledged or recognized. Kōhanga reo are spatial/platial anchors as much as they are social ones (much like marae, but less overtly so in terms of the symbolic built environment). The insistence on a Māori component in the St. Heliers School was a move to assert/insert a sense of Māoriness into the spaces/places of the school as much as it was into the sociality of the school. As a result a shift occurs in the social awareness of the residents of this part of Auckland that has the potential to shift how, in this case, wealthy Pākehā understand and interact with Māori. In fact, in all of Keri’s stories—

---

139 Although, it must be added here that kōhanga reo are often housed in marae.
140 I do not want to come across as too “idyllic” in my interpretation of Keri’s story here. There is no way to know or demonstrate without more in-depth research whether or not the changes that Keri and the other Māori involved with changing the school curriculum pushed through had an impact on these Pākehā in any real sense of shifting power relations. Did these Pākehā become more active in Māori issues as a result? Did they vote differently when elections came around? This research cannot answer these types of questions nor do I want to imply in any way these types of changes. But this does not mean that the experience that Keri relates is any
negotiating her Te Arawa and Auckland identities, becoming involved with Ngāti Whātua, developing a Māori sense of space/place through her university experiences, and pushing through enlightened Māori curriculum in her overwhelmingly Pākehā neighborhood—there is an underlying material geography that anchors identity and experience and interacts with sociality to inform and develop a sense of being Māori in the city that is grounded in whakamanatanga rather than crisis, resistance, or marginalization. This theme continues in the next featured interview, although with some very important variations.

5.4 “Māori by choice and by feeling:” From Forced to Fluid Māori Urbanisms, an Interview with Melanie Wall

Melanie Wall is in her thirties and is a Senior Tutor at Auckland University’s department of geography. Her research interests include race, culture, difference, Māori identity, youth, music, and everyday life. She was born and raised in Auckland, and more specifically in the Birkdale/Beach Haven area of Northshore City. She is of mixed Pākehā and Māori decent and has knowledge of her whakapapa, but limited ties to her hapū and iwi. As a result, her story differs significantly from that of Merata and Keri (see above) in that she

less meaningful. It certainly had an impact on how she experiences this area of Auckland, and did create a school curriculum that is more sensitive to Māori issues, even if the percentage of Māori in the school is still extremely small. It is further worth noting that when Keri read this footnote she added this comment: “Just a note regarding question in footnote: five teachers at my children’s school in St. Heliers, as a direct result of coming to Rotorua with us, went on to enroll and do...[language studies]...at AUT. They are all big advocates for Māori things now!”

141 Senior tutors have the same pay scale and responsibilities as Senior Lecturers in the New Zealand system, but they do not have a research requirement and, therefore, have a higher teaching load each semester.
does not have strong ties with her ancestral hapū or iwi. However, unlike many Māori who have lost this connection due to personal family histories that they had little or no control over, Melanie’s lack of tribal connectivity is as much a product of choice as it is a product of her family and personal history. Yet, despite this lack of connection, Melanie demonstrates a sense of identity that is profoundly tied to her Māori ethnicity. Adding to Melanie’s identity is the fact that her early childhood and young adult experiences were grounded in forced Māori urbanisms (low income urban environment dominated by a Polynesian population). Given this background, Melanie can best be described as a person who has transitioned from forced Māori urbanisms towards a combination of manuhiri fixed and fluid Māori urbanisms.

To begin to understand Melanie’s version of manuhiri/fluid Māori urbanisms it is necessary to understand the critical confluence of space/place and identity that played such an important role in forging her earliest Māori experiences. Melanie was born in Taupo, a medium sized town next to Aotearoa New Zealand’s largest lake (Lake Taupo). She is ancestrally linked to Ngāti Tuwharetoa, an iwi that claims the Lake Taupo area of the North Island as its tūrangawaewae. Her mother, of Pākehā decent, married her Māori father in Taupo but then divorced when Melanie was six. Being from Auckland, her mother moved back to the city with Melanie, moving into an area on the North Shore known as Beach Haven (see Figure 16).
The choice to move into this area of Northshore City was partly due to Melanie’s mother being from the North Shore, but was also driven by certain socio-economic realities. As a single parent, Melanie’s mother was attracted to this area because of the availability of affordable housing:

"Yeah, she grew up in Campbell’s Bay but obviously we could not afford to move there so we moved to the Beach Haven area. That area is an old State Housing area, one of the few areas—by default because it was a poor area— with large numbers of Māori, …so I grew up there…with quite a strong sense of an urban Māori identity."

This choice had a significant impact on Melanie’s identity because it brought her into daily contact with individuals coming from a lower socio-economic background and with lifestyles more closely resembling forced Māori urbanisms.

Melanie’s descriptions of her early identity formation are a combination of socio-geographic and socio-cultural context:
Melanie: Birkdale and Beach Haven, they are next to each other, and it’s basically down in a valley so it is physically isolated; the locals have lots of names for themselves—some call themselves Valley Girls and Valley Boys and others describe themselves as being from “The Haven”.

Serge: Does it have any relation to the Los Angeles meaning [Valley Girls]?

Melanie: No not at all, it has a totally Brown meaning.

The use of “brown” as an identity indicator was one that Melanie used often in describing her identity formation (it was also one that came up in interviews I did with several other Māori). It is a term that is infused with both class and race meanings in the way that Melanie describes it, but it is also one that was influenced by a geography that allowed for a certain topographical isolation further contributing to a sense of social distance from the dominant Pākehā social and residential environment associated with North Shore City.

Melanie: It is quite a different place. For example, when they wanted to rename the local high school in the late eighties because it had such a bad rep [reputation], they decided to let the sixth formers and the seventh formers at the local high school have a competition just to see what they thought they could call the school. Apparently three quarters of them voted to call it Sooty Valley High.

Serge: Is that a reference to skin color?

Melanie: Yes.

Serge: I guess they probably did not go with that?

Melanie: No. Instead of Birkdale College they went with Birkenhead College, which is a more affluent suburb adjacent to Birkdale/Beach Haven…

Serge: So in terms of what kind of identity that built for you…a lot of those things are identity components?

Melanie: They are, they are most definitely, because growing up in a predominantly Māori area meant that I had mainly a Māori identity…largely…not ruraly based, even though I knew my tribal affiliations, I knew my whakapapa. I didn’t actually go home much…so Auckland definitely became my home, but quite an isolated area of Auckland…I had no sense of what it meant to be from the North Shore, for me it was quite particular to that localized area which was a strongly race-based identity.
Melanie’s description of this period of her life demonstrates the profound impact of her urban socio-economic, and socio-geographic context. She developed a strong sense of her Māoriness, but this was folded into a more general sense of Brownness that was linked to a growing identification with African-American identity politics that she argued diffused to societies like those in Aotearoa New Zealand in the wake of the American civil rights movement. It was also an intensely urban identity, although a very isolated (bordering on ghetto-like) urban experience.

Many of the social ills often stereotypically attached to Māori in urban areas held true in Beach Haven, and Melanie’s life changed significantly when she was sent to a school outside of the Beach Haven area:

Melanie: But then on top of that, when I was going from intermediate to college (which was twelve-thirteen) I got sent out of there, because it was quite a bad area...I was hanging with the wrong elements.

Serge: Were you?

Melanie: Yes, most definitely, and that ended up being quite a good thing, my boyfriend at the time ended up dying in a car crash at sixteen, and many of us ended up inside [a euphemism for being in prison], and my best friend had four kids with four different fathers by the time she was eighteen... So I got sent to a very affluent school out of our [school] zone. It was my mum’s old school, which had become much flasher than in her day...it was still a State School though. Westlake Girls was single sex and almost everyone was Pākehā, so it was quite different to what I was used to...because I had a more mixed background. Initially, almost all my friends were Māori but each year I had to get myself different friends because they kept dropping out of school...

Serge: Māori at that school?

Melanie: Yeah and by my second to last year of college there were virtually no Māori or Polynesian students left. So by the last year of college I had a large number of Pākehā friends by default as there were few Maori and Polynesian students left. As such, being out of zone and being from a different background to most of the students, I often felt out of place at Westlake but this gave me good grounding for coming to University.
Thus we see that in Melanie’s case a change in geography played a critical role in her ongoing identity formation. While she still lived in the Beach Haven area she was meaningfully exposed to a Pākehā world where she discovered her intellectual “voice.” In this new single sex Pākehā educational context she was no longer constrained by gender or race-based social conformities that limited her motivation to express her academic abilities. As it turned out these constraints, once removed, showed Melanie to be what she refers to as a “high achiever;” they allowed her to excel in academics, which eventually resulted in her choice and ability to pursue a university degree and, eventually, an academic career.

Melanie’s experiences growing up in a working class neighborhood with a significant Polynesian population, and then her eventual ability to move out of this context (geographically and socially) marks her transition from forced to fluid Māori urbanisms. In this sense, her story exemplifies the flexibility that exists in the categories and further serves to remind us that these are anything but essential categories. Given the right set of opportunities and context fluid Māori urbanisms can emerge out of a broad range of backgrounds, and Melanie is a testament to this ability.

Importantly, Melanie also represents a Māori woman with a profound Māori identity derived not from a strong sense of connection to her whakapapa (although there is some of this), but rather an identity derived from her urban experiences. This is a critical point because it suggests that there are many pathways to achieving whakamanatanga-based Māori urbanisms than just those that involve connections or re-connections with a traditional Māori whakapapa and tūrangawaewae. While this may be a controversial point for some, it is
nonetheless a crucial one. It is crucial because it recognizes segments of Māori living within an urban context in culturally and professionally productive ways that are not necessarily linked at the level of everyday life to a traditional way of understanding Māori cultural identity. This is, importantly, in no way meant to undermine or lessen the critical importance of traditionally linked Māori urban identities, but rather to broaden the definition of what we mean when we engage in a discussion of Māori identity in the context of the Māori urban experience. This broader perspective is a powerful one because it is inclusive, and through this inclusivity furthers a sense of Māori infusing Māori values and worldviews into the urban context.

We have already seen in the case of Merata and Keri two ways in which Māori values and worldviews are asserted/inserted in the urban context, and how these both represent forms of Māori urbanisms grounded in social and material expressions of whakamanatanga. The form of urbanism that Melanie describes is also anchored in the social and material, but in very different ways than those described by either Merata or Keri. When Melanie describes her sense of Māori identity in relation to urban space/place it is much more about the power of Māori to define and perceive the urban context as being meaningfully Māori than it is about creating physical spaces/places of Māori urbanisms (e.g., the Māori urban marae). This point comes through as our conversation continued:

*Serge:* But if you don’t do kapa haka and things like that, are there things that you do that kind of reinforce your sense of being Māori? Or do you just carry it inside of you?

*Melanie:* I carry it inside of me...It’s partly reinforced by my friendship group. We had, for example, a regular get-together of some of the brown girls who are my friends from school. This is a brown girl get-together is where we go out to dinner and our sense of humor is both Māori and Polynesian. A couple of my friends are Niuean and Samoan
and we deliberately didn’t invite any of our Pākehā friends from school because we wanted to be as unconstrained as we want to be and there’s something different in our conversation when we get together. But that’s not space, it’s a place.

Serge: But it’s mobile?

Melanie: Yes, it’s mobile…

Serge: You create the space wherever you are…

Melanie: Absolutely, but it is something that we bring, it is something that…is within us, and sometimes we extend to the others around us, but in this situation no one else is invited…and it becomes a liberating space, one we actively have sought to promote. There are spaces and times when I sense my urban Māori identity much more…where I feel much more comfortable being obviously Māori. I went to a fund raising gig at Kelston Boys a few weeks back, for example, to support a friend of a friend. Everyone there was either Polynesian (especially Sāmoan) or Māori, both the performers and the audience. This space felt comfortably Brown. Being Māori is not subsumed in this Brown context but rather there is an unspoken connection between us in this situation. Your sense of identity is completely different in this context; a Pākehā person would be the outsider, and I feel completely Māori. Being Māori, it’s not anything I say or do, it just is.

These comments represents a theme that was consistent throughout my discussions with Melanie, and are indicative of some of the differences embedded within the concept of fluid Māori urbanism. How is it possible for a person such as Melanie to simultaneously feel powerfully Māori and yet not have strong ties to a more traditional whakapapa and tūrangawaewae-based identity?

Despite the controversial nature of this question, it is a critical one to answer because Melanie’s sense of Māori urban identity, I argue, is not unique, but rather representative of an important segment of the Māori urban population in cities like Auckland. There is a broad range of Māori in cities, from those that are deeply and meaningfully connected to their tangata whenua or manuhiri whakapapa and tūrangawaewae identities (sometimes in combination), to those who have little or no knowledge of their Māori heritage. Yet this range of
difference does not seem to be a definitive criteria for judging levels of Māoriness. Moreover, my research suggests that the city plays a critical role in the formation of Māori, like Melanie, that are both powerfully Māori in identity yet not particularly connected to their Māori heritage through whakapapa or tūrangawaewae. There seems to be a greater flexibility among Māori that have this characteristic in terms of their ability (or willingness) to identify a Māori urban geography outside of the more obvious or traditional icons of Māori culture (e.g., the marae, tangata whenua status, tūrangawaewae), and instead carry their Māoriness with them in ways that allow them to create Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga in the spaces/places that they occupy socially.

Some of the key elements of the above assertions are exemplified in the following conversation I had with Melanie. The statements by her that follow were a response to a rather long explanation on my part about my research. I explained that the interviews I had done so far suggested to me that there were multiple ways of representing a sense of Māori urbanisms. I asked her to comment on this multiplicity of views and perspectives:

[...] well that’s the point isn’t it, and that would be my comment. That there are multiple ways of seeing Māori spaces amongst Māori. But even then my biggest problem with it is the notion of a Maori urbanism; that there is a singular way of using or seeing space. There is no singular Maori way of being, seeing and doing. For instance, when an artist paints a painting, you can infer any kind of meaning in the painting; it is up to the viewer as to how they see it, and there will be multiple, overlapping, different, hegemonic and oppositional readings of that painting. It’s the same with space and Maori urbanism. You can have multiple readings, multiple uses, multiple people interpreting and using spaces in different kinds of ways. Whilst identity is always contextual and situated, it is a process, it’s not constant. It shouldn’t be constant. This touches on Fanon’s idea about cultural closure. He wrote that when marginalized cultures come to find a voice, they often essentialize their experience. As a result culture can become fossilized, a sort of living death. Basically in the process of understanding one’s culture, you start defining what it is, and then it seems it can only be that way. I feel there is definitely a space for Maori urban initiatives so long as they don’t become exclusionary, reified as the only legitimate expression of Maori urbanity. I think, alongside these initiatives, can’t Māori
spaces be everywhere, in the way of mana whenua, to allow a true multiplicity and use of space?

This idea of a “multiplicity and use of space” in terms of asserting/inserting Māori values and worldviews into the urban context is key to understanding the implications of Melanie’s arguments. One interpretation of her statement is a certain sense of liberation that comes from being disconnected from more traditionally Māori identity constructs. While those more entrenched in the traditional perspective may argue that any view that breaks away from these traditional iwi/hapū/whanau-based socio-geographic identities seriously undermines claims to being Māori, my interview with Melanie (as well as with other Māori) suggests that this non-traditional view is not only relevant, but may even represent new and important ways for Māori to live and create Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga in cities like Auckland (e.g., whakamanatanga-based Māori urban geographies do not necessarily have to begin with the marae).

Melanie’s kōrero also exemplifies a primary characteristic of fluid Māori identities: the ability to develop new ways of being Māori that comfortably borrow from other traditions and perspectives, but in doing so do not cause individuals to conceive of themselves as any less Māori. In the absence of strong connections to whakapapa, tūrangawaewae, hapū and/or iwi, stories such as Melanie’s suggest ways in which Māori, many of them living in an urban context, can be powerfully Māori without these connections. Her story also suggests that whakamanatanga-based Māori urban space/place, even outside the confines of traditional ones such as Māori marae, can be created in the urban context. This theme of creating non-traditional Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga is continued in the next two sections.
5.5 Creating Living Māori Geographies: Tairawhiti Museum’s C Company Exhibit

When I first traveled to Aotearoa New Zealand in July 2000 I spent several days in Gisborne, a medium sized city on the east coast of the North Island. At the time I was still in the beginning phases of working on a proposal for this dissertation and my trip to Gisborne involved meeting with several people (Māori and non-Māori) I had been referred to by my committee chair, Dr. Brian Murton. It was during one of these meetings that I had an experience that played an important role in planting the seeds of an idea that would eventually lead to my Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga thesis, and it seems relevant and worthwhile here to include that experience as another example of whakamanatanga-based Māori urbanisms. At that time I was still very much influenced by the film *Once Were Warriors* (Tamahori, 1994) and, as a result, was expecting to look at the impact that the city had on Māori, and expecting that for the most part this impact was one of crisis and/or resistance to a negative socio-cultural urban context brought on by processes of Māori urbanization and the legacy of colonialism. But when I met with the then director of Gisborne’s Tairawhiti Museum, Mike Spedding, I was forced to rethink this thesis in important and, as it turned out, profound ways (see Figure 17).
The Tairawhiti Museum was an early pioneer in efforts to incorporate Māori worldviews and values into their mission and design philosophy. This was done through such measures as significant Māori representation on the museum’s board of trustees (in 2000 over 50% Māori), and through the implementation of design features that honored Māori understandings of space/place (e.g., orientation of entranceways, location of food stalls, how Māori taonga were displayed).\footnote{Taonga are defined as “property, goods, possessions, effects, treasure, something prized” (AUT online Māori dictionary: \url{http://www.maoridictionary.co.nz/index.cfm}).} As Mike Spedding (who is himself not Māori) walked me through the grounds of the museum and showed me the exhibits, he explained all of this to me. These features alone impressed me greatly. It was clear that underneath all of this honoring and implementing of Māori worldviews and values was real power sharing, and that much of this power sharing was going into reinterpretations of space/place in order to make this...
museum one that truly celebrated and respected Māori culture, society and history.

As I listened to Mike’s descriptions and explanations I began to have trouble equating what I was seeing to the Māori urban crisis portrayed in Once Were Warriors. It was not that this crisis had somehow magically disappeared, that would have been a ridiculously naïve conclusion, but rather that what I was seeing suggested a whole series of possibilities about how Māori currently were going about producing their culture, even in the heart of a fairly good sized Aotearoa New Zealand city like Gisborne; ways that were certainly not grounded in crisis, and were perhaps even moving beyond resistance. But these glimmerings of ideas exploded into epiphany when Mike showed me one last exhibit. It was clear that he understood the impact of this exhibit on visitors to the museum and that he had, as a result, intentionally concluded my tour at this part of the museum.

This last exhibit was designed to “celebrate the men and memories of the C. Company, Māori (28) Battalion,” one of many Māori units that fought during WWII. The name of this exhibit, “The Price of Citizenship,” is suggestive of how many Māori perceived the impact of their fighting for the Aotearoa New Zealand government (the Crown) during this war. This service marked a highly symbolic (and yet so intensely real) moment in the history of Māori relations with the Crown. The makeup of these battalions was organized by iwi/hapū, and the Tairawhiti exhibit was dedicated to the company with Māori men from in and
around the Gisborne region. As a result this exhibit was both broadly socio-historical and yet deeply local in its presentation.\textsuperscript{143}

While all of these aspects of this exhibit are important, it was the design and symbolic meanings embedded in this exhibit that had the most impact on me. These two elements acted interdependently in the presentation of this exhibit. The main part of the exhibit, its centerpiece, was designed in the shape of the koru (see Figure 18), a spiral shape commonly seen in Māori design. As I walked along this koru I finally entered into a center room with a single bench in the middle. Surrounding the bench was a circular wall filled top to bottom with photographs of young Māori men, but also many frames that were empty with only names below them. When the exhibit first opened the museum put frames for all the men that served in the C. Company, but the frames filled with photographs represented only a small percentage of the total number. Their hope was that as Māori came to visit this exhibit relatives of the men that served but had no picture would see the name of their ancestor and, if available, donate a photograph to add another face to this wall of honor. When I was there in 2000 barely half of the frames were filled, but a more recent photograph from 2008 shows a room where nearly all of the frames are filled.

\textsuperscript{143} The above quote and much of the factual information in this section was obtained from the Tairawhiti Museum website: http://www.tairawhitimuseum.org.nz/exhibits-galleries/semi-perm-exhibits/cco.asp.
Figure 18: Tairawhiti Museum C Company Exhibit: a more recent photograph of the interior of the koru showing many more photographs than when I first visited this exhibit in 2000 (source: Tairawhiti Museum website http://www.tairawhitimuseum.org.nz/exhibits-galleries-semi-perm-exhibits/cco.asp).

It is difficult to describe the impact this exhibit had on me, and the profound way it germinated the seed of my Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga thesis. One of the most remarkable aspects of this exhibit was its ability to elicit a palpable sense of living history. Unlike more traditional museum exhibits controlled entirely by the creators and presented in a proprietary manner, this exhibit was one that gave a sense of meaningful relationship with the local Māori community. It did this by inviting them to participate in its ongoing formation through photographic contributions, and by creating a space/place that simultaneously elicited intense emotion and deep pride. While I, as an outsider, could appreciate it as well (it gave me chicken skin in fact), I was simultaneously aware that a whole set of references and relationships were involved in this exhibit that I could not be a part of.
It is useful and important to consider here how this exhibit embodied so much of what it means to argue from a Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga perspective. As noted previously, there are three specific requirements that must be fulfilled in order to argue a space/place represents this kind of geography. In the first place it must be a Māori space/place to a significant extent. While other non-Māori influences, as will be shown in Chapters 6 through 8, can come into play, the Māori element has to be present in a meaningful and substantive way. The C Company exhibit at Tairawhiti museum was palpably Māori both in presentation and, through the participation of Māori donating photographs, in use as well. Second, this kind of geography must be meaningfully urban. Tairawhiti museum is located in Gisborne and museums in general have a long history of urban association. Third, Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga must have a material component—they represent socio-culturally produced space/place—that fosters, maintains and reproduces a sense of whakamanatanga in those that interact with these spaces/places.

This last component is, of course, critical, and the C Company exhibit demonstrates this exceptionally well. A whakamanatanga-based space/place is one that involves three critical elements: meaningful control, lived participation and creative growth. Through the Tairawhiti board of trustees and through the participation of Māori consulting on the design of the exhibit meaningful control was manifested. Through the invitation to those Māori visiting the exhibit to offer stories and photographs for those without visual representation, the Gisborne Māori community was able to not only experience but actively participate in this exhibit; it was, in other words, a truly living exhibit. And
through this participation a creative process is undertaken, one that impacts an ever-broadening community as more and more people visit this exhibit, and through the feedback the creators of this exhibit get from this community of viewers and participants. This meaningful control/lived/creative process is an essential part of whakamanatanga-based geographies and, as we will see in the next section, is not unique to Tairawhiti’s C Company exhibit.

5.6 Fluid Māori Urbanisms at the Waikato Museum: Brett Graham and Rachel Rakena’s Aniwaniwa Exhibit

Venturing out of Auckland is always exciting because nowhere else in Aotearoa New Zealand is quite like this sprawling global city (including the other large cities). On one of these occasions I found myself in Hamilton, a city of approximately 200,000 (4\textsuperscript{th} largest urban area in Aotearoa New Zealand) located in the Waikato region of the North Island (around 130 kilometers south of Auckland; see Figure 19). Hamilton sits solidly within the iwi domain of Tainui (and its various hapū) and is the central place for a thriving agricultural region. The Māori of Waikato suffered some of the most extensive land confiscations by the Aotearoa New Zealand government, and have been fighting ever since to re-acquire lands they consider to have been taken from them illegally (with some success it should be noted, although this fight is ongoing).\textsuperscript{144}

While in Hamilton on this particular trip I was invited to a gallery opening at the Waikato museum, and it was at this opening that the tragic

\textsuperscript{144} The Tainui website is a good place to begin to understand this history: http://www.tainui.co.nz/main.html.
history of Māori land loss and whakamanatanga-based Māori urbanisms converged (see Figure 19). The show was titled *Aniwaniwa* and was the creation of artists Brett Graham and Rachael Rakena.\(^\text{145}\) I include this opening and exhibit here because, like the Tairawhiti C. Company exhibit, it so profoundly illustrates what is meant by fluid Māori urbanisms and, simultaneously, how these urbanisms are capable of producing Māori urban geographies of Whakamanatanga. It does this by managing to combine effectively and unapologetically the modern and the traditional in ways that both create traditional Māori space/place while simultaneously intertwining this space/place with cutting edge forms of modern art. And it does this in a major museum that, as was noted in the previous section, is an iconic built environment and significant institution of major urban areas.

A gallery opening for Māori artists at a major museum is never an informal affair. In the case of this particular opening a formal *powhiri* was held beginning outside of the museum and culminating with a ritual welcoming by the host Māori and responses from guests in front of Waikato museum’s whare nui (carved meeting house; Te Kohao o te Ngira).\(^\text{146}\) After the powhiri, hosts and guests moved on to the exhibit where the artists introduced the art,

\(^{145}\) I first met Brett Graham while we were both students at the East West Center in Honolulu, Hawai’i between the years of 1990-1992. He is a forty one year old artist of mixed Māori and Pākehā ancestry, and is the son of a very accomplished Māori artist and is, in his own right, also an accomplished artist. He has worked in many mediums, although probably best known for his sculptures. Rachel Rakena is a digital and moving image artist of Ngai Tahu, Nga Puhi and Ngāti Pākehā descent. She is known for contributing to collaborative works with artists working in many other mediums.

\(^{146}\) A powhiri is a ritualized ceremony involving host tangata whenua welcoming guest manuhiri onto a marae. Speeches are given and ultimately the negative spiritual energy between host and guest is cleansed allowing for comfortable association between the groups. Most major contemporary Aotearoa New Zealand museums have a carved meeting house, and almost always these are “living” exhibits in that they are used by the local Māori community for special occasions. Significantly, this particular whare nui was carved and designed by Brett’s father, Fred Graham.
explaining its meaning and, particular to this exhibit, how its use was intended.  

![Figure 19: Location of Hamilton, Aotearoa New Zealand, North Island (left); location of Waikato Museum (right) (source: base maps from Google Maps).](image)

Issues of use, occupation, meaning, and even the reactions of those viewing this exhibit for the first time are all revealing and helpful to understanding how this exhibit serves as another example of both fluid Māori urbanisms and Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga. Aniwaniwa occupied a large room with dim ambient lighting. The hosts and guests were invited into the room to gather around and listen to the artists explain their work. When one first enters they are immediately struck by two elements of the exhibit, and then by a third one once eyes adjust to the dim lighting. The first is the ethereal music playing reminiscent of a Māori woman calling visitors onto

---

147 The Waikato Museum’s website has an excellent overview of this exhibit for those interested in delving deeper in its intended meaning: http://www.waikatomuseum.co.nz/news/pageid/2145841180/ANIWANIWA.
the grounds of a marae (if you have never heard this sound before it inevitably gives you chicken skin). Second, one is struck by the odd shaped “pods” hanging from the ceiling. Finally, as eyes adjust, it becomes apparent that the floor of the space/place is dominated by thin bed mats with head cushions, oriented so as to be under the hanging pods (see Figure 20).

![Figure 20: Artists Brett Graham and Rachael Rakena introducing the exhibit (left), and supine viewers (right).](image)

Outside of the exhibit is a large plaque that describes Aniwaniwa in the following manner:

Aniwaniwa is a stirring tribute to Horahora village where Brett Graham’s father lived and his grandfather worked at the power station. In Aniwaniwa the theme of submersion is used both as a metaphor for cultural loss, and as a medium to retell stories of survival. Wider references are made to environmental issues, rising sea levels and global warming, and concerns about cultural loss in an era of globalization. The visual anecdotes are fittingly contained in the Wakahuia [treasure box], because they represent lost treasures and revisits a place that begs us to remember her; poignant of whakapapa and land that provide us with a sense of belonging, even when that place is no longer visible to us.

The village and power station were flooded in 1947 to create Lake Karapiro, to feed the new larger power station down-stream. It is of particular significance that Aniwaniwa comes home to the Waikato Museum after being exhibited at the 52nd Venice Biennial, 2007. For it is here in the Waikato, where Horahora now lies in her watery grave and where the imagery has its whakapapa (origin).
Much like the C. Company exhibit at Tairawhiti Museum, this exhibit was intended to fully engage the viewer as participant. It did this by encouraging (almost demanding) that the viewer lie down on the mats and watch the visual display above them in this fully reclined position. From this supine position one watches video images on the pods hanging from the ceiling. These deeply surreal and evocative video images were of Māori going about their everyday lives in the village of Horahora, but doing so entirely submerged in water. Ghostly images were interspersed with an intense eye-like spiral that was intended to evoke the spinning of the power plant’s turbines (see Figure 21).

As viewers participated in the recurring submerged world of Horahora they also were ensconced in an ongoing occupation of space/place. Aniwaniwa literally produced an aesthetic space/place of Māori culture and politics. It was a space/place of mourning, a space/place of honoring, and a space/place of recapturing. Through this exhibit the mana (spiritual power) and whakapapa (genealogy) of Horahora was re-established in, importantly, a particularly Māori way through memory and storytelling, but also just as importantly through the claiming of museum space/place and the use of modern technology.

This occupation, claiming and social production of space/place, was rife with symbolic meaning. The mats on the floor were meant to evoke the marae in that whare nui typically have these types of mats for overnight guests to rest and sleep on. This symbolic evocation of an intensely Māori sacred space/place (the marae) was juxtaposed with the quintessentially postmodern hanging pods; and the use of video further suggested the ability of modern technology to be used in
the service of Māori cultural production. Certainly this exhibit was experimental and innovative in terms of ways to (re)present Māori culture and politics. And certainly these artists were pushing the boundaries of how Māori culture and politics can and should be (re)presented.
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Figure 21: Images From Aniwaniwa Exhibit: Submerged clothing hanging on a line as the people of Horahora go about their everyday lives (top left); turbines spinning (top right & bottom right); submerged man peering out at the audience (bottom left)

This last point became clear to me during the social gathering that occurred after the visitors had spent time in the exhibit. As I sat sipping punch
and absorbing as much of this experience as I could, several of the old kuia sitting next to me engaged me in conversation. After “talking story” for a bit as is the way in the Polynesian world (Where are you from? How do you know the artist? Why are you here?), these kuia then asked me quite frankly what I thought of the exhibit. As I prepared my answer, wanting to show that I had a deep appreciation and some understanding of things Māori, I suddenly realized that this is not what they were looking for. As I looked into their eyes it was clear that they were hoping that I could explain to them the meaning they were supposed to glean from this exhibit. This took me by surprise in that I assumed that as Māori they would have access to the cultural and political meaning and content of this exhibit to a greater extent than I did. As it turned out, however, they were having a difficult time digesting the meaning of this exhibit, and they finally admitted to me and to each other that they really did not get it at all. And yet at the same time it was clear that they were deeply proud that Māori artists were being given this space/place of honor.

On the one hand, it seemed as if Brett and Rachel’s interpretation of Horahora was so avant-garde that it produced symbolisms and meanings that were outside the realm of some Māori, particularly of the older generation, to comprehend. And yet on the other, it still managed to produce a sense of pride and, possibly, whakamanatanga. This contrast reminded me of another conversation I had with a young Māori DJ. As he was talking about his upbringing he made this remarkable observation:

…the generations in my family were really close together so my grandparents had their children early, at a young age, and so did my mother so growing up I saw a lot of those

---

148 Kuia is Māori for old lady.
generations, so I knew my great grandparents, and my great great grandparents and the
differences and transitions [inaudible]...and it was definitely...in my parents it was
definitely hard for them to grasp the things around them and...[they] did and have
now...totally a part of it...but made easier for us...it was made easier for us through
them, and now it makes it a little bit easier for us to reach back a few steps and then bring
them forward...

The kuia I was speaking to were of a generation that experienced profoundly the
legacy of colonialism. Yet despite the intense burden of this legacy many of
these Māori persevered and set the foundations, many in urban areas, for future
generations to prosper. Artists such as Brett Graham and Rachael Rakena are the
products of these kuia’s stubborn resistance to assimilation/acculturation; in
exhibits such as these they are attempting to at once look forward to future
potentials while simultaneously celebrating and honoring their whakapapa. By
doing this they are, in other words, reaching “back a few steps” to bring the
generations forward that gave them the foundation to prosper in the present.

Aniwaniwa is a cultural bridge connecting a past history to a
whakamanatanga-based future. It is a statement that aspects of Māori culture
considered essential to the expression of this group, like whakapapa, can be
celebrated and honored while simultaneously integrating a modern context.
And it is an illustration of the power of the material and of the ability of
space/place to reinforce and reproduce this backward honoring/forward
looking cultural politics. And all of this in a museum located in Aotearoa New
Zealand’s fourth largest city.
5.7 “So that we can better see our faces in our places:” A Conversation with Māori Architect Rau Hoskins

In this final case study one of the principle founders of a Māori architecture firm, Rau Hoskins, is highlighted. The work being done by this architect and his colleagues is quite remarkable in that it represents a coming together of fixed Māori and fluid Māori urbanisms. In commingling these two types of Māori urbanisms this architecture firm is a leader in producing built environments that not only articulate Māori conceptions of space/place, but also do so in a way that exemplifies Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga. The result is built environments whose designs foster, maintain and reproduce traditional Māori values and worldviews while simultaneously incorporating the urban environment in new and exciting ways.

Figure 22: Location of designTRIBE in Auckland (source: base map from Google Maps).
Rau Hoskins is an Auckland University trained architect and one of the founders and principle partners at *designTRIBE*, an architecture firm dedicated to designing and building structures that incorporate, at all phases of the design process, Māori values and perspectives (see Figure 22). Besides his work at *designTRIBE* Rau is also a part time lecturer in architecture at Unitec (a type of New Zealand university similar to polytechs or community colleges in the United States), and an active participant in efforts to infuse Māori design values into Aotearoa New Zealand’s cultural landscapes through *Te Aranga Maori Cultural Landscape Strategy*, which encourages collaborations between Māori tribal groupings, the Māori design community and local and regional government.

Rau is a member of Nga Puhi, which is the main tribe of Northland (occupying the expansive peninsula that extends north-east from Auckland) and has extensive knowledge of his whakapapa (genealogy) and tūrangawaewae (land that, through his whakapapa, he has a right to occupy). Although born in Auckland, Rau spent much of his childhood “up north”, but eventually moved to Auckland as a young adult to pursue higher education. He has a bachelors and masters degree in architecture from Auckland University. Rau is a man of strong personality and persona and is a recognized leader in the Māori design community. It is clear from the most casual conversations with Rau that he is passionate about both Māori architecture and Māori issues in general.

Early in his undergraduate education (1980s) Rau was aware of the lack of any type of Māori perspective in the architectural teaching at Auckland University:
I quite quickly became aware of the shortcomings of the architectural course at Auckland, and the shortcomings of the lecturers in terms of their knowledge and appreciation of things Māori, and Māori architecture...there were two or three lecturers who were very pro Māori and open to supporting Māori students and the rest were pretty dismissive of those sort of things and kind of...like the rest of the architectural profession...privileged European traditions and North American architecture over anything local and/or Pacific.

This lead Rau, along with some other Māori architecture students, to begin to explore ways of thinking about architecture from a Māori perspective. It is this early drive to assert/insert a Māori perspective into existing architectural conventions and ideologies that eventually lead Rau and several others to first envision, and then establish designTRIBE.

*designTRIBE* is located in an area of Auckland City known as Grey Lynn. This neighborhood, once dominated by working class housing and a predominantly Polynesian population, is now a very fashionable area that has experienced classic gentrification (Latham, 2002). Grey Lynn, and the adjacent Ponsonby Road business district are now dominated by renovated and highly picturesque housing, trendy pubs, cafes, and restaurants and have, mostly due to prohibitive land and rent prices, a majority upper middle income Pākehā demographic profile (Latham, 2002). While there are still some pockets of Polynesian dominated lower income housing dotted in and around Grey Lynn and Ponsonby, they are clearly representative of a minority residential population that are, for the most part, a product of difficult to move State Housing apartments.

Grey Lynn and Ponsonby represent the types of “creative culture” neighborhoods urban civic leaders throughout the Western world encourage and get excited about (Hubbard, 2006). They are perceived by these leaders to be areas of economic productivity that are attractive to tourists and middle to upper
income residents alike. They are perceived as areas of civility, safety, and desirability leading to increasing land values and all the income generating ripple effects that go along with these increases (particularly, from a government perspective, the increase in property taxes). They are also areas that result in often large-scale displacement of lower income groups and a general homogenizing of the demographic landscape, as only people that can afford to rent or buy in these areas come to dominate, and in Aotearoa New Zealand these people tend to be Pākehā (Latham, 2002; Hubbard, 2006).

*designTRIBE* fits well into this type of neighborhood and sits apart as different in important ways. On the one hand, architectural firms like *designTRIBE* are exactly the type of profession that these types of neighborhoods attract; architects are highly skilled white-collar professionals, but also creative-artistic types who fit easily into an inner city trendy neighborhood. On the other hand, the politics of *designTRIBE* are in many ways antithetical to the elitist and homogenizing influences that are often the driving forces behind gentrified neighborhoods. *designTRIBE* is dedicated to fostering stronger communities, particularly among the lower income groups, through the design process and by creating built environments that serve these communities. Yet, *designTRIBE* is located in a neighborhood that in many ways represents the dismantling of these types of communities, many of them once dominated by working class Māori and other Polynesians. Ultimately, however, I would argue that this seeming contradiction is more ironic than truly representative of a tension inherent in

---

149 This observation is derived primarily from my own personal experiences in and around the architectural community.
designTRIBE’s existence. At the time designTRIBE moved into Grey Lynn rents were still quite reasonable and this is one of the main reasons they located there.

Figure 23: designTRIBE entranceway (left) and exterior (right)

Figure 24: designTRIBE interior

When you first walk into designTRIBE there is little about it that immediately makes one think, “this is a Māori space/place.” Certainly the name suggests an indigenous component, although a simple online search finds this
name popping up from Ireland to India to the USA. *designTRIBE* has an unassuming front door leading up to the second floor of the two-story building where it is located (see Figure 23 and 24). As one climbs the stairs and enters onto the second floor—neatly designed, well lit with high ceilings—one is reminded of nothing more than a small architecture firm going about the business of designing buildings. True, after a moment one might begin to acknowledge, or become aware of the “unusual” models hanging on the wall or sitting on a table (these are technically called land plates). These are not your typical models (no sky scrapers or obviously Western style buildings here), and anyone with even a basic knowledge of Māori building design would recognize the elements in these land plates that strongly suggest a Māori influenced design. But despite these visual clues one is still not overwhelmed by a sense of Māoriness. Nor do the faces of the people working at Kfm shout that this is a Māori place; some are Māori, some are not, some are brown faces some white.

But this surface impression is misleading. On closer inspection it becomes obvious that *designTRIBE* is an intensely Māori space/place. Importantly, however, this Māoriness is embedded in what is being done there and what is being conceived there, rather than any overt Māoriness evident in the space/place itself. There is a certain irony here that an business so profoundly dedicated to incorporating Māori values into the design process and product is not particularly designed as an overtly Māori space/place itself. An obvious contrast would be with the Māori marae—a space/place that in every minute aspect of its design represents and embodies traditional Māori values and worldview. But I don’t think this represents a contradiction in terms of the main
thesis here: that Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga exist at the interface of Māori urban sociality and Māori urban materiality.

Rather, it suggests that the creation of these geographies does not have to always incorporate heavily symbolic elements. In some cases a space/place can be created that is radically dedicated to asserting/inserting a Māori sense of space/place into (in this case) building design, and yet occupy a space/place that is basically following a Western sense of, and use of, space/place. When asked the question, “so when you think of designTRIBE now do you think of it as a Māori place?” Rau responded:

Rau: I think what’s happened in the last three to four years...what I’ve tried to...well, there has always been the desire, but I think what we have been able to do in the last few years is to provide a place for Māori graduates to come and begin to work with their own people; so we’ve got Ripeka, we’ve got Amiria, and we’ve got Anaru, and just recently we’ve got Charmaine who’s from Tonga. So the idea there is to try to provide a working environment, which is welcoming to Māori, and more recently Pacific students where they can begin to work with their own people. And it’s been a conscious effort, but it has taken some years for those graduates to come through the system to the point where they can be employed, so...

Serge: Sounds like designTRIBE is a conduit or hub...

Rau: It is! Take Ripeka she came and worked for us for two years, she always intended on doing two years, and has moved on to Sydney but has maintained contact with us and, well, you know, who knows...we’ve got two other staff members that have gone away for a period of time but come back. Miles, who’s not Māori, but has an affinity for Māori projects went away to Sydney for over two years and was really pleased to come back to work with us, and has brought new skills that he learned from there. So, do I think it’s a Māori place? I think it’s a Māori friendly place, I think from my perspective probably eighty percent of the work we do is Māori still, and in terms of the practitioners we have here there’s Maurits...he’s a speaker of Māori, and has always been very interested in Māori things, and back from student days, when we did our first ever Māori projects in 1993 he was invited to be part of it because of his affinity to the place that we were designing, plus he’d demonstrated his commitment over a long period of time. So I think of myself in one of three directors. Certainly where I am coming from provides a base where Māori can work with Māori and people can begin to forge connection with their own people. For instance Amiria (who you may get to talk to as well), the third project I got Mataitaua Marae project, was the Hokianga Harbor...a marae; it turned out to be her marae...she didn’t know it...but it turned out to be one of her marae.
In *designTRIBE*’s case the actual design of the space/place is based on the practical demands of maintaining a functioning architectural business rather than some sense of ignoring or not acknowledging the importance of Māori design. It is very much a “conduit” for Māori activity and the furthering of Māori values through their insertion/assertion into the built environment, and yet the people at *designTRIBE* can comfortably do this in an urban environment and office space that does not deviate significantly from a Western model.

This is a very important point because it suggests that the process of creating and maintaining these Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga is not necessarily dependent on reproducing traditional Māori spaces/places. For example, these types of geographies are not only confined to the urban marae; they are happening in all kinds of spaces/places in cities like Auckland. In this sense it can be argued that Māori living and actualizing these geographies are as comfortable and productive in spaces/places of modernity as they are in those spaces/places that are quintessentially Māori (the marae being the most obvious example). These spaces/places are, in other words, no less Māori whether on a marae or in a modern architectural office. This does not negate the importance of the material, but rather expands the range of possible spaces/places that foster, maintain and reproduce whakamanatanga, and emphasizes that the actions and practices of those inhabiting these environment are an absolutely essential component of creating Māori urban geographies that manifest whakamanatanga. To better understand how the people at *designTRIBE* are able to create this space/place of Māori urban whakamanatanga it is useful to look at how this business came to be and to draw on the ideas and stories about what *designTRIBE* is all about.
The origins of designTRIBE involve a group of like-minded designers coming together over several years and slowly conceiving and then establishing this architecture firm. It was a slow process for both financial and professional reasons, but eventually by the middle 1990s designTRIBE was up and running. Understanding designTRIBE involves comprehending its mission; to describe it as a purely for profit architectural firm is to seriously misunderstand what the people at designTRIBE are all about. As Rau describes it,

[we met regularly and we worked up a kaupapa (constitution), a basic kaupapa of what we were about and essentially (as I’ve probably mentioned before) we were trying to practice architecture in such a way that we could work with disenfranchised groups...groups that weren’t served by the mainstream architectural community. In other words Māori groups, working class groups, community groups; people who weren’t middle class, who didn’t have ready access to finance and architecture and architects, so to speak.

This statement suggests that designTRIBE is as much or more about community outreach, with a specific focus on the Māori and the socio-economically challenged groups, as it is about profit or pure architectural design. However, as Rau explains these two groups were often one and the same: “It was a community design initiative at that time but more often than not that meant a Māori community component.” This theme came up again when Rau was describing work done by himself and designTRIBE in Whakatane (a medium size city east of Auckland in the eastern Bay of Plenty) working with the local iwi, Ngāti Awa:

[s]o we began to bring their [Ngāti Awa] aspirations into our plan, and began to find out a lot of history about the town things of where their sacred sites had been removed, or built over, or blasted. It’s bringing those aspirations back into the planning process. And so while we were also dealing with wider community issues, we were able from that project on to say well, you know, Māori are always going to be an affected party in any urban design project so, yes there is a community design approach, but in preference to that it was appropriate to have tangata whenua [the iwi with the strongest claim to a given territory] interaction and inclusion in the dialogue and in the design process.
This explanation by Rau marks designTRIBE as different from a typical architectural firm because there is an underlying class-based and indigenous-based politics motivating the projects undertaken by designTRIBE and the way that these projects are approached socially and materially.

From its humble roots designTRIBE has developed over the last decade and a half into an architectural firm that is deeply involved with Māori design projects both in Auckland and in other areas around Aotearoa New Zealand. The designTRIBE website (http://www.designtribe.co.nz/about.html) neatly summarizes the mission of this organization in the following fashion:

Tena koutou e te iwi ... [welcome to all]

designTRIBE Limited was established in 1994 and specialises in translating the needs and aspirations of Māori communities within the built environment. This knowledge and expertise has been gained from successfully engaging in numerous Māori community projects within cultural, educational, residential and tourism sectors for more than a decade.

Kaupapa/Design Philosophy ...

As a design philosophy designTRIBE focuses closely on the maximisation of Māori architectural knowledge and ways of working with the natural environment to enhance cultural and environmental connection to place. Such a focus includes an emphasis on culturally derived planning principles and the use of sustainable materials and energy sources.

It is this type of statement that reveals the unique melding of Māori sociality—Māori aspirations, community needs, knowledge, philosophy, relationship with the natural environment, and cultural values—with the materiality of the built environment that makes designTRIBE such an important case study for this research. Māori geographies of whakamanatanga, whether urban or not in this case, are what the people at designTRIBE are all about. And it was one of the few places where, when I described my research during my first trip in 2007, Rau’s
response was “well, that is what we do! We create genuine living presences for Māori in the city.”

The best way to understand how these “living presences” are created for Māori in cities is to look more closely at one of designTRIBE’s on-going projects—the building of a marae (mataatua whare nui) and community space/place for Te Runanga o Ngāti Awa in Whakatane. One of the most intense types of projects involving Māori design is, of course, the planning and construction of a marae. As Rau noted, “the marae...represents the pinnacle of the level of complication design required.” This complication is derived from the need to address and adhere to layers of protocol involving tangata whenua status and, in the case of this particular marae, the relationship between iwi and hapū. Designing marae in an urban context often makes the whole process more complicated because of the added layers of bureaucracy, both in terms of layers of governance and issues of zoning, ordinances, traffic regulations, etc. Mataatua marae is very much an urban marae within the boundaries of Ngāti Hokopu, one of the fourteen hapū connected to Ngāti Awa iwi. On top of these purely Māori elements there is also the Whakatane Town Council and all of the zoning and regulatory concerns and restrictions that, from a Western urban design perspective, have to be taken into consideration. One of the main concerns and challenges for the designTRIBE team has been to sensitively negotiate these different interest groups, while steadfastly maintaining a process that honors and acknowledges the mana whenua (right of authority) of the iwi and hapū of that place.

---

150 See chapter three for a description and discussion of marae.
151 To give some sense of how complicated this can be the following description of the process by Rau is revealing: “Well, in this situation we are building it for them, we are building it for the iwi so
This process of negotiation is profoundly connected to what it means to argue that there is a Māori architectural design process. When asked “what do you think makes an architectural design Māori? Rau responded at length:

I think you can address that question from many levels. I was asked a similar question a few weeks ago when I interviewed for an architectural publication and an example I gave was, okay you’ve got a downtown Wellington building and they want to do a makeover of the building and they want to make it...put a bit of Māori flavor on it. Now you could go to a Māori or non-Māori architect and they could come up with a few ideas and put it past the client, get them to buy in, proceed to working drawings and get it built. That would from some angles be Māori architecture. In other words, people would perceive it...they would say, “well okay I can read that’s Māori, and I think it’s neat that it’s in Wellington and it does show us, and our culture and it is in keeping, and I feel good, and I feel like it’s speaking back to me in my language.” And then another person from a local tribe...say Te Ati Awa might say ...”hang on a sec, that’s not our pattern; who gave their blessing to do that? That’s not the way we used that particular form and what’s the meaning here and was there any connection to us?” So, you see what I am saying? One set of viewers could be quite nourished by that and another group could feel disenfranchised by it. By a) they weren’t involved, and b) what’s done has not been appropriate to context and to the particular history of that area. So, while Māori architecture can be construed as being any piece of architecture which exhibits Māoriness to the beholder; it can also be more ideally construed as having the integrity of a design process which is acknowledging of tikanga, and if you want to acknowledge tikanga at designTRIBE we say that land is never neutral, land is always connected to people, we cannot truly have a design process with integrity until we have engaged with the people.

This theme of engaging the people, both functionally and spiritually, through an acknowledgment of tikanga was a dominant theme throughout my discussion with Rau and the other architects I spoke with at designTRIBE. It was readily acknowledged that this was not an easy thing to do, but it was also stressed that

---

there...um...there interestingly the iwi here—Te Runanga o Ngāti Awa—they are wanting to build a marae on their own land, here [pointing to a design plan on the table], that happens to be in the area of one of the particular hapū, and there’s fourteen hapū. So, their responsibility is to go to that hapū (or sub-tribe) and get their definitive approval to build on that particular site. So they’ve got internal tikanga issues to engage with. And these hapū...they don’t flawlessly follow the party line...they are Ngāti Hokopu (yes they are also Ngāti Awa)...but they are Ngāti Hokopu...their loyalty is primarily to their hapū. So for that tribe there has been quite detailed consultations...intra-consultations...back down to the hapū, or the local sub-tribe.”

152 Rau defined tikanga as “What is right; tika is right or correct, and tikanga is basically theories of processes which are held to be correct.”
it was the only way, and that the idea of a “right way” was directly generated from Māori values and worldviews.

But in a modern context it is not enough, especially in an urban context, to involve only the Māori groups that would have some legitimate claim to being involved in a project. According to Rau there are “three core groups” involved in most contemporary design projects that must be addressed and incorporated into the design process. These are 1) iwi, hapū and whanau, 2) local and regional government, and 3) the Māori design community (architects, landscape architects, planners, engineers, artists, etc.). In the case of the Whakatane...
Mataatua marae all of these interest groups were certainly involved, and the architects at designTRIBE have had to facilitate and negotiate all of these interests groups while steadfastly holding onto a Māori protocol at each stage of the project (see Figure 25).

While the Mataatua marae has not yet been built at the time of writing, it was well along in the planning stages and the designs had been for the most part completed. In looking more closely at these designs in conjunction with the explanations about them by the architects involved it is clear that the urban context has also played a critical role in this marae’s design. For example, Ngāti Awa leaders expressed a desire to create a marae that not only served all of the traditional marae functions (e.g., funerals, meetings, language school), but also incorporated spaces/places that were open to the public. To understand that the Mataatua design is a significant departure from traditional marae design it is necessary to talk briefly about the typical Māori marae.

One of the most obvious aspects of the marae cultural landscape is one of a clearly delineated geography of outsider versus insider. Marae are not public spaces/places. They are sacred built environments controlled by strict spatial/platial protocol as to who can enter the marae atea (the space/place in front of the main carved meeting house) and whare nui (the main carved meeting house). You do not just walk onto a marae unwelcomed (although one can only guess how many clueless tourists have done this), and marae are often walled or fenced in to deter this type of spatial behavior (Rosenblatt, 2003). It is in this aspect that the Whakatane Mataatua marae stands apart as different from the typical marae. Much of this difference can be related in the following
conversation I had with Rau and Carin Wilson specifically about the designs for this marae.\footnote{Carin Wilson is a designer whose business, Design Pasifika, is located across the hall from designTRIBE. Some of Carin’s views on Māori notions of empowerment are featured in chapter one. At the time of this discussion he just happened to be in the room and Rau called him over to join our conversation.}

Serge: Do you think these design and political struggles are partly due to being in a town, in other words would this be different if it were in a more rural context?

Rau: Ah, yeah there are definitely issues…well this is now an urban tribe. The land is called Te Manuka Tutahi which is the location of the ancient Manuka tree which has played an important symbolic role for the people…

Serge: Has this land always been in Ngāti Awa control?

Rau: No, it has come back…so the land has come back, and the value is coming back…

Carin: And a lot of the town is coming back, which is provoking reaction.

Serge: You mean property values are going up and such?

Rau: Well that’s happening anyway because it is a coastal zone, the reaction is really about twenty years ago Ngāti Awa was like a ginger group and now they are a key player

Serge: What did you call them?

Rau: A ginger group…like a kind of thorn in the side, a bit of a noisy thorn that wouldn’t go away. But now they are economically quite powerful and through their wananga, their own university, they’ve become the second biggest employer in town. But their relationship with council has improved remarkably in the last twenty years, although a bit tense right now due to some of these issues…Council is really digging in, they are really digging in around the busses. They don’t want busses to go past the site. They are trying to turn this into…

Carin: More like a reserve?

Rau: Well, yeah, they’ve got a lot of pressure from some of the neighbors, even from Ngāti Hokopu as well. There is another marae, a hapū marae, two doors down.

Serge: Is there a border here? Some kind of iwi boundary?

Rau: No, here is the hapū of Ngāti Hokopu and the rest is the whole tribe.

Serge: Is this just empty land now?
Rau: No there is a telecom...a large warehouse here, and this building here is on the site, and there is a house here used by Ngāti Awa as their archives center. That will be removed. This will be chopped in half and this will be removed. So everything here that you see is proposed except for this quite robust concrete building which we are going to keep half of.

Up to this point this is a fairly unremarkable conversation about the issues surrounding the marae and some of the design elements. Clearly being in an urban context makes construction of this marae more challenging, with issues of traffic, for example, becoming a major stumbling block for the designers. But then Rau made the following statement:

So, here will be a café. This is the place where Ngāti Awa will present themselves and open up to the community in an informal way, and this is where they open up in a formal way. So there are two different dynamics happening here. So here is the whare kai/conference center, exhibition center here, and café here, commercial kitchen here...kind of a quasi-commercial space. Paepae [formal sitting area] for tangata whenua / local speakers here and this (paepae for visitors) will be added later.

What? I had to pause at this point because I had never heard of this type of public/private design for a marae! And as it turned out most of the people I spoke to about this later had not either. The idea of a marae incorporating a space/place designed to “open up to the community in an informal way” speaks volumes to the progression of the Māori renaissance from one of resistance through re-establishing boundaries (both physical and metaphorical), to one of having achieved a level of cultural revitalization where resistance is no longer the primary focus and, as a result, boundaries are no longer as important as they once were.

Marae, as beautiful and profound as they are to the most casual observer, often seem very closed, protective, a kind of cultural fortress protecting the most important core aspects of Māori culture from further colonial/Western
encroachment. The idea that a marae can be built that no longer needs to
manifest (at least not fully) this perspective, and instead is able to present itself
(and by extension the iwi it represents) in an open, outward, welcoming socio-
spatial/platial manner is the epitome of what is meant here by a Māori urban
geography of whakamanatanga.\textsuperscript{154} I was so personally struck by Rau’s
description of the Mataatua marae as incorporating a public component that I
asked him to explain this aspect in more detail:

\textbf{Rau:} So here is the site plan with the river over here and the buildings over here. This
conference center (the whare kai) is having to do a lot more than it would normally have
to do if it were just a dining hall...we’re putting in bi-folding doors that can go this way
or this way...we’ve got a stage situation that can be set up, so it’s got to be a very flexible
space. It’s designed so you can book out just this part here, or the café can have an
exhibition opening here, so there are different ways you can divide up the space. You can
actually divide the space so you take that there, or you can take that there, so that two
groups can actually be working side by side.

\textbf{Serge:} So to enter into this space [the café and exhibition area] does not demand
powhiri?

\textbf{Rau:} No that’s the careful creation of thresholds. You’ve got a critical threshold here in
the visitation area...it indicates that your free to come in here, your even free to go and
use the toilettes here, but this line here, you know, you need to be formerly brought on to
this space. And that’s not to say that that is always the case. When there is no formal
event happening people will be free to walk on there...it’s not tapu to that extent...

\textbf{Serge:} But not into the marae?

\textbf{Rau:} Not into the house, no, not without someone else.

\textbf{Serge:} Is the idea of a partially communal space linked to the fact that this marae is
located in a town?

\textbf{Rau:} This is about cultural identity of the iwi, okay? Because you have fourteen hapū
this is an opportunity for the iwi to present the epitome of their artistic excellence in
historical terms and also to project their excellent art and current identity and future
explorations through this building here. So it’s about encapsulating both worlds and
weaving them together...as they should be.

\textsuperscript{154} And it is important to note too, that this openness is not being driven by tourism but rather by
the desire of the host iwi to build bridges between the Māori community and the town.
This last part merits repeating: “So it’s about encapsulating both worlds and weaving them together.” Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga also involve this “weaving” process, and the willingness to do this comes directly from Māori cultural groups, like Ngāti Awa, gaining the confidence—through cultural revival and growing economic power—to create a space/place that is at once an anchor for Māori culture and a space/place that welcomes the greater community (Māori and non-Māori) to experience and appreciate this material expression of their whakapapa and tūrangawaewae.

“Mataatua,” according to Rau, is “the name of the canoe that brought most of the recent ancestors to this area. This building is Te Ara Tawhao, which is the waka that was sent from here to go and get the kumara [sweet potato] from Polynesia. So this building is about venturing forth; it’s about a new venture—venturing forth to improve the livelihood of the iwi.” And this is indeed one of the essential aspects of what is meant in this dissertation by Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga; it is a turn outward for Māori after a long period of inward focus. This inward focus was absolutely necessary as a way to recover and protect the core elements of Māori culture from the onslaught of foreign cultures. But as Māori begin to reap the benefits of this cultural trench warfare (an appropriate metaphor since Māori invented trench warfare to fight the British—see Belich, 1998), they are increasingly able to assert/insert their culture in ways that are open, less bounded, and without fear of dilution or compromise.
The purpose of this chapter is to demonstrate the confluence of whakamanatanga-based Māori urbanisms (fixed, fluid and, in some cases, forced) with Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga, and to do so within the context of Māori everyday life experiences. As was noted at the beginning of this chapter, any claim of Māori urbanism is seriously compromised unless it is supported by the stories and ideas of those living these urbanisms, and it was argued throughout that these urbanisms have mutually constituted social and material expression. Thus, one of the primary goals of this chapter is to relate and reflect upon these stories and then connect them meaningfully to the materiality of the city.

One of the most striking conclusions that comes from the various “vignettes” featured above is that there are many ways in which Māori are living and producing whakamanatanga-based urbanisms. But they are all Māori. They are doing this through their professional and personal lives, through art and design, through the pursuit of education and through efforts to improve their neighborhoods. They are doing this from many different backgrounds and with different levels of connection to traditional Māori whakapapa and tūrangawaewae. But they are all Māori. There is, in other words, a miro (thread) that runs through all of the infinite variations of whakamanatanga-based Māori urbanisms discussed in this chapter, but the added dimension being inserted here is that there is a space/place component of these Māori urban experiences that cannot be ignored.
This same theme continues in the next three chapters, although my empirical focus narrows to look at one specific space/place in Auckland: Mana Moko-Te Karanga (otherwise known as Kfm). Kfm both reinforces the concept of Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga and adds new and important dimensions to this concept. Like the Whakatane marae discussed in the designTRIBE section above, Kfm offers an example of these geographies that is at once grounded in Māori identity and outward looking in its multicultural environment. Kfm also serves as an example of how Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga have the potential to be intensely locally focused while simultaneously globally connected.
6. Mana Moko-Te Karanga: A Unique Manifestation of Whakamanatanga-Based Māori Urbanisms in Inner City Auckland

In this chapter, and in the following two, my focus turns to one specific organization in Auckland City called Mana Moko-Te Karanga. More casually referred to as Kfm, this establishment serves as an example of the potential for whakamanatanga-based Māori urbanisms to evolve truly unique and progressive urban spaces/places. Much like the example of Whakatane Mataatua marae discussed in the previous chapter, Kfm represents a socio-spatial/platial turning point in the development of Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga. This turning point is marked by an outward and open orientation suggesting a new phase of Māori urbanisms. This new phase is no longer about recapturing or protecting Māori culture, ways of life and geographies, but rather is about creating a space/place where Māori can engage, in positive and culturally productive ways, the myriad socio-cultural forces converging in a city like Auckland.
There is also much about Kfm that is not like the Whakatane example. This is not in any way a traditional Māori space/place, and in fact the “Māoriness” of Kfm is embedded in a myriad of other non-Māori characteristics and representations such that to claim it is exclusively a Māori space/place is problematic if not flat out incorrect. Having said this, however, there are fundamental elements of Kfm that are grounded both in manifesting aspects of Māori culture and in honoring and celebrating this culture. It is this fusion of Māori and non-Māori elements at Kfm that suggest its strong association with fluid Māori urbanisms, and yet simultaneously it is a space/place that individuals and organizations representative of fixed, fluid and even forced Māori urbanisms all collective interact with. One of the main objectives of this chapter and the next three is to unravel this complexity in order to understand better how Kfm represents the comingling of whakamanatanga-based Māori urbanisms and the complex other urbanisms that are a part of inner city Auckland. Ultimately, the argument that is being made here is that this comingling represents one profound possibility of Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga: to create spaces/places where Māori can productively interact with the increasingly multiethnic environment developing in Auckland, but do so in a way that does not undermine their culture, but rather powerfully inserts/asserts it into the urban milieu.

My discussion of Kfm over the next three chapters is organized around four themes:

1) Kfm as organic space/place production
2) Kfm’s space/place in the context of everyday life
3) Kfm as space/place-based social movement
4) Kfm as Māori space/place of difference
The first of these themes, Kfm as organic space/place production, is introduced and explored in this chapter. I do this by first looking at Kfm’s situation in Auckland City and, more specifically, on Karangahape Road; the point being here to demonstrate that when it comes to the formation of organizations such as Kfm where they manifest is just as important as what type of space/place they represent. In other words, the “urbaness” within which this space/place evolved is considered particularly important. I then turn to the stories told by those most intimately associated with Kfm in order to develop a deeper understanding of how this organization came into existence. The second theme, Kfm’s space/place in the context of everyday life, is the subject of Chapter 7 where I argue that, through the daily activities of the people that run and frequent Kfm, a critical confluence of sociality and materiality is constantly being produced—i.e., Kfm as a site of unique socio-space/place production. In Chapter 8 I introduce the third and fourth themes by moving away from an analysis that focuses on how Kfm came to be, of how Kfm is continuously in a state of becoming, and instead look at how Kfm manifests an outward looking Māori urban geography of whakamanatanga. Here I argue that Kfm is a space/place based social movement creating social networks at multiple scales (neighborhood to global). I also argue in Chapter 8 that the people at Kfm have managed to create a socio-space/place that is uniquely able to honor and celebrate Māori as the first nation people of Aotearoa New Zealand while simultaneously creating a space/place that is profoundly accepting of difference and otherness—what I refer to in Chapter 8 as Māori spaces/places of difference. In achieving this simultaneous space/place of Māoriness and of multicultural acceptance the people at Kfm
have managed to create a space/place that arguably embodies Edward Soja’s (1996) notion of thirdspace, or Lefebvre’s (1991) notion of differential spaces.155

6.1 Reflections On a Kfm Experience: Setting the Geographic Context

A necessary starting point for discussing Kfm is its location in Auckland. Starting my discussion this way facilitates an understanding of Kfm from two important perspectives: the impact Kfm’s present location has on Kfm and the impact the historical development of this location has had on this organization. Both of these perspectives help in developing a deeper understanding of Kfm in that they tell us about the importance of location and the space/place urban milieu in fostering a context that allow certain organizations to flourish at certain times. Kfm, in other words, does not exist in a vacuum, but rather is part of a neighborhood, and the story of this area of Auckland, as it turns out, is an important part of understanding this unique organization. This is true, as will be demonstrated, whether one takes an outsiders or insiders perspective. I begin by first offering the reader a sense of what it is like to come across Kfm serendipitously while wandering through the urban landscape. I then turn to a more historical perspective, and then ask the people at Kfm to explain the importance of their neighborhood to Kfm’s development and present character.

Auckland is sprawling city occupying an isthmus with many inlets and two major bays. The original walking city that today is the Auckland Central Business District (CBD) is incorporated into Auckland City, one of Greater

155 Of course, in keeping with the arguments put forth in this dissertation, I would modify these to thirdspace/place, and differential space/place.
Auckland’s seven sub-metropolitan geographically designated areas. Within these areas are smaller “suburbs” and neighborhoods each with a distinctive identity often centered on a small business district. Auckland is a city of fickle weather, dramatic topography and is dominated by automobile and bus traffic with only limited other transportation options. Auckland’s CBD is oriented along Queen Street, a broad road built in a ravine that runs down slope towards Auckland Harbor (steep at the upper portion and more gradually inclined as one approaches the harbor). Walking up-slope along Queen Street from the harbor one slowly traverses the heart of the CBD with its buildings of varying heights and ages. The commercial district is typical of any Western-styled CBD with a mix of office and commercial buildings, restaurants and, particularly on the side streets, cafes, bars and pubs (see Figure 26).

![Figure 26: View of Auckland CBD from Harbor Bridge (left); Lower Queen Street (right).](image)

As one begins walking up the steeper upper portion of Queen Street the cultural landscape influences of Asian immigrants becomes obvious in the

---

156 The other six are: Rodney District, North Shore City, Waitakere City, Manukau City, Papakura District, and Franklin District.
signage of the restaurants and the types of businesses. At the top of the hill Queen Street crosses Karangahape Road, known to locals as K’ Road. Turning right on K’ Road brings you immediately into an area that clearly has its own unique “personality” (see Figure 27).

Figure 27: Selected images of K’ Road’s eclectic mix of businesses.

K’ Road, once a bustling area of merchants, then Auckland’s red light district, and now an area of hipsters, fashionably alternative urban chic businesses mixed with trendy clubs, probably the greatest range of ethnicities and social classes one will find in Aotearoa New Zealand, an emerging “creative culture” element made up of artists and alternative media professionals, and a distinctly turn of the century architectural style, is a street that stands out as notably “different” to even the most casual observer.
If one were to cross to the south side of K’ Road and head west into the heart of this district, browsing the clothing stores, funky cafes, and businesses along the way, it is possible that while you were walking along that first long block, running from Upper Queen Street to Mercury Lane, you might notice an interesting looking sign hanging from the awning that conveniently shelters pedestrians from the ever possible “unexpected” Auckland rain shower (usually brief but always cold and enough to get you wet with only brief exposure).

![Figure 28: Mana Moko-Te Karanga Sign on K’ Road.](image)

This sign, if you did notice it, is on a black shiny background with bold white lettering that reads “Mana Moko-Te Karanga” with smaller lettering below listing all of the different functions of this place (see Figure 28); you will most likely also be struck by the interesting red koru that divides the sign, and if you are from Aotearoa New Zealand you would probably recognize this as a very common Māori symbol. A person more deeply knowledgeable about Māori concepts could tell you that the koru represents creation, perpetual movement, a
return to the point of origin, thereby symbolizing the notion that life is both constant change and yet is always the same.\footnote{A quick Google search will give you multiple sites that discuss the meaning of the koru. I went to Te Ara: The Encyclopedia of New Zealand for the above definition (http://www.teara.govt.nz/NewZealanders/MaoriNewZealanders/MaoriCreationTraditions/1/ENZ-Resources/Standard/1/en).}

Pondering this sign may lead you to look at the entrance and see a door leading into a narrow delicately lit and artfully decorated stairway that angles mysteriously to the right keeping you from being able to see where the staircase leads (without actually going up). You would probably also notice a couple of sandwich boards placed in front of the door listing the “tea of the week” (usually accompanied by a quote about tea from some famous person), and also announcing various upcoming events (see Figure 29 and 30).

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure29.png}
\caption{Kfm Front and Entrance Way: Mana Moko-Te Karanga occupies the 2\textsuperscript{nd} floor of 208 K’ Road (left); The entrance (right).}
\end{figure}

A moment of choice occurs at this point. Do you go up to explore this place or not? For those that decide to do so it is an interesting question as to...
what entices them up the stairs. Is it the promise of tea? Or is it the music that one can hear as soon as they stick their head into the stairwell? Or is it the promise of an art gallery showing its current exhibit? Any one of these factors could be what draws a person into this place, or maybe even a combination of them. And for some it is likely just a need to satisfy a curiosity as to what exactly this place is all about. Because, despite the signage, it is not entirely clear from the street level, and I would hazard to guess

Figure 30: Kfm’s stairway as it winds up into the second floor space/place.

that as many or more of the people that notice this place do not go up simply because of the ambiguity of the entrance. Some sense of discomfort, perhaps, at not being absolutely sure as to the function of this place (is it a café? Is it an art gallery? Is it a radio station?); this ability to create a certain amount of
uncertainty and even confusion for first time “experiencers” gives an initial clue as to what is different about Kfm. Most people living in a modern global city do not have this confusion when they enter into a Starbucks or a McDonald’s, and clarity in the cultural landscape is something, I would argue, that makes people feel “safe.” But perhaps there are those individuals who are enticed by a certain landscape ambiguity, and I would argue (based on observations and discussions with people interacting with this organization) that more times than not it is this type of person that decides to walk up the steps and find out what this place is all about.

And what do they find when they make this decision? I can speak to this question from two perspectives. On the one hand, I can speak to it as a person that got to first experience Kfm in a way similar to that described above. On the other, I can speak to this question as an academic who sat and worked in Kfm for months and observed quite intentionally the reaction of individuals as they entered this space/place for the first time. From the experiential perspective you slowly make your way up a staircase that takes two ninety-degree turns and, as you come into the Kfm space/place, your first view is of the Tea Culture café with its solid handmade wooden tables and chairs. Instinctively one looks to the right at the Tea Culture bar and the amazing rows of jars holding over one hundred different types of tea. People tend to then look to their left and turn around to see the Kfm radio booth, then the art gallery, and then the ta moko (tattoo) studio (usually having done a 360 degree turn at this point; see Figure 31, 32, 33 and 34). All the while the Kfm downbeat or reggae sound is pulsing through the space/place. Sometimes one will enter into bustling activity and other times into a total absence of activity. Either way it is hard, from my
perspective, not to feel a sense of wonder (I certainly did the first time I walked into Kfm) at the uniqueness of this place. My reaction, however, by no means suggests a universally similar reaction to Kfm, and in fact the range of reactions turned out to be an important clue to what makes Kfm special.

Figure 31: The Tea Culture café.

Figure 32: The Kfm radio booth.
Figure 33: The Te Karanga Gallery.

Figure 34: The Mana Moko tattoo studio
And quite honestly I never ceased to be amazed, both personally and from an academic perspective, at the range of reactions on the faces of people that entered Kfm for the first time, especially those that seemed to wander in off the street. There was a wide variety of types of course: the polite art gallery browser, the uncomfortable but too-polite-to-leave-immediately type who would look around for a bit but then leave, the hesitant person looking for a café experience but not sure if this café was really going to satisfy that experience (its nothing like Starbucks after all).

But more important than any of these is the person who, upon walking into this space/place, experiences a sense of wonder, or comfort, or intrigue, or calm (or any combination of these), in a visceral and intuitive way. It is this type of person that seemed to be recognizing that there is something not only different about this space/place, but something unique and special, and with that recognition decides to engage it in order to better understand what it is about Kfm that elicits in them these positive space/place feelings.

It is equally interesting to observe how the people that work at Kfm have developed an attitude that allows people, when they first come into this space/place, to take the time to decide if this is a place they want to engage or not. A kind of practiced disengagement that says, “Kia ora, welcome to Kfm; figure out what this place is going to mean to you and when you do let me know and I will be happy to help you begin to explore it!”158 There is no judgment in this approach, but rather it reflects a respect for the ability of individuals to figure out what they want at that moment from this place. It is this wonderful

---

158 “Kia ora” is a very common form of greeting in Aotearoa New Zealand. The Māori translation is most commonly “hello” or “thank you.”
mix of the impact of a material space/place combined with a social environment that seems to lacks any of the unequal power relations inherent in a typical capitalist service environment (e.g., I am being paid to work here, you are a paying customer, therefore you have the power to treat me any way you like) that sets Kfm apart from the typical café or art gallery, and instead speaks to its multifunction as a community space/place that has some service components to it, but none of them determinant of its on-going existence.

Ultimately, however, in order to gain a clearer understanding of how an organization and space/place like Kfm was created it is necessary to dig deeper than the experiential approach undertaken above. As Allen Pred (1984) demonstrated back in the 1980s, place is a historically contingent process. Therefore, it is important and instructive to look at how Kfm came to be in order to comprehend more fully the unique way in which Kfm exemplifies Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga.

6.2 Kfm’s Urban Space/Place Context: Auckland City, K’ Road and the Creative City

A closer look at Kfm reveals that, on the one hand, Kfm is clearly a unique space/place-based phenomenon located on the second floor of a single building with a relatively small group of people intimately connected to its day-to-day operations; on the other, however, it is simultaneously part of a broader urban

159 Allen Pred’s (1984: 279) basic argument views “place as a constantly becoming human product as well as a set of features visible upon the landscape. Place is seen as a process whereby the reproduction of social and cultural forms, the formation of biographies, and the transformation of nature ceaselessly become one another at the same time that time-space specific activities and power relations continuously become one another.”
phenomenon—especially evident in the Auckland City area—of the formation of “creative city” and “bohemian” urban neighborhoods (Latham, 2002; Hubbard 2006). The point here is to emphasize the fact that Kfm is not a socio-spatial/platial phenomenon occurring in a vacuum, but rather is one that is linked in important and critical ways to historical processes and to other urban scales and phenomenon. In other words, the argument that is being made here is that in order to understand Kfm as a space/place-based social movement it is important to make the connection between the formation of this specific organization (Kfm) and the type of urban context within which it has flourished.

The first part of the discussion in this section involves a broader analysis of the neighborhood Kfm is located in, specifically K’ Road, and the link between this area and Kfm. This broader geographic analysis is further linked to the way people at Kfm understand and conceptualize the relationship between Kfm and K’ Road as a distinct area of Auckland. This relationship is expressed as both connected to a traditional Māori cultural geography and to multiculturalism and alternative lifestyles that are being negotiated and expressed on K’ Road.

Kfm, as has been noted, is located on K’ Road near Auckland’s CBD and within the administrative district known as Auckland City. Auckland City includes the original parts of the city with Auckland’s CBD as its central feature, although its boundaries extend well beyond the original walking city. Extending out from the CBD is a handful of densely populated inner city neighborhoods with names like Grey Lynn, Parnell, Ponsonby, Herne Bay, Mount Eden, and Sandringham. Some of these neighborhoods have developed from their inception as wealthy Pākehā enclaves (particularly those with good views of the bay), while others started out as working class Pākehā and Māori
neighborhoods, but have progressively gentrified over the last two decades and are now generally middle-to-upper middle-income neighborhoods dominated by Pākehā. There are also some pockets of lower middle and even low-income areas interspersed throughout these neighborhoods. Generally speaking in Auckland City the wealthier the neighborhood the more Pākehā it is, and the poorer the area the more Polynesian (Johnson, et al, 2003 and 2008). However, in Auckland City, there are also areas (e.g., Sandringham) that are quite mixed both socio-economically and ethnically.

Figure 35: Location of Karangahape Road near Auckland CBD (source: Google Maps).

K' Road is a 1.05 kilometer (.65 mile) long road that runs roughly east-west along a ridge perpendicular to the CBD and following the line of the harbor (see Figure 35). This thoroughfare has a long history beginning as a Māori road that was part of a network of roads, trails, and pathways used by Māori
throughout the area they call Tāmaki Makaurau. The Māori meaning of the word Karangahape has some variation depending your source. However, the version that was most often told to me from people at Kfm (as well as from various individuals associated with K’ Road, and from several other sources) was that Karangahape was a Māori word that translates to “calling on Hape.” Hape, in this story, was an influential Māori chief that lived near Manukau Harbor and K’ Road was the way to his territory coming from the west.

Those individuals I spoke with who had close association with K’ Road (both Kfm people and others) consistently argued that this perceived link to an original Māori geography was an important part of what makes K’ Road both different and special. Those specifically linked to Kfm argued to varying degrees that the Māori genealogy of this road and its contemporary characteristics of alterity and heterogeneity were importantly linked to these same qualities as they have developed at Kfm.

A brief overview of the historical development of K’ Road is the starting point for understanding the sense of place that it evokes today and the importance this sense of place has for Kfm. Between 1900 and the 1960s K’ Road was one of Auckland’s busiest business districts, with clothing shops, department stores and other retail businesses having a presence on this busy

\[\text{\textsuperscript{160}}\text{For a good overview of this history see: Bennet, Edward (2005) Karangahape Road Heritage Walk, Karangahape Road Business Association}\]

\[\text{\textsuperscript{161}}\text{I would like to be more specific in this assertion but, unfortunately, I cannot be. It was clear to me that this link that people associated with K’ Road and Kfm consistently brought up was important. I only began to ask more specific questions about this link after this point was made to me time and again without any solicitation from myself. When I asked people to more specifically explain this link it always boiled down to a feeling about the spirit of the place that Kfm and K’ Road occupied. This “spirit” was seen to be one embodied with a mauri (energy, chi) that came from this original Māori geography. Another way to interpret this sentiment is that it was a way to link K’ Road and Kfm to meaningful place-whakapapa (the Māori term for genealogy).}\]
street. This period of economic vitality came to an end with the construction of the inner city motorway in the 1960s that resulted in the displacement of 50,000 Auckland residents (mostly working class) and critically undermined the community base that took advantage of the propinquity of K’ Road’s businesses (Bennet, 2005; see Figure 36).

![Figure 36: Google Earth image of K’ Road and Motorway: Using Google Earth one can easily see the broad swath of land that had to be cleared in order to make way for the motorway as well as K’ Roads propinquity to this motorway.](image)

It was at this time that K’ Road began to transform (mostly due to the onset of lower land values and the rents associated with these values) into Auckland’s main red light district. By the 1990s K’ Road began to change once again as higher income groups moved back into the CBD and surrounding neighborhoods. Areas near to K’ Road, like Ponsonby, underwent classic
gentrification and K’ Road became Auckland’s premier entertainment district (Latham 2003). As these socio-economic and demographic changes transformed Auckland City, new businesses began to relocate to K’ Road once again and its red light district function slowly receded to form a funky backdrop rather than the central function so that today, of the approximately 400 businesses in the K’ Road area presently, only around ten are sex industry oriented (Bennet, 2005).

Today, K’ Road is a commercial and entertainment zone that attracts a multiplicity of ethnicities and a general sense of counter culture. Trendy alternative retail stores are interspersed with ethnic restaurants, inter mixed with penetrations of corporate globalization such as Starbucks, and multinational banks. Prostitutes of all types can be found in and around the K’ Road area (although not so much on the main road as the side streets). The typical K’ Road person is just as likely to be sporting a mohawk haircut and punk clothing as he/she is to be dressed in urban chic clothing or downtown business attire. Ethnically this neighborhood is probably more diverse than any other in Aotearoa New Zealand with Pākehā, Polynesians, Asians (predominantly Chinese, Japanese, Koreans, and Indians), and Africans all clearly present on the streets, working in the shops, and running the businesses.

K’ Road has also turned into an area of film and radio production as well as an inner city urban arts district. This arts/creative industries aspect of K’ Road suggests that it has also developed economically into an area similar to other creative zones found in various parts of Auckland City as well as in other urban areas globally (Latham, 2004; Hubbard 2006). The combination of a more bohemian characteristic with this creative culture component makes K’ Road itself a fascinating case study and, although it is not the primary subject of this
chapter, it is argued here that it is an important component of how Kfm developed into the unique place that it is today.

Individuals involved with Kfm commented on this connection and it is through their voices that the importance and relevance of this connection is most clearly expressed. Two dominant themes emerge from these discussions. First, like Kfm, K’ Road is a place of diversity and alternative lifestyle and as such complements Kfm’s identity and mission. Second, a certain segment of Māori are attracted to this environment in the sense of feeling more comfortable hanging out in this part of Auckland City than in other parts, and this same feeling extends into the Kfm space/place.

Speaking to both of these themes Ramon Narayan, a part Pākehā, part Fijian Indian who describes himself as a “do everything guy” at Kfm (and from my observations this is not an exaggeration), as well as Kfm board of trustees member, had this to say about K’ Road’s importance to Kfm in the midst of a conversation we had about Kfm’s origins:

Serge: So, correct me if I am wrong, but this is what I hear you saying: that there is this basic Māori foundation…it kind of evolved out of that…and its grounded in a kind of respect for the original indigenous people…and that through that…that’s what opens the door for this space of diversity and acceptance that exists here.

Ramon: Yep, totally, it seems like it attracts that kind of people as such an open environment…

Serge: Do you think there is some link between that vibe and being on K Road, or being in Auckland, or could this of happened anywhere?

Ramon: I don’t know… I think that being on K Road certainly makes that really possible…I mean the “K”…Karangahape…is the “K” in Kfm…and it’s a huge diverse community unto itself anyway…and it does attract a certain body of people up here.

---

162 The Kfm mission statement is dealt with in detail in the following chapter seven.
Here Ramon acknowledges a link between a sense of openness to difference at Kfm and Kfm’s location on K’ Road. Ramon points out that K’ Road is itself a “huge diverse community” and as such seems to connect this diversity with what is going on at Kfm and perhaps even suggest that it acts as a conduit for this sense of openness. Moreover, Ramon’s statement that the “K” in Kfm is based on the “K” in Karangahape Road connotes a sense of historical connection to this road. This idea of connection as it was applied here was often further connected back to K’ Road’s Māori roots, and this, I would argue, describes a more profound sense of linkage between the Kfm whanau (family), K’ Road, and a sense that Kfm’s whakapapa (genealogy) is one that finds its origins in a Māori geography.\(^{163}\)

Julz Rahui, a young Māori women who worked at Kfm as an administrator, barrista, DJ, and member of Kfm’s board of trustees had this to say about K’ Road:

_Serge: So what parts of the city do you feel the most comfortable (or the least) expressing your Māoriness?_

_Julz: Umm…they’re places…I don’t know…they’re places…they’re definitely places that I’d would feel more comfortable than others…like K Road for instance. Auckland to me is pretty multi-cultural so it doesn’t like for me…if you keep to the main streets its cool, but like there’s just some clubs or places, like Downtown particularly that its just sleeze…lol…_

Here Julz is articulating a feeling about K’ Road that many Māori I spoke with (formally and informally) consistently repeated. There is something about

---

\(^{163}\) The Māori word “whanau,” is translated as “family” in English. It is a word used very commonly by many New Zealanders and it can mean an actual family related through ancestral ties, but it can also be used much more informally to refer to groups of people bound together in ways that simulate a family-like atmosphere. The word Ohana is used very similarly in Hawai’i. The whanau concept as it relates to Kfm is discussed in more detail in chapter eight.
K’ Road that makes them feel comfortable and this contrasts with the alternatives which are sections of the city that make them feel less comfortable, or even uncomfortable. For Julz this was a theme that came up often in our discussions and here she is making that contrast at the very personal level of her day-to-day experiences negotiating the streets of inner city Auckland.

Arama Cookson, a young Māori man and one of the original DJs at Kfm, made what was one of the more personal connections to K’ Road in the following conversation:

Serge: Well that sort of links to my next question, which is, are there places you feel more comfortable expressing your Māori identity?

Arama: It would be the K Road area, I’d have to say, I’d have to sit in thought about Auckland, but there is something about this area, I mean its urban in a way, with the multi-level buildings, but…some sort of Bohemian feel about it. Because when I look at the visual history of my past, like photos of my parents and family and uncles and…in photos and books and stuff, there’s a style that they had that I really admire and thought was cool and there seems to be a little bit of that around here…yeah…its nice and trendy but still a little bit dusty, you know, its not totally super clean but its not casual…but a both…and that’s why I like K Road because it has that more so than any other part of the central area.

Here Arama is making a direct connection between his Māori identity and the sense of space/place that he perceives K’ Road to manifest. This sense of space/place is captured for him by the term “Bohemian” and is further linked to old photographs of his Māori urban relatives that he admired. The idea that K’ Road is attractive to Māori because it is trendy but not too flashy speaks to influences being generated from both issues involving class and culture. The Bohemian reference is also quite interesting here. Most Māori have historically, within the context of the legacy of colonialism, occupied a lower socio-economic level and working class jobs were the ones available to the vast majority of Māori when they first migrated to cities (Spoonley, 1996). Both Arama and Julz
referenced aspects of this class context during out discussions and this further suggests a connection between Māori urban culture and working class landscapes. An area like K’ Road becomes attractive in this context because it does not affect the trappings of upper class society (read: Pākehā) in either its businesses or its people, and yet at the same time manages to be a “hip” part of town full of networking and entertainment possibilities for young urbanites.

Hubbard (2006: 224), in his discussion of urban geography literature focusing on “the creative city,” links research on urban areas with a predominance of art spaces/places to research on the concept of bohemian sub-cultural movements. He writes that “Originally referring to the spaces of nineteenth-century art production in Paris, the label bohemia carries with it a romanticized imaginary of freewheeling, countercultural experimentations and excess...This is often contrasted with the lifestyle and spaces of the bourgeoisie, who favour a more Protestant work ethic and adhere to a more respectable set of moral codes and conventions.”

My experiences with Kfm certainly resonated with aspects of this definition of bohemian movements. The description of Kfm as a space/place of “freewheeling” individuals often seemed more than apt, and certainly the general political view that was expressed was one that was not just tolerant to countercultural views but more often than not deeply sympathetic to these views. Moreover, for better or for worse, Kfm is also a space/place where excess is allowed in certain ways and forums, although there is also a keen awareness that this needs to be supervised and managed so as not to allow the space/place of Kfm itself to be damaged or tainted. Hubbard (2006: 224) further writes that the “distinct ‘structures of feeling’ created in bohemian spaces/places thus
reclaim the main elements of what Lefebvre (1991) termed “differential space.” Hubbard describes this type of space as “created and dominated by its users through bodily practices which value quality over quantity, the look over the gaze and the sensual over the scientific. Bohemian zones may also be characterised as ‘free zones’ whose functional and economic role is difficult to explain in terms of capitalist economics” (Hubbard, 2006: 224).

While it can be debated to what degree K’ Road or Kfm perfectly reflect this bohemian atmosphere and sense of space/place, there are nonetheless aspects of both this urban area and organization that have at least some of these qualities. In Kfm’s case in particular it was evident that quality was valued over quantity in the sense that use value was always prioritized over exchange value (which is what Lefebvre means by this contrast).\(^{164}\) Although there were many aspects of Kfm that involved the opportunity for those coming into this space/place to pay money for something—tea or coffee at the café, art from the gallery, to get a moko tattooed to their body, or to buy pounamu (New Zealand greenstone) necklaces—these opportunities were rarely if ever “pitched” to these people. If they wanted something they generally had to initiate the intercourse and then whoever was around at that time would happily help them.

I cannot emphasize how much this was the case throughout the many hours I spent hanging out at Kfm and/or working at the café. In fact, at first while working in the café I found this quite frustrating since, coming from an American service background, I immediately could tell that the lack of

\(^{164}\) Use value refers to the value of a thing based on its ability to satisfy a human need without consideration of monetary value; exchange value, on the other hand, refers to the value of a thing based on the amount of money it could command on the market (Knox, Paul & Pinch, Steven (2000: 30).
obsequious “service” turned some prospective customers off so that they did not stay to buy anything or, most likely even if they did, would never come back. Part of the process of my beginning to understand what Kfm was all about was my acknowledging that the exchange value way of doing things was deeply embedded in my consciousness but was contradictory to the Kfm way of doing things. This rejection of a capitalist way of setting up relations between those that entered this space as consumers and those that were intimately involved with Kfm is critical to its ability to offer an alternative space/place-based social context.

It is also fair to argue that in Kfm’s case the look and the sensual were privileged over the gaze and the scientific. The look/gaze contrast suggests the difference between meaningful and valued relationships versus relationships based on objectification and therefore unequal power relations; the sensual/scientific contrast suggests valuing everyday life experiences through ones senses and emotions (including intuition) versus the quantification and potentially dehumanizing aspects of an “objective” scientific view. In both these cases I would argue the people at Kfm managed to create a space/place that fostered privileging the look/sensual over the gaze/scientific.

While the discussion in these last four paragraphs diverged somewhat from the main focus of this section—the relationship between Kfm’s development and character and Auckland City and, particularly, K’ Road—it is perhaps not as far as one might think. This divergence began from the assertions by Ramon, Julz, and Arama that there was something special about K’ Road and that this was linked importantly to the type of space/place Kfm has developed into. What is interesting about K’ Road, from my own observations, is that it
does seem to be a space/place that attracts a wide range of people (ethnically, socio-economically, and professionally) both because and as a result of an atmosphere that makes a wide range of people comfortable. A homeless person seems just as comfortable hanging out on K’ Road as does a hip urban “creative culture” type; a Pacific Islander (Māori or otherwise) strolls down K’ Road seemingly just as comfortably as Pākehā in business attire. But at the same time K’ Road is unquestionably a capitalist space/place dominated by retail and restaurant businesses including some major players in global capitalism (Starbucks, Bank of New Zealand). If K’ Road is a bohemian space/place it is one that is rife with contradictions to the ethos of the bohemian philosophy.

Kfm is different from K’ Road, however, in that it seems to have constructed an environment that comes much closer to subverting some of these contradiction and, as a result, truly creating a space/place that is alternative and socially progressive. So on the one hand, Kfm benefits from its location on K’ Road through a shared context of funkiness, openness and diversity, but on the other, Kfm represents a space/place-based social phenomenon that exceeds anything that K’ Road has to offer. In order to understand how Kfm has managed to create this type of alternative and progressive social space/place it is necessary to delve into Kfm’s origins.

6.3 Kfm as Organic Space/Place Production

Answering the question “how did Kfm come about?” offers important insight not only into what gives an organization like Kfm its distinctive character, but also more generally how space/place formation is an on-going,
dynamic process (Pred, 1986). In the case of Kfm a term was needed that captured the core elements of how this organization came to be. Certainly Kfm is an example of space/place production understood as the process whereby individuals go about the business of purposely creating a distinctive materiality; Kfm is, in other words, socially constructed (as opposed to being created by physical geographic processes, by animals, or even by Gods). There are, however, many ways to go about socially constructing a space/place, ranging from a very formally planned process to seemingly spontaneous “eruptions” of socially constructed spaces/places.

In the case of Kfm, however, clearly the emphasis was on informal process, on opportunities leading to decisions, and on need driving design rather than some clearly conceived plan as to what the final outcome was going to be. The term that is used here to capture the way Kfm came to be is organic space/place production. I use this phrase because it is one that was related to me often by those most closely associated with Kfm’s development while discussing its genesis. In other words, the definition of organic space/place production that I offer here has been developed based on the way people closely associated with Kfm described the process of its formation.

Organic space/place production, then, refers to the creation of built environments that are rarely planned in terms of their final form; these spaces/places develop in a context of need-driven growth and serendipitous moments that lead to new space/place formations. The use of the word

---

165 Although to be fair Pred did not align space and place in the same way that I do. His approach was much more classically dualistic (see Merrifield, 1993, for a critique of this approach).

166 For an example of the more formerly constructed place see Lorretta Lees (2001). For an example of more spontaneous place production read on!
“organic” in this phrase is not intended to connote a sense of space/place production being natural (as in the sense of having been derived biologically). Rather “organic” is being used here to describe “a relation between elements of something such that they fit together harmoniously as necessary parts of a whole.”  Combining this definition with the concept of space/place production we achieve a definition of space/place formation that is grounded in everyday life activities that involve both a sociality and a materiality through which a space/place is created that takes on a holistic sense of space/place production; i.e., the parts that come to make up a space/place make sense individually but at the same time create a sense of wholeness and interconnectivity. The material space/place (Kfm) begins to take form as individuals become involved in its formation; simultaneously the material space/place continuously reinforces the needs of these individuals and serves as a reproductive force in the social activities that begin to occupy and inform this space/place.

The concept I have come across that comes closest to this definition of organic space/place production is Edward Relph’s (1980: 18) definition of dwelling. In defining this concept Relph draws on the work of the philosopher Martin Heidegger. Relph, following Heidegger, connects dwelling to the act of building; he writes,

[i]n building which embraces dwelling there is no deliberate or selfconscious attempt to mould space as though it is an object—rather space is moulded, created, and possessed by the very act of building or landscape modification. The result is places which evolve, and have an organic quality, which have what Heidegger calls the character of ‘sparing’—the tolerance of something for itself without trying to change it or control it—places which are evidence of care and concern for the earth and for other men (sic). Such spaces and places are full with meaning;

---

167 This definition comes from my MacBook widgets dictionary.
they have an order and a sense that can be experienced directly, yet which is infinitely variable.

The sense here is that (spaces)/places develop out of, and during, the act of creating them, rather than as a product of some pre-conceived over-arching plan. In the case of a Heideggarian sense of dwelling the environment within which a space/place organically emerges is a critical factor, and Heidegger’s sense of this is explicitly rural. Interestingly, with Kfm the urban context was just as important in its formation as Heidegger’s idyllic rural landscape. The importance of Kfm’s urban context has already been discussed above, but this theme will continue to come up in the remainder of the Kfm chapters. In both the Heideggarian and Kfm cases places are created that are “full with meaning” and “can be experienced directly” resulting in a deeper, more intense experience for those that have meaningful contact with these built spaces/places, and even for those that come into contact with these spaces/places for the first time. The fullness of meaning and directness of experience are no more or less intense in rural or urban context, only different.168

Relph’s conception of places defined by the principles of *dwelling* can be contrasted productively here with Loretta Lees’ (2001) research on planned spaces/places and the ways in which those that use planned spaces/places (once they have been built) create their own interpretations and uses of the built environments that result. Lees’ research looks at the intentions of the architects, designers and planners that were involved in the construction of a library in

---

168 Using Heidegger via Relph here could be perceived as a contradiction of Lefebvre’s social production of space thesis. However, I do not think this is the case because, as was noted in chapter two, Lefebvre has phenomenological moments embedded in his framework through the lived, perceived, conceived trialectic.
Vancouver, Canada in terms of how they intended the space/place to be used. What Lees found is that when people actually began to use this space/place they did so in unexpected ways that did not always “fit” the expectations of those that designed the space/place. Lees found, in other words, that planned spaces/places may become susceptible to multiple interpretations and uses that escape the intentions of the creators of the space/place. Planned spaces/places are the antithesis of spaces/places created through dwelling or, within the context of Kfm, spaces/places that have been produced organically.

Through organic space/place production a very different process is undertaken from the beginning leading to a very different type of environment. With organic space/place production we see the coming together of a space/place (its design, function, etc.) as a result of the needs, interpretations and uses of those involved with it, and as a result a space/place is formed that is perhaps a “surprise” even to those that were most intimately involved in its production. The type of space/place formation that Lees described involves design-creating-use (both predictable and unpredictable) while the organic space/place production involves use-and-need-manifesting-design (a use that is inherently unpredictable because of its lack of a preconceived design).169

169 An important caveat here involves the building Kfm developed in. Like most of the buildings on K’ Road it is old, having been built in the early 1900s. No doubt this building has seen many uses and functions, some more “planned” than others. So despite the argument being made here that Kfm developed through a process of organic space/place production, it did so in a building that has gone through multiple uses and types of space/place production. In this sense Kfm represents both the type of planned space/place Lee describes in her work and organic space/place production. But even given this caveat it is clear that Kfm is very different from, say, the business that was there before it. Before Kfm moved in the both floors were occupied by a McDonald’s—a quintessentially planned space/place if there ever was one. Kfm certainly represents a very different type of space/place production from that of a McDonald’s, and these types of differences are important because they are clues to understanding what it means to say that Kfm represents an alternative and progressive space/place-based social movement.
To better understand how Kfm’s development exemplifies organic space/place production one need only to turn to the ways in which those involved in its coming into being describe this process. Several times over the course of my research people intimately involved with Kfm from its earliest days described how this organization came to be. This happened both in formal interviews and during more casual conversations, and it is through these interviews and conversations that I began to understand what they meant when they argued that Kfm came through a process of organic space/place production.

6.4 The Story of Kfm: a Narrative of Organic Space/Place Production

The story of Kfm begins with a chance meeting by two extraordinary individuals in Sandringham, a multiethnic Auckland neighborhood about a ten-minute bus ride from the CBD. John Greet, a musician and entrepreneur owned a home on a small street in this part of the city that just so happened to be next to the home of Tame Iti, one of the more controversial contemporary Māori activists of Tūhoe decent. Over time these neighbors became close friends, sharing many a conversation on each other’s decks. Music was always one of the main points of shared interest between John and Tame. John is an accomplished guitarist who has toured worldwide as both a solo virtuoso guitarist as well as with a successful Italian rock band in the 1970s. Tame Iti was at that time a DJ at

---

170 Tame Iti is without a doubt one of the more colorful Māori activists of the last few decades. For an introductory understanding of this complex individual, YouTube is a wonderful source. Two videos that will give the reader a brief but insightful glimpse into this man’s perspective are: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DE_lscS__0M and http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TnQjRYSWbNE&feature=related.
a popular Auckland radio station called George FM and was already involved as a Māori and Tūhoe activist.

One day, while John and Tame were sitting together in a café, a friend of Tame came up to them and told Tame that the government was issuing some new low frequency radio signals for $100 (NZ) and he thought Tame might be interested in getting one. Tame looked at him and said, “well, they probably wouldn’t give one to me,” then looking at John he said, “but they would give one to you!” So John thought about it and decided it was a good idea and went down and picked up the 106.9 frequency license. At first he had no idea what he would do with it, but over time he and Tame decided to begin a radio station and thus Kfm the radio station was born. The “K” came from the original location of the radio station on Karangahape Road, on the second floor of St. Kevin’s Arcade above where John and his wife at that time owned an African hair salon.

At first John planned to create a jazz station and he and Tame set up a radio booth in a “hole-in-the-wall” they shared with homeless people and other assorted bohemian types. This first radio booth was sound proofed using old egg cartons on the wall and whatever other material they could get their hands on to get the radio station up and running. Tame invited some of his young DJ friends from George FM along to start things up, with Arama Cookson and Gene Rivers being the first two DJs along with John and Tame. These two young Māori DJs, however, very quickly redefined the Kfm playlist to be one that emphasized a downbeat sound interspersed with reggae and whatever local

\[171\] The idea here as related by John was that they would give a radio license to him because he was Pākehā.
sounds that fit with these genre\textsuperscript{172}. John told me that the minute he heard the music these young Māori DJs were playing he knew that this was the right sound for Kfm and quickly let go of the idea that it would be primarily a jazz station.\textsuperscript{173} Here, at this moment of initial creation, we see an example of organic space/place production. In this case one idea (jazz station) being supplanted by a better one (downbeat/reggae) as new people became involved in Kfm’s creation. Critical to this was (and continues to be) the willingness by people like John to be open to this type of spontaneous development engaging in a benign guidance rather than a rigid control over Kfm’s development.

The development of Kfm as (partly) a Māori space/place also demonstrates the way ideas about Kfm’s social role developed in a dynamic, flexible manner. Ramon Narayan, another early DJ at Kfm, pointed out to me that, particularly because of the influence of Tame Iti, Kfm was initially also conceived as a fairly staunch Māori station promoting Māori issues and politics.\textsuperscript{174} John, Ramon, and others soon realized, however, that this approach to Kfm was not suitable to what they were beginning to understand this station to be all about. It was too exclusive and combative, and it was clear to them that this would “turn off” as many listeners to the Kfm “sound” as it would attract; and ultimately their goal was (and has remained) one of inclusivity rather than the opposite. It isn’t that Māori politics were conceived as unimportant—they clearly have been important from the very start as will be discussed in sections

---

\textsuperscript{172} The downbeat puts a heavy bass emphasis on the first beat of a measure. James Brown was famous for pioneering this form of rhythm.

\textsuperscript{173} John, a Kfm DJ himself, still does a weekly jazz show.

\textsuperscript{174} “Staunch” is a word often used by New Zealanders. It has a meaning that is often context dependent. Here it is being used to mean “resolutely dedicated to maintaining a certain message.” In other contexts it can mean: stubborn (in a negative sense), stubborn (in a positive sense), resistant to change, intrepid, or even ignorant.
below. Its just that as this place began to form people like John and Ramon began to develop a sense that this place needed to be dominated by openness to more than just Māori politics, and the more combative Māori politics, especially, tended towards creating limitations in terms of the range of people that would be turned on by this message.

As a result, a decision was made to deemphasize the overtly political Māori component of Kfm radio and instead infuse a Māori component with a more global downbeat and reggae influenced sound. This was a critical moment for Kfm (as both John, Ramon, and Arama pointed out to me on separate occasions) because it created a context for the formation of a Māori foundation at Kfm—that honors and acknowledges Māori status as tangata whenua—while simultaneously creating a place that celebrates and embraces difference.

Over time the space above St. Kevin’s became too restricting both in terms of the physical plant and in terms of the quality of the space/place (aesthetically, the “dive” factor was apparently becoming problematic) and as a result John began looking for another space/place. Across the street from St. Kevin’s a McDonald’s restaurant went out of business offering an ideal space/place for the radio station. The upstairs of the old McDonald’s was taken over by the growing Kfm crew and a more functional radio booth was constructed in a space/place that had room well beyond the small space of the radio booth. It is in this larger space/place that Kfm’s contemporary form—a radio station, a café, a ta moko (tattoo) studio, an art gallery, and a community space/place—began to take
shape. This process took about five years and the end result is the space/place referred to today as Mana Moko-Te Karanga. A Te Karanga board of trustees was formed and the space/place-based social movement that is Kfm became fully functional.

Perhaps the best way to understand the sense of spontaneity and need-driven design that led to the organic space/place production of Kfm is to listen to the stories of this genesis as told by those most closely involved in this space/place production process. Much of this process was summarized succinctly to me when John Greet said: “We let the space be determined by the activities that were found to happen up there.” A profound link between everyday life activities and space/place production is made in this statement. This link is continued through Ramon’s description of how all the different parts of Kfm came together:

Serge: So how did Kfm come to be?

Ramon: Yeah, well it was a totally organic process...none of it was ever done on purpose. Basically we ran out of room over there [St. Kevin’s] and it was really scaddy [dirty] and we wanted to up our game...[long explanation about how the original space was dirty and too small]...John found the space up here, but when we first came up here this was all concrete floors, no wall, no nothing, it was just bare walls and a concrete floor so this was just a big open space all the way to the back with like a toilette, and that was pretty much it. And so, the first thing we did was build the booth and moved all the equipment and brought it from over there and got it ready to broadcast. That was the first thing. Than originally there was a stage over here which we were going to use for kind of parties and things, and the guys from mana moko at the time were kind of looking for a place to move and they were like “hey, have you got a space for us because we would really like to move,” and we were like “yeah, yeah.” This was pre Pip, when it was Ara Pepa, George Nuku, and Tua Makinas...and...yeah, those three boys...and so, yeah, they had that space...ah...and then...basically once we had built that we said, “ahh, what are

175 The obvious and profound irony of Kfm taking over a defunct McDonald’s restaurant, a flagship of the placeless forces of globalization, should not be missed here.

176 More recently a room in the back has been used for shiatsu seminars and the idea of putting a meditation studio back there was being discussed at the time that I left New Zealand in October of 2008. Another room in the back was in the process of being set up as a small recording studio as well.
“we going to use that space for?” And we thought well that really could be a kind of gallery and this was originally going to be a bar...and so we built it as a bar and the stage over there...we weren’t to keen about the bar...we thought, well, you know it would be good...because we had been kind of thinking about it...we hadn’t got a license or anything like that, and we hadn’t put anything on; but one of the DJs up here was a lawyer and he had a party with twenty other lawyers up here and one of the guys got up on the roof, fell through the roof and got paralyzed, and he has a wife and kid and all this kind of stuff. He should never have been on the roof anyway, but they were just kind of being stupid, they were having a smoke up there or something, and fell through...and so we thought, nah, fuck that, we don’t want to have that kind of stuff going on, we don’t want to have to worry about that kind of shit. And, so, we had a big blessing of the space, to clean the space and the area, you know, and Ata Pepa did a waiata [a song in Māori often used for rituals and blessings] and did a whole kind of proper process to kind of cleanse all the energy of all that...and that’s when John thought lets just go for it, because he was always into...mad about tea, so it kind of made sense for us...and so we took the stage out of there because it wasn’t really working any way and then turned this into a café and then, yeah, yeah, went from there.

There are several aspects of this story as told by Ramon that are notable. First, overall the sense of Kfm never being conceived in its final form before hand is clear throughout this narrative. After the radio booth was built, the original Mana Moko artists heard about what was going on and asked to rent part of the space, the gallery came into being as an act of spontaneous decision making, and the café came into being as the result of a tragic event that lead to the realization that the original use planned (special events bar and entertainment area) was not appropriate. Second, it is important here to recognize that organic space/place production should not be conceived as a uniformly “feel good” process that is always positive in nature. Tragedy can play as significant a role in guiding the development of a space/place in this form of space/place production as any other more positive series of events. Third, the early use of Māori protocol to spiritually cleanse the Kfm space after the accident is suggestive of the early commitment made by those involved in the creation of this space/place to honor and acknowledge Māori values and worldviews.
After hearing Ramon’s story of Kfm’s genesis I pressed him a little more on whether or not there was a vision that drove the decisions they were making concerning Kfm:

Serge: So was it organic and a vision at the same time?

Ramon: Yeah, but I think it was very much an unconscious one, that kind of formed its way...we had these intentions of ways of being and the people that were attracted carried the same kind of intent, but it was a very unconscious thing, it wasn’t like what we were setting out to do, it was just something that kind of evolved.

Ramon is suggesting that, on the one hand, many of the choices that went into developing Kfm happened at an “unconscious” level, but that these decisions were, nonetheless, driven and directed by a shared sense of “intentions” and “ways of being.” This tension between unconscious place “evolution” and groups coming together under a sense of shared values and intentions suggests some of the underlying forces driving organic space/place production; intentionality, serendipity and unconscious choice simultaneously driving the development of a space/place.

The development of Mana Moko as a space/place rented and designed by Pip Hartley is also instructive of this tension between intentionality, serendipity and unconscious choices being made. Pip is a young Māori women in her mid twenties and an accomplished ta moko (tattoo) artist. Her story is similar to many of the people that I spoke to at Kfm in that the prominent role she has there today (the primary ta moko artist and Te Karanga board member) came about serendipitously as opposed to through a series of clearly preconceived plans and goals:

Serge: When you say you got a calling to come up here, what was that about?
Pip: Yeah, well...um...I'd met this guy over in Australia, in Byron Bay...it was about six years back...and he was telling me about this place [Kfm] actually...and that it was a good friend of his that started the radio station, and about Mana Moko, and da da da [etc.]...and then I was like “Oh, that sounds pretty amazing” ra ra ra [etc.]...and then it kind of like...passed on by the thought train...and then...um...yeah, I'd totally forgotten about it until I came up here and...um...and then it all just kind of fell into place for me really...like...I came up here to meet up with one of the ta moko artists that was still here from the original five that started Mana Moko and...um...yeah, I was going to come up here and work with him and then it kind of went down with him, and then he had to leave...and there was a whole studio waiting for me...

Much like the story of Kfm, the story of Pip’s coming to Kfm is one of opportunity seeming to fall into her lap rather than being the product of a clearly conceived plan or strategy. The point here is not to suggest that Pip’s (or any other person closely associated with Kfm) experience is totally unique in its serendipitous nature. It does not seem too far fetched to argue that many people would describe the unfolding of their life path as one filled with serendipitous moments and “chance” happenings leading to opportunity (or tragedy). But what is remarkable about Kfm and the people involved with this place is the consistency of this narrative in terms of both how the actual material space/place came to be and how those closely associated with this place came to be involved with it.

Another way that this narrative was expressed was in terms of “felt” experience. Many of the people I spoke with at Kfm explained their choices leading up to their becoming associated with Kfm as having been driven by a “feeling” at the level of intuition. John Greet, probably more than anyone else I spoke with at Kfm, was able to intellectualize and verbalize the link between Kfm as felt experience and Kfm as a material place that fostered, reinforced, and reproduced these experiences:
It boils down to a very, very simple thing that like-minded people who come together like a magnet…once you have a consensus, a group of similar people that think “this is what I want to work for”, you know? There’s not too much spelled out there, there’s not too much sitting down and [figuring] it all out…I mean we put the words on it after we already had the thing going! You know what I mean, it seemed like we didn’t have to explain ourselves, it was something we just felt.

This is a powerful statement of sociality expressed here by John. That like-minded people serve as a force that attracts others of similar disposition to them is clearly stated here, as is the idea of having “just felt” their way to the type of social consensus about place and community that was developing at Kfm. In the next quote, however, the role of space/place in all this is more firmly stated by John:

_The point I’m making Serge is that it’s felt, the whole thing is felt, it’s not expressed in words…it’s felt and Julz felt that very strongly, you know what I mean? She felt something in me, but what she really was feeling is the whole expression of the place. Because I think what happens is you get a lot of people together…you get a nucleus of people together that start putting out a certain sort of vibration of how they want it to be, what is there ideal, in an area where they basically leave the outside world behind the moment one steps into that space…and that vibration grows, and that’s what you have at Kfm. That’s why I’ve seen the amazing effect it has on Māori…see Māori come up those steps… and Māori always look suspicious, because we [Pākehā society] make them look suspicious because we are full of suspicion [inaudible], you know what I mean? “Am I going to get accused of stealing”, “Who’s looking at me?” “Who’s that fucking old White guy behind the bar?” And within minutes I’ve seen them melt; I’ve seen them walk into the ta moko studio and look around…they melt, they melt, because what they’re feeling is not specifically coming from us, it’s the sum of the energy that has been created in that space…I get that all the time when I walk into Buddhist temples, you know places where lot’s of people have been meditating for a very long time, I can feel it, it’s palpable, you know what I mean? I can feel it with every fucking pore in my body, the sum of the energy, there’s a thing in that room with people meditating and I feel that, and that’s what we have up there…because it’s like…what they’re feeling is…it’s the energy of the place that they’re feeling, it’s the energy of a kind of acceptance that’s been established there, and its stronger than any negative…because people that have got the negative approach walk in and walk out._

This profound statement by John describing what it is about Kfm that makes its sense of space/place so unique and special has multiple components that are deeply relevant and important to this discussion. Once again the notion of a
shared felt experience permeating the way people involved with Kfm interpret and connect to this place is asserted. Linked to this felt experience is a “vibration” (energy in Western parlance, chi to the Chinese, mauri to Māori) that connects the sociality of Kfm to its materiality. This is absolutely critical to the ontological argument that has been made throughout this dissertation that space/place and the social exist in a mutually constitutive relationship; that space/place is socially produced but simultaneously space/place is an essential component of being in the world; and that once material places are created they then serve to foster, reinforce, and reproduce the socio-cultural formations that occur in relation to them.

In making these arguments it is not, however, my intention to suggest that organic space/place production is primarily a smooth, unproblematic process whereby individuals, “tuning in” to the “energies” about them, create built environments without any overt intentionality or direct agency. As Kfm developed there was clearly moments where individuals made choices and “steered” Kfm in certain directions in terms of its contemporary characteristics and functions. John Greet notes this agency in the following conversation:

*Serge:* …I guess what I am looking for from you is just a discussion about Kfm, and what you think it really means…what it means to Māori, what it means in the context of urban Auckland…so I mean really its pretty open…

*John:* Well really that is a question right there where I can jump into it…okay, there it is right there… basically… just to give you a quick little bit of background on the whole sort of scenario we often talk about as the organic process…and that’s pretty much what happened…there is a kind of vetting and screening that goes on, so it is organic to the extent that we let things evolve, but we probably cancel out as many things as actually get to evolve…we chop out about half a dozen, you know what I mean? There is a vetting process, its not just totally organic in that sense; and one of the things that becomes very apparent when your living in a city like Auckland and a country like New Zealand is this whole multicultural metamorphosis that is going on at the moment, you know…
The first and most striking aspect of John’s statement is the suggestion of a connection between the process of organic space/place production at Kfm and the “multicultural metamorphosis” that he perceives Auckland to be undergoing. Why is this important? It suggests that space/place production does not occur in a vacuum; it is intrinsically connected to the greater socio-spatial/platial context within which Kfm space/place production is occurring. In other words, the qualities of space/place that Kfm is producing and the socio-cultural space/place-based experiment that Kfm is undertaking are directly related to processes of social change that are happening in Auckland as well. They are, in other words, deeply and profoundly interdependent.\footnote{177}

A second component of this statement is the idea that organic space/place production, as it is occurring at Kfm, is a process of trial and error by those most deeply involved in its maintenance and development. When John refers to “a kind of vetting and screening that goes on” he is pointing out that many opportunities to influence the character of Kfm as it developed into its present form were presented to people in a position to adopt or reject these opportunities. Which of these was adopted and which was rejected comes through a combination of discussion and intuition as to what needed to happen at Kfm in order to continue its development and growth. Having witnessed this vetting and screening process at both a board of trustees meeting and in the day-to-day workings of Kfm, it is clear that this is indeed one of the core components of the organic space/place production process as it unfolded at Kfm.

\footnote{177}{This theme is taken up in more detail in chapter eight.}
This suggests a major difference between spaces/places that are planned “from above” by architects and planners and then opened to use by a general population as opposed to those that were created from the start by the individuals that end up using them (Lees, 2001). In a sense it is the difference between being emotionally embedded in the means of space/place production versus using a space/place where you personally had no connection to how it was produced. In the latter case built environments become meaningful spaces/places over time as people invest their everyday life experiences in them. But can they ever acquire the level of intrinsic connection that is derived from actually being a part of the design and creation of that space/place? In this sense Kfm represent non-fetishized space/place for those that have been involved with its creation and still remain deeply committed and connected to its everyday usage and function.

6.5 Conclusion: Understanding the Space/Place Production Process At Kfm

Understanding how a place like Kfm came to be is a complex undertaking that involves multiple perspectives. In this chapter I explored two aspects of this complexity: the role of geographic and historical context, and the importance of agency. I argued that to understand Kfm it is necessary to understand where Kfm came into existence, further arguing that both its location in Auckland City, but more importantly on K’ Road, played a critical interdependent role in the unique type of space/place Kfm developed into. I further argued, employing the concept organic space/place production, that analyzing how spaces/places come into being must involve in-depth conversations with the people most intimately
involved in its space/place production. It is only through these conversations that the intricacies of how spaces/places organically come into being can be fully comprehended.

However, the two perspectives employed in this chapter represent only part of the analytic process involved in understanding an organization like Kfm. Understanding the historical and geographic context within which a space/place emerges, and the role of individuals in this process is only partial because this process never reaches an end point. Once a space/place like Kfm comes into existence it remains in a constant state of becoming, and eventually will enter into a phase of un-becoming (nothing lasts forever!). Thus, another important component of understanding a space/place like Kfm is to not only ask how it came into being, but also how it continues to be.

In the next chapter it is this issue of space/place as constantly becoming that I explore. Again, the importance of the individuals that are most intimately associated with Kfm play a critical role in understanding this process. In this next chapter the emphasis on sociality and materiality existing in a mutually constitutive relationship is continued. I argue that through a detailed analysis of how the people that spend the most time at Kfm and run this organization interact with Kfm’s space/place, think about this space/place, and even spiritually interact with this space/place on an everyday basis an even deeper understanding of Kfm as continuously becoming space/place is achieved.
CHAPTER 7
SPACE/PLACE PRODUCTION AND PRACTICES OF EVERYDAY LIFE: THE CASE OF MANA MOKO-TE KARANGA, PART TWO

7. Kfm Space/Place as a Process of Continuous Becoming

Up to this point my discussion has centered on the subject of how Kfm came to be in order to better understand its relationship to Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga. This involved situating Kfm within its urban context (both historical and contemporary), constructing a narrative about (and by) the individuals that came together to actively form Kfm, as well as a more theoretical discussion about the nature of space/place production at Kfm. Within this analysis I proposed and defined the notion of organic space/place production: a process whereby use, need and feeling were seen as far more significant driving forces in how Kfm came into being and was designed than did issues of exchange, control and order.

These discussions of the nature of space/place production and the genesis of Kfm are, however, only a piece of the puzzle that is Kfm—albeit an important piece. A more in-depth comprehension of what makes Kfm such a unique and special organization must also include a discussion of how Kfm can be understood—in its present form—as a space/place of everyday life and as a space/place of continuous becoming. Moreover, it is the complex interplay of thought, action (practice) and materiality at Kfm in the context of everyday life that must be comprehended in order to truly understand what makes this place
so unique, special and, I argue, important to understanding whakamanatanga-based Māori urbanisms.

In order to fully elucidate the way in which space/place production and practices of everyday life comingle to form Māori urbanisms at Kfm, this section draws heavily on the theoretical discussions of space/place in Chapter 2. These discussions involved in part the literature on the production of space in everyday life, the notion of place as socially constructed and as being-in-the-world, and the argument made in Chapter 2 that all of these approaches to space and place can be combined within a space/place conceptual framework. Using this framework I have argued throughout that there is an interdependent relationship between the social production of space/place and the space/place production of sociality. I further argued that from a Māori perspective the material is as much a part of the spiritual as humans are, and as such a space/place like Kfm develops an “energy” that plays a critical role in how it is perceived and interacted with by those that are most intimately involved with Kfm.

In this chapter I continue to apply this framework at the intimate space/place level of Kfm in order to demonstrate in the context of everyday life how space/place is continuously produced both through sociality at Kfm and its materiality. My approach to developing an in-depth space/place narrative of everyday life at Kfm involves a conversation about each of its “parts” (radio station, ta moko studio, tea café, art gallery); this narrative is developed both in the context of my experiences with this place but also (far more importantly) through the voices of those most intimately involved with Kfm. This fractured approach to understanding Kfm is methodologically driven rather than symbolic or metaphorical. In other words, Kfm should not (based on this approach) be
understood merely as the sum of its parts. Kfm is a holistic organization where each of these parts are continuously intertwining and interconnecting through the actions of the individuals involved with Kfm, and through both sensory, material and spiritual aspects of the Kfm environment.

My goal throughout these discussions is also to emphasize ways in which the physical space/place of Kfm—its design aesthetic, its aural environment, its visual references and its interior layout—ontologically foster, maintain and actively reproduce the sociality of space/place at Kfm. In Lefebvrian terms it is argued here that through creating Kfm the individuals involved with this creative process of space/place production inscribed a unique representation of space into this second floor building on K’ Road that allowed them to engage spatial practices and spaces of representation that are harmonious to their values, politics, and social views. This extrapolation of Lefebvrian theory has, I argue, great potential to extend his theory in ways that have not (to the best of my knowledge) been attempted as yet. In general Lefebvre tends to see representations of space as spaces of domination controlled by forces of capitalism. Spatial practices and spaces of representation are, in contrast, seen as ways of disrupting representations of space from those in control of the forces of capital. To extend Lefebvre’s trialectic of space to the micro level of Kfm, and to further argue that people at Kfm have produced their own representation of space to harmonize their spatial practices and spaces of representation suggests, I argue, the potential to use Lefebvrian theory to understand the role of everyday life in the production of space/place.

It is further argued in the conclusion of this section, again following ideas developed in Chapter 2, that a fourth dimension emerges out of the Kfm case
study. This fourth dimension, derived from Māori conceptions of space and place and understood particularly through the concepts *wairua* and *mauri*, contributes a uniquely Māori perspective to my theoretical framework concerning the interdependent relationship between sociality and materiality. Simultaneously, the insertion of this fourth dimension suggests broader implications for ways in which Māori perspectives have the potential to “take hold” of Western conceptions of space/place (like Lefebvre’s socio-spatial trialectic) and as a result create whole new understandings of these concepts.

A final theme found throughout this chapter demonstrates the link between local processes of everyday space/place production at Kfm to forces of globalization. This theme is taken up more comprehensively in the next chapter, but here it is introduced as one way to understand how practices of everyday life at Kfm are simultaneously locally productive and globally connected. The consistency with which this theme came through in the stories told to me by those most intimately involved with Kfm, and through my observations of the inner workings of this organization is truly remarkable, and certainly the Kfm radio station is as good an example of this local-global space/place production as any.

### 7.1 Kfm 106.9: Forging the Rhythm of a Space/Place-Transmitting to the World

The Kfm radio station, 106.9 FM, is an obvious starting point for this discussion. As was shown in earlier sections, it is music that brought the principle founders of Kfm together, and it is music, I argue, that is a binding force for the entire Kfm/Te Karanga Trust space/place-based social movement.
In the beginning, there was just a shared love of music, a chance opportunity at obtaining a cheap low frequency radio license, and the desire by a few individuals to turn this opportunity into something more. And it was the Kfm radio station, as it developed a sound and collected DJ’s, which became the impetus for the search for a larger space and the eventual move into the second floor at 208 Karangahape Road.

When one enters Kfm it is the music that they first experience. Yes, there is the visual aesthetic of the stairwell with its mixed Asian/Māori art and symbols (see Figure 30 on page 322), but when you walk up the stairs it is the downbeat or reggae sound that you not only hear, but literally feel the music vibrating through your body. This aural/rhythmic experience is omnipresent at Kfm for as long as an individual remains there (it is even piped into the ta moko studio so that, when the door is shut, the rhythm of Kfm is still a part of the Mana Moko studio). This aural/rhythmic on-site radio station feature marks one important aspect of Kfm’s sense of space/place uniqueness. While most other stations are little more than a radio booth in an otherwise non-descript floor of a building, at Kfm the radio station is a critical part of Kfm’s sense of space/place. It is also clearly a different experience for the DJ’s to be simultaneously projecting out to a wider world and actively participating in creating this sense of space/place. This was particularly obvious when the DJ’s would talk on-air in that they would regularly refer to the Kfm space/place and to the people their. During both formal and informal conversations I had with DJ’s they often talked about what a different and special experience DJing at Kfm was, both because they felt a part of this space/place, but also because this spatial/platial context gave them a greater sense of being part of the Kfm organization.
For example, during a discussion I had with Ramon Narayan he made this observation in response to the questions: “How do you think the radio station influences this space? Did this space evolve around this radio station?”

*It kind of works all together as well, because, like, BASE FM is unlucky where they don’t have a café, and because they are in this little booth in the middle of Ponsonby Road…whereas for us we get to play and there are people around us and creates that buzz for us as well.*

There are several important points that Ramon is making here. First, he is contrasting Kfm to one of their main rival commercial stations (BASE FM) and pointing out that the DJ’s at BASE are at a disadvantage because of the space/place from which they are broadcasting. The BASE FM space/place is typical of most radio stations in that it is dedicated only to the functioning of the station (a radio booth and administrative space). 178 Kfm, on the other hand, is a space/place that gives the DJ’s access to a café (free tea or coffee whenever they have the need), to the art gallery and its ever changing exhibits, to the ta moko studio and to the people that flow in and out of Kfm.

Second, and even more importantly, Ramon points out that Kfm’s materiality is perceived to be a critical component that sets the Kfm DJing experience apart from that of other radio stations. Third, this materiality is

---

178 Throughout the time I spent at Kfm in 2008 it was common for people like Ramon and John Greet to bring up a recent experience they had had that involved BASE FM. The BASE FM people challenged Kfm to a “sound clash” which involved the DJ’s associated with these stations performing one after the other in front of a live audience. Audience response at the end of the competition determined the winner. This event was well attended and the Kfm people went into it with little expectation of winning because BASE FM is a well funded and broadly listened to radio station with popular “rock star” DJ’s. However, as it turned out Kfm won the event in a landslide much to the chagrin of BASE FM. All of the people at Kfm were extremely proud of this accomplishment and several of them told me that the reason they won was because they participated in the competition as a whanau (family) and that the audience recognized this and responded to it positively. Several “scenes” from this sound clash can be viewed on YouTube at: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cUxCQgO5eW8 (to see the main Kfm performance) and at: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=toBoiGE5T88 (to see the audience voting Kfm the winner).
linked to sociality at Kfm through the DJ’s experience of broadcasting not just to an unseen audience but also to an immediate one in the form of people in the café, in the gallery, the people working at Kfm, etc. The idea that this creates a “buzz” for the DJ’s at Kfm is a clear expression of the difference involved in DJing at Kfm, as well as a recognition of the mutually constitutive relationship between Kfm’s materiality and its sociality; the use of the word “buzz” further suggests an experience infused with excitement and intensity.

This relationship is also evident through other aspects of what it means to be a Kfm DJ. The DJ’s at Kfm are all volunteering their time and expertise at a radio station that allows them a lot of leeway in terms of playlists and on-air commentary (there are no paid DJ’s and no paid commercial advertising). While I did witness some informal monitoring of what type of sound individual DJ’s produced (especially when they were new), once it was felt by people like John Greet and Ramon Narayan that a particular DJ “got” what Kfm is all about, they were given a remarkable amount of freedom to create a sound that furthers the Kfm project and yet also gives them plenty of room for individual expression.179 Almost every person that I got to know who was intimately involved with Kfm took a turn DJing, many of them hosting a regular show once or twice a week, thereby furthering the role of the radio station as a force “binding” Kfm’s separate parts together into one holistic place.180 This binding ability is

179 The only thing comparable in the U.S. as far as I can tell is college radio stations, although even these have to abide by the FCC rules to a much greater extent than the powers that govern radio stations like Kfm in New Zealand seem to (for example, Kfm DJ’s have no problem using profanity from time to time, nor are they shy when it comes to promoting radical politics and alternative views).
180 On my second stint of fieldwork in Aotearoa New Zealand I was honored with being given a one-time two hour DJ slot at Kfm. The set up was quite informal in that one day I approached Ramon and said I was interested in having a go at DJing. He looked at the schedule and said
articulated both physically (with music literally vibrating through the bodies of the people while they are at Kfm) and socially through the broad participation in DJing and through the social experience of the music that is being played (see Figure 37 below, and 38 page 386).

![Figure 37: DJ Militant Gypsy (Julz Rahui, left) & DJ Morning Steppa (Arama Cookson, right) working in the Kfm radio booth.](image)

The sense that Kfm radio plays a key role in binding the Kfm space/place both socially and materially was most clearly articulated by John Greet in the following conversation:

*Serge:* What do you think will be Kfm’s legacy? How is it going to last past your life span (for example)? Is it a momentary occurrence or is it something that will persist?

*John:* No, it is a totally ongoing thing. Look, Serge, Kfm exists because there is a need...there is a need. I mean, Kfm happened out of a group of people being sensitive to

“great! I’ll put you down for a two hour segment tomorrow.” Having never been a DJ before I was given a crash course in how to operate the equipment and then just showed up on the day designated and preceded to put on my show. It was a singularly fun and interesting experience that I hope I will do again when I return. I was told by John that he and Ramon listened to the first five minutes of my show to make sure I wasn’t totally going to crash and burn and, once they were satisfied that I was playing music that fit Kfm’s sound, they stopped listening and went about their business.
the need of this marginal, artistic, creative community that we’re part of…um…needed, you know? The need was there…if you like…

Serge: The need for…?

John: The need for a coming together, for a gathering under something…initially that’s music, the common bond that we all had was music…I mean the diversity of people…we had, like, we had a corporate lawyer (three lawyers), a media lawyer…and we had young Arthur, a little broke art kid from South Auckland that just sort of liked the place, you know what I mean? You know, that spectrum we had from Mary Anne through to…let’s say…Carla…you know the diversity of characters up there is incredible. What’s the binding principle? The binding principle is that sense of community enhanced by the music that we play…enhanced by that common thing…the music is the fucking tribal drum beat Serge…it’s the tribal beat…it’s the sitting around the fires at night time in some village in Africa beating on that drum and putting yourself in a trance-like state…you know what I mean? There is no difference…the throb and hum of that music!

The point that John is so passionately and eloquently making here is that there is a link between Kfm as a space/place of music and Kfm as a space/place of community; it is the music itself that has a power in it to act as a binding force that, when combined with physical space and a like-minded group of people, becomes an active force in building, maintaining, actively producing and actively furthering community.

The role of the Kfm radio station to build community goes well beyond this more abstract binding “force” to encompass some very tangible aspects of Kfm as a community network program. The radio station serves as a vehicle for promoting both Kfm events and a broad range of events around Auckland both in terms of the music scene and in terms of individuals being involved in social activism. Linked to this notion of social activism is the fact that DJing as a skill is also taught at Kfm to interested youth from the Auckland area. This social activist aspect of Kfm radio is neatly summarized in a proposal written by Ramon Narayan for the purpose of applying for an increase in the wattage of the Kfm radio signal:
Te Karanga is a multi-faceted musical and artistic experience with over 50 volunteer DJ’s—originating from many lands and cultures including peoples from the Pacific, Europe, Asia, Africa, the Americas and the Middle East.

These DJ’s volunteer their time in a charitable capacity. Not only do they give up their time to broadcast on the community radio station but they also lend a hand to our various social programs that we facilitate.

Since its inception, our community radio station, Kfm 106.9 has been a training ground for mentoring DJ’s. We provide an opportunity for people who felt passionate about music but lack the experience to play on air or the skills to play at events. It is by providing people with the opportunity, the skills and then later the confidence that they find themselves in hot demand around the city.

Like many of the individual “parts” of Kfm, the radio station and the DJ’s involved with spinning its music and maintaining its sound are involved in an intricate space/place practice that simultaneously involves space/place construction at its most intimate level as well as space/place construction through a growing network of community based social activisms.

This aspect of Kfm radio as a nodal point for growing networks of people and organizations extends well beyond the boundaries of K’ Road or even Auckland. Despite the relatively small wattage that Kfm’s radio waves put out locally (100 watts), its entrance onto the World Wide Web through live streaming has given the DJ’s at Kfm access and input into a globalized music scene. Spinning sounds that are collected from the global explosion of music, and combining this music with locally generated sounds to reflect their local identities and agendas, the Kfm DJ’s have become deeply embedded in a globalizing/localizing process of space/place production. At over 80,000 hits a month (and growing) the Kfm downbeat and reggae “message” is reaching out to people in areas all over Aotearoa New Zealand, as well as in countries around
the world. It is a local space/place message, but it is simultaneously a global one.

This globalizing/localizing aspect of Kfm radio is also reflected in its being identified by those that are most closely connected with Kfm as a multicultural/world beat radio station. In its earliest incarnation Kfm radio was envisioned as a staunchly Māori radio station as noted in the following conversation:

*Serge:* What’s interesting to me is that you are not Māori, John’s not Māori so where do you think the Māori vibe comes from? I mean, do you think this is a Māori place?

*Ramon:* I think that...um...I think that it was more so...I think that it was something that, because way back in the day, when the station got first created, like John started with Tame Iti, so he’s quite a big activist...and so that was at the very roots of Kfm and then a lot of the early programming was really a lot of political kind of stuff...

*Serge:* Māori politics?
Ramon: Yeah, yeah, and it ended up kind of starting to take over the music so we needed to find a balance through it...so we ended up kind of, kind of...Tame Iti had moved out of Auckland...but we still carried the flag really, and it was always something that John was really, really passionate about—he had a boat down at the viaduct, it was a flash boat having the big tino rangatiratanga flag [Māori sovereignty flag] at the top—and so it has always been part of what we did, and more so, it was a move for us to really concentrate on, I guess, social consciousness and global issues as a real crux of what we are about and what we do, and doing things with that intention of well being for the community and the globe. But for that to happen, and for us to really have well being in our community, we can’t have well being until there is well being within tangata whenua and all those things...so that really needs to be at the beginning.

It is clear from this conversation between Ramon and I, however, that it was quickly recognized by the early founders of Kfm that to define Kfm radio as primarily a vehicle for Māori politics would limit the reach of Kfm to a narrow audience. This did not mean, as Ramon makes quite clear, giving up the Māori component of Kfm entirely, and in fact Ramon strongly argues that finding a balance at Kfm with this aspect of Aotearoa New Zealand society is a critical part of what Kfm is all about.

Currently Kfm has one radio program a week dedicated exclusively to Māori issues and done entirely in Māori. But this does not mean that the rest of the time the radio station does not have a Māori component. Many of the DJ’s have Māori ancestry and bring this aspect of their identity into their radio show. For example, Arama Cookson, one of the original DJ’s at Kfm speaks to this melding of a Māori perspective at Kfm with that of a more multicultural and global sense of the music. When I first asked Arama whether or not he felt Kfm to be a Māori radio station his answer was quite specific:

*I’d say its more of a world radio station...um...I’d never really want to class it as a Māori radio station because of all the different cultures involved in it.*
This same idea was echoed by many of the people I spoke with on this issue of whether or not Kfm radio should be considered a Māori radio station. For example, Zane, a young man of both Pākehā and Māori descent who works at Kfm as a barrista and in marketing the wholesale distribution of Tea Culture teas, had this to say:

*Serge: How about Kfm…the radio station…do you consider it a Māori radio station?*

*Zane: No. Not at all…No, I wouldn’t say it is a Māori radio station at all…um…but at the same time the beauty of this kind of whole space and what happens up here is that it’s very much acknowledging Māoridom, it’s culture, it’s artwork, it’s history…um…it’s living and breathing kind of history as well…um…but its not about that…it’s kind of in line with that…it goes, it goes hand…it goes side by side with what, with kind of all cultures as well because here is a place that anyone from any culture can come and feel respected and, like, and feel they belong here.*

So on the one hand, Zane is quite adamant to point out that Kfm radio is not a Māori radio station but rather one that is multicultural and inclusive. At the same time, however, he also is quite keen to make the point that despite not feeling that the radio station should be categorized as Māori, there is simultaneously an undercurrent of Māoriness connected to the entirety of Kfm (its radio station, gallery, ta moko studio, etc.) that honors and acknowledges, as he puts it, “Māoridom”.

This idea of Kfm as a site of linkage between a Māori sense of space/place and an environment of multiculturalism and inclusivity is further articulated by the following comment made by Arama:

*Yeah, that comes from my music because I play a world style of music, I play music from every where…and, and can see how a mix of music makes people feel…it affects them in a calming way, in an even playing field, so it doesn’t matter who or what you are, you can relate to that style of music; so I think for Māori to step forward into society we embrace all those things the same way, and present ourselves in that way…ourselves still speaking Māori, but also embracing every other language.*
Ultimately, what Ramon, Zane and Arama are all arguing is that while it is incorrect to classify Kfm as exclusively a Māori radio station, it is also incorrect to view this as in any way a disregarding of the importance of the Māori aspects of Kfm. Rather than see this as a contradiction or tension, these individuals see this Māori and multicultural characteristic of Kfm as being one of the fundamental components of what makes Kfm so special.181

The Kfm radio station actively binds together the Kfm space/place while simultaneously connecting Kfm to a growing network of communities. It does this in a way that celebrates the multicultural characteristics so apparent at Kfm, but also creates a medium through which Māori can insert their perspectives into this globalizing/localizing phenomenon. The Kfm radio station operates as a binding material and virtual force that combines elements of Kfm’s Māori and multicultural sense of space/place, and actualizes this sense of space/place through the everyday activities of the DJ’s, the people listening to the radio station music at Kfm, and the wider audience listening in Auckland, throughout New Zealand, and around the world. Many of these themes continue as I turn to Kfm’s ta moko studio: Mana Moko.

181 This absolutely fundamental point about Kfm as a space/place-based social movement that simultaneously embraces Māori values and a social context of multiculturalism is the main focus of the next chapter and is dealt with in more detail at that time.
7.2 Mana Moko: the Heart of Kfm’s Māori Sense of Space/Place

If the Kfm radio station acts as a force for binding all the disparate components of Kfm, and does this while negotiating the relationship between Kfm’s multicultural and Māori sense of space/place, then Mana Moko serves as a reminder, within the context of this negotiation, that at the foundation of Kfm’s space/place production is an honoring and acknowledging of Māori. Mana Moko, the ta moko (tattoo) studio, serves as a symbolic, social, and material reminder of the strong sense of Māoriness that runs through Kfm’s sense of space/place, and it does this both through its everyday activities, and through its material expression. Both metaphorically and literally Kfm’s Māoriness is being carved into its sense of space/place through the actions and existence of Mana Moko.

Mana Moko was established soon after the radio booth was built. At that time there was no café or art gallery. The individuals that established Mana Moko at Kfm were all Māori ta moko artists. As Ramon noted previously Mana Moko came to be established at Kfm as part of Kfm’s organic space/place production:

_Than originally there was a stage over here which we were going to use for kind of parties and things, and the guys from mana moko at the time were kind of looking for a place to move and they were like “hey, have you got a space for us because we would really like to move,” and we were like “yeah, yeah.”_

As it turned out, however, these ta moko artists did not work out and the reason for this is suggestive of the sense of Māoriness that permeates the Kfm organization. John Greet describes the demise of these original artists as follows:

_You know, when we opened mana moko the first two or three tattoo artists were full-on, you know, call to arms amongst the Māori people...let’s throw the Whites out...that type_
of polemic activists, you know what I mean? We had a bunch of those up there and those guys had got a serious chip on their shoulders and, you know, it just simply didn’t work, and it held us back, it really held us back in the beginning and there were harsh words spoken. Ironically, since those guys have kind of moved on...you know since those guys sort of moved on...they still come back and they honor what we have achieved, you know what I mean?

However, this initial disharmony lead to the creation of a ta moko studio that did work at Kfm. The key was finding a ta moko artist that could embody the strong sense of a Māori foundation that had already been established at Kfm while simultaneously embracing the multicultural environment characterized by an acceptance of diversity and difference. The ta moko artists that originally set up Mana Moko left behind a fully stocked ta moko studio, and it was from this opportunity that a talented young ta moko artist by the name of Pip Hartley became part of Kfm.

Pip grew up in a predominantly Pākehā rural area north of Auckland with the beach and forest as her backyard. Pip’s father is a full-blooded Māori and her mother is of mixed European ancestry. She did not grow up with any clear knowledge of her whakapapa (genealogy) and was not taught Māori language. And yet, like many of the Māori living in urban areas that I met during my fieldwork, Pip has managed to maintain a strong sense of her Māori identity despite not having access to these more traditional aspects of her cultural heritage. Pip has developed her strong sense of Māori identity through her discovery, and eventual training in, the art of ta moko, and through a deeply spiritual sense of being on a path to rediscover her Māori whakapapa.182

182 Towards the very end of writing this dissertation I had the opportunity to meet up with Pip in Honolulu (September, 2010). During our conversations she mentioned that she was working hard to establish stronger connections to her iwi, Tū Wharetoa. She was spending time at her
From an historical and generational perspective Pip’s story is a typical one of Māori families becoming increasingly disconnected from important core elements of Māori culture—especially kōrero (language), whakapapa (genealogy) and tūrangawaewae (meaningful connection to iwi/hapū territory and marae). And yet despite this Pip is, as is shown below, profoundly aware of, and proud of, her Māori identity. This seeming contradiction of Māori who are at once seemingly disconnected from their cultural background and yet simultaneously intensely aware and proud of their Māoriness was one I came across often in my research. Many of these Māori, moreover, are living lifestyles that they feel are profoundly Māori, and expressing their Māoriness in creative ways that are contributing positively to the production of contemporary Māori culture. I would further argue that much of this type of Māori cultural productivity is occurring in, and importantly influenced by, urban ways of life. When these elements are brought together—profound Māori identities and actions combined with urban ways of life—then all the elements of whakamanatanga-based Māori urbanisms are in place. The development of Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga are both a manifestation of this coming together as well as active forces in fostering, maintaining and reproducing them. And critical to all of this is the notion that one does not

183

marae on the shores of Lake Taupo (Aotearoa New Zealand’s largest lake in the center of the North Island), and she was working hard to encourage her father to re-engage with his iwi as well. Through her ta moko practice and, I suspect, through her participation with the Kfm whanau, Pip has begun to reconnect with her whakapapa and tūrangawaewae. For me this is another indication that whakamanatanga-based Māori urbanisms like Kfm, although radical departures from a more traditional path to empowerment, are just as capable of stimulating individuals to reconnect with their Māori roots.  

183 Although, to be fair, in my interview and informal discussions with Pip it was clear that her sense of being urban was fraught with contradictions and complexities. On the one hand, it was clear that she really did not like cities very much and aspired to a life built around a rural
necessarily have to have strong kōrero, whakapapa and tūrangawaewae skills and connections to be powerfully Māori. Pip’s story, as much as any I came across while doing my research, exemplifies this line of reasoning.

Pip’s interest in ta moko came about through getting to know several tattoo artists during her teenage years:

Well, when I was living with those tattooists and they offered to teach me, and they took me to this cultural tattooing convention in Borneo…and that was pretty much my introduction to tattooing.

As she developed her interest in tattooing she traveled to Europe to attend more tattooing conventions:

I was surrounded by some of the world’s best tattoo artists. At the time, I was fresh into the scene and I didn’t even know it…you know…I was hanging out with these amazing tattooists and they were giving me these little tips and just inspiring me along the way…it was cool…and from there we were invited over to Europe to go work for this studio in Lisz in Belgium and…yeah, there was this big convention over in Holland.

However, her European experience was mixed with both enthusiasm and disappointment:

Yeah, well then after Europe I went back to live on the West coast [of Aotearoa New Zealand]…because going around to different conventions in Europe kind of slightly put me off a little bit…because it was a very commercial kind of scene…mainstream tattooing and lots of Bikeys and just the kind of mentality that really wasn’t me…

After traveling a bit more Pip’s introduction to Kfm was partly opportunistic and partly serendipitous. As was noted in Chapter 6, Pip’s journey to Kfm was based on following a path that lacked any clear pre-conception of the end point and fits well into the notion of organic space/place production discussed. But more importantly here is an understanding of the kind of Māori perspective Pip sustainable community. On the other hand, however, she was also willing to admit that the city has a certain draw for her and that there were things she needed to do professionally and personally that could only happen in Auckland.
brought with her when she took over Mana Moko. As one of the many thousands of Māori who did not grow up with traditional markers of Māori cultural knowledge, Pip’s adult life has partly been defined by a journey to reconnect with these most basic aspects of Māori cultural identity. Ta moko has played a critical role in this process, as has Pip’s slow reconnection with her whakapapa-based hapū.

But here I want to insert an argument based on the many Māori I spoke with like Pip who were finding their Māori identities as adults, having been deprived of this knowledge as children. As much as this lack of knowledge has created problematic identity issues for Māori (many of them Māori living in urban areas), it has also created positive possibilities for some of them. In particular, I believe that for some of these Māori the process of reconnecting with their Māori identities has empowered them as Māori but made them simultaneously adaptive within urban society. One result of this adaptability is an ability to be comfortable with heterogeneity and difference. In a space/place like Kfm this becomes a strength in that it is an organization that is attempting to find a balance between a sociality that honors and acknowledges Māori world views and values and one that embraces and celebrates Auckland’s growing cultural diversity. Critical to the success of this sociality is the production of a space/place like Kfm that enables this process to go forward, and mana moko plays a central role in anchoring the Māoriness of Kfm’s space/place.

As a ta moko artist Pip practices one of the most visual and symbolically powerful representations of Māori culture—the moko. According to Tricia Allen (2005: 2) “Tattooing was practiced by nearly all Pacific Island cultures...[and]...Its origins may go back as far as the initial migration and
colonization of the Pacific." When Polynesians migrated to Aotearoa and Te Waipounamu (the Māori name for the South Island) they brought this tradition with them and, over time, developed uniquely Māori moko styles and skills. With European colonization, and the many socio-cultural pressures that were part and parcel of this process, the Māori practice of ta moko went into decline with a low point occurring in the mid-20th century (Losch, 2003).

However, like many other cultural practices that blossomed once again as part of the Māori Renaissance of the 1970s (e.g., Māori dance forms, Māori language), moko became increasingly popular. Certainly this popularity was helped along by, and a significant part of, the growing popularity of tattoo as a global phenomenon, but in Aotearoa New Zealand it was for Māori also (and importantly) a localized act of cultural politics as much as anything else. Referring to the cultural politics of moko for Māori, on the PBS website Skin Stories: the Art and Culture of Polynesian Tattoo, Kealalokahi Losch argues that,

> although many Māori do not seek moko with a desire to make a political statement, the tohunga agree that all moko are perceived as such statements by the general non-Māori population. The statement says, ‘I am Māori.’ It is a wero (a challenge) to the dominant Western world that colonized our societies. Just as in the past, the tattoo is an inalienable heirloom that cannot be taken or diminished whether one is poor, incarcerated or otherwise oppressed. Thus, while moko are no longer understood in their original capacities by the general population, they still hold much meaning for the individuals and contribute to the construction of identity and self-image (original emphasis).

Within this statement are significant keys to understanding why it is so important that a ta moko studio was established at Kfm. As much as the act of

---

184 For example, according to Kealalokahi Losch (2003) writing for the PBS series Skin Stories: The Art and Culture of Polynesian Tattoo (http://www.pbs.org/skinstories/culture/role2.html), the Māori are the only Polynesian group to develop the spiral form of tattoo (generally referred to as the Koru).
getting and wearing a moko is a political act and statement for the individual Māori, it is argued here that the creation of a ta moko studio is just as political an act (whether intentionally so or not). If by getting a moko the individual Māori is saying, “I am Māori,” the presence of Mana Moko at Kfm is just as profoundly proclaiming “This is a Māori space/place.”

What is critical to understand in the above argument is the relationship between the act of tattooing performed at Mana Moko, the physical presence of the Mana Moko studio, and the role that this relationship has in helping to create a Māori urban geography of whakamanatanga at Kfm. Tim Cresswell argues (2004: 37; following Nigel Thrift, 1996),

> [i]f we focus on the way we do things...we get at a primal relationship with the world that is more embodied and less abstract. Place, then needs to be understood as an embodied relationship with the world. Places are constructed by people doing things and in this sense are never ‘finished’ but are constantly being performed.

Thus, to understand Mana Moko is to understand that the act of ta moko is as much a part of this space/place as is the material space/place itself. As Pip goes about the business of creating art on the bodies of her clients she is simultaneously performing Mana Moko as space/place. This performativity occurs through the actual act of skin penetration and injection of ink to make art, but also through the sounds emanating from the ta moko equipment (and possible from the people getting the tattoo), as well as from the art decorating the walls of the studio and the shrine to Pip’s ancestors and mentors watching over the Mana Moko space/place (see Figure 39).
There is, in other words, an interdependent link between Moko as sociality and materiality, and this link is seen, felt, touched, and heard. The seen component of this sociality/materiality marks Mana Moko as the dominant visual element of Kfm that people associate with Kfm’s Māori sense of space/place. This association is well represented in the following conversation I had with Zane:

*Serge: Would you consider Kfm to be a Māori place?*

*Zane: Ummm….yes…but yes and no, you know?*

*Serge: Yes, tell me about that, because I think that is really important…*
Zane: Yeah...uh...its kind of hard to describe, because there isn’t...I mean there’s obvious things that kind of stand out as being sort of Māori up here...with the mana moko studio and, you know, the pounamu [green stone] on display and a lot of the artwork up here have themes of Māori, or Māori combined with stuff, or incorporated into them...gives that whole visual stuff...

The presence of Mana Moko (and the various pieces of Māori art as well as the Māori artists, DJ’s and other Māori individuals spending time at Kfm) all reinforce and reproduce a sense of Māoriness to those interacting with Kfm. The permanent installation of a carving of Tame Iti’s moko (one of the founders of Kfm radio and a Māori sovereignty activist; see Figure 40 below) on the wall facing Mana Moko plays an important role in this reinforcing/reproducing aspect of Kfm’s Māori sense of space/place, and works to further reinforce the intensity of this sense of Māoriness that Mana Moko creates.

Mana Moko is also a space/place that is physically interacted with on a daily basis as potential customers flow in and out of the ta moko studio and, especially, when Pip is working on a moko. Large windows allow people outside of the Mana Moko studio to observe moko being applied to Pip’s clients and the sound of the electric tattoo needle buzzing is a common aural component of the Kfm space/place experience. In all of this can be seen the intertwining of the visual, the practiced, and the material to create a space/place—Mana Moko—that serves as an anchor for the Māori sense of space/place that flows through Kfm. At the same time Mana Moko—serving a broad range of customers from disparate socio-economic, cultural, and ethnic backgrounds—links into the multicultural aspect of the Kfm space/place; Mana Moko is at once the most traditionally Māori component of Kfm and a space/place that is opening up this traditional cultural form to a broader non-Māori audience.
The moko being etched into the skins of individuals from all walks of life in the Mana Moko studio is a powerful reaffirmation and reproduction of a proud Māori cultural tradition that has certainly played a role in the post-WWII Māori renaissance. It is, in this sense, an intensely local form of cultural and material production and serves as an anchor of Māoriness for the Kfm space/place. At the same time, however, the production of moko situates Māori ta moko artists as contributors and participants in the popularity of tattoo body art that has been globalized through the media, and through the tattooed celebrities that are seen by young and old throughout the world. As Māori travel to tattoo conventions throughout the world they share their knowledge while
simultaneously incorporating new ideas and traditional designs that can continue the evolution of this Māori cultural trait.\textsuperscript{185} Mana Moko is, in this sense, an aspect of the local and the global interfacing in productive and creative ways. This interface between the local and global also comes through in Kfm’s tea café, the subject of the next section.

7.3 Tea Culture: A Global Product Steeped in Communal Place

If Kfm radio functions as a force that effectively “binds” Kfm’s Māori sense of space/place to its multicultural environment, and Mana Moko functions as a profound assertion of the fundamental honoring and acknowledging of Māori values and worldviews at Kfm, then Tea Culture is a communal space/place where all of the disparate cultural, socio-economic and functional elements of Kfm as space/place production can comfortably collide. I use the word “collide” here strategically to suggest that this communal-commercial space/place is not being idealized as one where there is an entirely unproblematic intermingling of Māoriness and multiculturalism without tensions or contradictions. This is not the case and, for important reasons to be discussed below, this is a good thing. By appending the adjective “comfortably” I further want to suggest that Tea Culture creates a space/place where these

\textsuperscript{185} One of Pip’s mentors, Inia Taylor, has a YouTube video detailing his work and, more specific to the topic here, his trip to Brazil to share Māori ta moko at a tattoo convention in Sao Paulo, Brazil. Inia was one of the early players in the Māori ta moko renaissance and believes strongly that Māori can and should share this tradition with the world without it in any way compromising Māori politics. This video is an excellent window into the tattoo “scene” in Auckland and, more importantly, to the ways in which Māori are able to participate in global movements without compromising their Māori identity. The video can be found at: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=InXqhXe9RRA.
tensions and contradictions are worked out without overt conflict but not necessarily always with resolution (in the sense of consensus) as the end point.\textsuperscript{186}

The origins of Tea Culture are an important starting point for understanding its role in Kfm’s space/place production. The original intention when people like John Greet and Ramon Narayan were developing Kfm was to have a bar and stage for special events. This idea faded after a tragic accident occurred early on when Kfm had first been moved across the street to its present location. After this accident John had the entire Kfm space/place blessed and spiritually cleansed by \textit{tohunga} (Māori priest/priestess) and had to seriously rethink what Kfm was going to be all about. The bar was already in place so it was logical that some sort of bar service-oriented function should be considered.

It was at this point that John began to consider creating a café dedicated to tea. John lived in Japan for many years and during his time there developed a love of teas. He is a strong believer and advocate of the health and curative properties of tea and he realized that a tea bar would serve as a vehicle for furthering this advocacy. Moreover, the tea bar would create a communal space at Kfm that would be inviting (it was hoped) to the public and act as a draw to get people to come up to Kfm. There was also a sense that a successful café

\textsuperscript{186} It should be noted that in this section, unlike the other sections of this chapter, there are no quotes about Tea Culture from the various people at Kfm I spent time with informally and through formal interviews. Partly this is due to my never directly asking anyone about the importance of Tea Culture and partly this is due, I believe, to the unselfconscious way Tea Culture operated as a part of the Kfm space/place experience. However, a large percentage of the time I spent at Kfm was in the Tea Culture cafe either writing, reading, talking story, eating, conducting interviews, sipping tea, working behind the bar, or serving tea to customers. As a result I feel quite comfortable in this section drawing on my many hours of “passive” and “participant” observation in order to construct the arguments about Tea Culture’s role in Kfm’s space/place production.
could help fund the broader Kfm project of community networking and community activism as well.

Tea Culture is the first thing people see when they enter Kfm and its design sets the tone for how people interpret this space/place. As café’s go it is a bit odd; many café’s are clearly visible from the street (or from some type of exterior perspective) and allow the individual to assess the ambiance of the café before entering. There is, in other words, a time-space/place gap between outsider and insider that gives the individual the ability to psychologically transition from outside to inside and to decide whether or not they actually want to go into the café before physically being in it. At Kfm one wanders up the stairs knowing that there is a café up there because of the signs outside, but never sure (for the first timer) what you will find when they emerge from the stairwell. When you get to the top of the stairs you are standing smack in the middle of the café allowing little time to make the insider/outsider transition. This is an interesting moment to observe and, once recognized, I made a point of consciously doing so whenever I was in the café.187

The reason this moment is interesting involves both the look of Tea Culture (combined with the rest of the Kfm space/place) and the way the café is often utilized. As the newcomer’s gaze sweep across the café he/she sees beautiful solid wood tables and chairs matching the wood shelves that all the tea jars are held on and the beautifully carved wood bar. Their gaze may fix initially

187 It may be worth noting at this point as well that, on my second time in Aotearoa New Zealand, I began early on working in the café. This was never formally requested of me, it really just began with me offering to do dishes, and then helping deliver the tea to tables when the bar got busy. This allowed me to observe the entrance of newcomers both from a café customer’s perspective, and as a person behind the bar greeting these people with a cheery “kia ora!” It also allowed me to contribute in what I hope was a meaningful way in exchange for the opportunity to engage in my research.
on the “alter” that sits in the window that runs the entire length of the café and looks down onto K’ Road. This alter is made up of various deities from an eclectic mix of Asian, African, Christian and Indigenous traditions. There are candles and incense and a few ornate and/or interesting teapots in and around these deities. If one looks to the left they will see a shelf of East Asian design with teapots and other tea accoutrements on it and bordered by large speakers pulsing with the Kfm radio sound. As they begin to pick out details around the café they might also notice books stacked and shelved here and there dedicated to everything from Bob Marley and the history of reggae music to a broad range of philosophical treatise and other interesting books. To the casual observer Tea Culture clearly looks like a café, but at the same time as soon as one looks around they realize that there is much more to this space/place and, in some cases, it seemed that a certain space/place confusion was generated from this multiplicity of functions.

Kfm’s look and “feel” is both a product of one individual’s influence and how Tea Culture’s use has developed since its inception. John Greet, one of Kfm’s principle founders and patron, has played a central role in the creation and design of Tea Culture. John has lived a very colorful life with both trials and tribulations as part of this colorfulness. He told me on several occasions that Aotearoa New Zealand was not his ideal place to live (his heart is in Paris) but his living there for these many years involved events and circumstances somewhat outside of his control. As a way to deal with this disharmony between John’s space/place choice and his actual home he has put a lot of effort into making Kfm a sanctuary from aspects of Aotearoa New Zealand society that he finds the least attractive (in particular Pākehā society). The combination of
Polynesian and Asian esthetic that permeates Tea Culture in particular is very much grounded in John’s personality and place desires. However, I think John would be the first to agree that despite his underlying influence on this space/place, ultimately its sense of space/place has detached itself from his influence and become a force that involves many people; it has, in other words, moved from an idealization of a single person’s space/place preference to a one that is intertwined with many people’s experiences and memories, and as such has taken on a “life” and “personality” of its own.

Another important factor in how newcomers to Tea Culture interpret its function is in the way the café is being utilized at the time they first enter the café. Sometimes they will enter into a café completely empty which often seems unnerving to first time customers, other times it will be full (it seats about twenty people comfortably) with people drinking tea. But other times the people that work at Kfm use the café as a dining area, meeting area, or just general gathering area (see Figure 41 and 42 below). It is in these latter cases that the most confusion occurs for first time café customers. Having observed this many times I would say the reason for this is mostly due to the attitude of the Kfm people towards the café (and towards Kfm more generally). For these people there is such a strong sense of, to borrow a term from Edward Relph (1980), existential insideness in regards to their presence at Kfm that the newcomer immediately seems to sense their outsider status.

According to Relph (1980: 55), “the most fundamental form of [existential] insideness is that in which a place is experienced without deliberate and self-conscious reflection yet is full with significances.” “Existential insideness,” Relph continues, “characterises belonging to a place and the deep and complete
identity with a place that is the very foundations of the place concept” (55). This concept is part of a continuum of place experiences proposed by Relph ranging from existential outsideness to existential insideness and is part of Relph’s project to use phenomenology as a vehicle for understanding, at the most intimate levels, the relationship between human experiences and place. Despite the fact that place theory has moved well beyond Relph’s 1980 thesis, there are still elements of his argument that are relevant to this discussion about Tea Culture and how it is experienced by newcomers versus how it is used by Kfm people. For the people that contribute to Kfm, particularly those that are most intimately a part of Kfm’s operation, there is a strong sense that Kfm is a space/place that elicits a sense of being “home” and that the people that they see everyday are part of their extended whanau (a Māori concept most generally translated into English as “family”).

Figure 41: Members of the Kfm whanau “sharing kai” (food): a prime example of how Tea Culture is used informally as a gathering area. For the newcomer this type of scene often elicited space/place confusion.
One of the contradictions that emerge from this existential insider aspect of Kfm involves Tea Culture as a space/place of exchange value versus as a space/place of use value. In other words, the way people most intimately associated with Kfm use and perceive Tea Culture is sometimes in tension with Tea Culture as a business-oriented café. The Te Karanga Trust is a non-profit entity built on the principles of social entrepreneurialism. This concept will be discussed in more detail below, but suffice here to say that it entails an organization working to make a profit, but with that profit intended solely to further the social agenda of the organization. One way in which Kfm has the potential to make a profit is through the Tea Culture café. But unlike many other service establishments where profit is a goal and therefore where issues of
customer service become of primary importance, the people that work at Tea Culture do not function under this mindset. This is not to say that they are rude or unfriendly in any way, but more that they feel no pressure to be obsequiously customer service oriented in their attitude towards café customers. The sense of an unequal power relation between paying customer and hired service worker just does not exist at Kfm. As a result, I observed fairly frequently newcomers to Kfm and the Tea Culture café seeming “turned off” by the lack of service they received from the Kfm employees. Ultimately, this seemed to be an effective mechanism for filtering out those people that only wanted a service oriented café experience from those that were open to the use value oriented service at Kfm.188

This tension between a space/place of exchange value versus one of use value is one of the more obvious “comfortable collisions” alluded to at the beginning of this section. Ultimately, this means for the newcomer a decision has to be made as to whether or not they want to “commit” to this space/place. I personally saw as many people walk out of Kfm based on their initial impressions as I did individuals that were clearly intrigued, captivated, or emotionally moved by their first Kfm-as-space/place experience (and presented with this observation I think most Kfm people would say that this is okay). In this sense Tea Culture serves as a gateway into the Kfm experience as much as it does a one-off opportunity to have a café experience. As a result, Tea Culture is

188 In a recent conversation with Pip Hartley (the Mana Moko ta moko artist) we spoke about the acquisition by the Te Karanga Trust of a restaurant on K’ Road called Verona. Verona is an iconic establishment on K’ Road that had fallen on hard economic times over the last several years. When the Kfm crew first began running Verona they quickly found, according to Pip, that their use value approach to service did not work as well outside of the Kfm space/place. This necessitated the bringing in of consultants and trainers to teach the Kfm crew how to deliver a more exchange value based service when working at Verona. Apparently, armed with this new knowledge, Verona has turned into an economic success and is now generating much-needed funds for the Te Karanga Trust.
a space/place of regulars far more than it is a one of strangers coming and going. Most people that go there more than once end up getting to know the staff very quickly and the inevitable “what it this place?” question often begins their introduction into the Kfm experience. As a space/place where all the people involved with Kfm (DJ’s, artists, ta moko customers, café customers, volunteers, workers, etc.) can gather and mingle easily Tea Culture serves a critical function as part of the holistic Kfm experience. As Hubbard (2006: 223) notes,

The consumption of food or alcohol may be the pretext for a meeting, and gives sociability a purpose. Such forms of consumption may well be mundane, but become productive of a new type of space and new forms of sociality

In the case of Tea Culture both tea and food are constantly being consumed, both by customers and those more intimately involved with Kfm. The result is a space/place that is a café but also is clearly something else—a gateway to Kfm, a gathering space/place, a meeting space/place—and it is in this comingling of functions that a new type of space/place and “new forms of sociality” are manifested and actualized at Kfm.

Kfm as gathering space/place also marks an important descriptor of how Tea Culture taps into, and contributes to, the Māori underpinnings of the Kfm environment. While on the one hand, the design of Tea Culture does not illicit a strong sense of Māoriness (as opposed, for example, to Mana Moko), on the other, the creation of a space/place for gathering and, especially, eating food together is very much part of Māori culture. The Māori have an idiomatic expression for this act—“sharing kai”—that I heard often at Kfm (as well as
elsewhere while in Aotearoa New Zealand). It was clear to me that there are deep cultural meanings in this phrase that the outsider must learn in order to fully understand them. Arguably, this meaning stems from the importance of sharing a meal after guests have been formerly welcomed onto a marae. The act of eating together marks the coming together of the two groups (hosts and guests) once all negative energies have been dispelled through the marae process. The importance of this act on the marae has been extended out into everyday life so that eating together on a regular basis is perceived by Māori to be an important component of group cohesiveness. This importance was clearly evident at Kfm, and Tea Culture served this critical function.

As a final note on Tea Culture it is important to recognize how this part of Kfm also represents a fusion of forces of globalization and localization. The tea that is being sold and consumed at Kfm represents one of the original global products spread through trade and colonialism. When Europeans were introduced to this product in East Asia they quickly adopted it as a quintessential European practice and then exported this product and practice throughout the world. “Tea Culture” has more than 150 teas from all over the world affirming the globalization of this product overtly and proudly. And yet at the same time tea is a product at Kfm that encourages and inspires a spirit of communality and conversation manifested through the act of sitting and drinking tea in the café. In this sense it is an intensely local act of community

189 Kai is both a verb and noun. As a verb it translates to “to eat, consume, feed (oneself), partake, devour;” and as a noun to “food, meal” (Auckland University of Technology’s online Māori dictionary: Te Whanake (http://www.maoridictionary.co.nz/index.cfm).
190 See http://www.2basnob.com/tea-history-timeline.html for a brief and entertaining overview of how tea originated and spread throughout the world.
building and socializing all facilitated by the materiality of both Kfm and the tea itself. The display of tea in jars and their accessibility to customers who are encouraged by those working at Kfm to wander in to smell and sample these teas, also suggests the power of this plant (in all its incredible herbaceous forms) to build community through the true spirit of café culture.

7.4 Te Karanga Gallery: a Space/Place of Urban Creative Culture

Having defined Kfm radio as a force that “binds” all the disparate “parts” of Kfm into a holistic space/place, and having described the role Mana Moko plays as a Māori foundation for Kfm’s sense of space/place, and the tension between Tea Culture as a space/place of capitalist consumption and gathering space/place for the Kfm whanau, the final piece of Kfm as space/place that needs to be discussed is the Te Karanga Gallery. Occupying the largest space at Kfm, the Te Karanga Gallery serves as a connection between Kfm and Auckland’s “creative culture” (Latham, 2003; Hubbard, 2006); but, as is typical of Kfm, it does this in a way that is unique and decidedly outside of the mainstream elite art gallery milieu.

Te Karanga Gallery is a rectangular space that dominates the backside of Kfm (see Figure 43 below). Many of the people that come up to Kfm do so specifically to see gallery shows, having heard about them on the radio, seen advertisements for them on posters, or having read about them in alternative city guides, through word of mouth, or having seen the sign out front as they were passing by. New shows are mounted on average every two weeks and, depending on the show, the gallery has the potential to significantly shift the
visual landscape of Kfm. Most of the shows I saw when I was there were clearly Polynesian or Māori oriented or influenced, while others represented a broad range of artistic mediums and styles with no particular ethnic references. Regardless of the type of show, however, the presence of art has a dramatic impact on Kfm’s sense of space/place. Galleries are both spaces/places of visual consumption and capitalist consumption. Also, depending greatly on the quality and subject matter of the art as well as the subjective interpretation of individual viewers, the art hanging in the gallery has the potential to create an “aura” of profound meaning for the viewer. When the art showing at the gallery was Māori themed (as it often was) the sense of Kfm’s underlying Māori foundation discussed in the section on Mana Moko above was particularly poignant.

Te Karanga Gallery is extremely important to Kfm’s overall space/place identity, yet its genesis, as with Kfm in general, was seemingly an act of spontaneous space/place production. As Ramon Narayan noted as part of an earlier quote: “…and then…basically once we had built that we said, “aah, what are we going to use that space for?” And we thought well that really could be a kind of gallery…”. And thus Te Karanga Gallery was conceived and created. Yet, despite this less-than-profound beginning Te Karanga Gallery serves as a critical component of the Kfm space/place-based social movement. It does this through its ability to link Kfm to a broad range of creative individuals and organizations dedicated to the arts, as well as through its role as an avenue for artists with little or no access to the mainstream art scene to gain experience and exposure. Arguably the gallery also adds an heir of “respectability” to the Kfm sense of space/place because art galleries, regardless of how alternative they might be, are regarded as elite businesses (who else can afford art after all?). At the same
time, however, Te Karanga Gallery is dedicated to giving artists—with a particular emphasis on Māori and Polynesian artists—that have never shown their work before access to a gallery. Only occasionally do established artists show their work at Kfm because it is part of the Kfm mission to give opportunities to artists that otherwise would find it difficult to gain access to a wider audience.

Figure 43: Two different Te Karanga Gallery shows at Kfm: top left and right is a show by a mix of artists both local and international although the show was generated by predominantly Māori artists. Bottom left and right is a first time show by a young Tongan New Zealander with paintings based on a famous series of Māori moko drawings.

This Polynesian/Māori focus is, as John Greet points out, intentional:

_In this kind of way...if some bunch of Māori kids got an art project and they're in Hamilton...alright?...and they think: “hey, we’d love to show this art in a gallery,” and some kid says, “hey I know a gallery where my cousin showed his art, it’s called Te_
Karanga, it’s on K Road, go there, they’re cool,” you know what I mean? That kind of word is how we get…our exhibitions are predominantly Polynesian, you know we don’t exclusively do Polynesian art, but most of our art exhibitions feature Māori art. And the reason for that is through the “grapevine”, you know, this is a place for Māori to go and show their work…yeah, it goes like that, so and that’s the honor for us, that’s the acknowledgment when, you know, a group of Māori people we don’t know at all walk in with their whanau intact, with the kids and the older people, and say, you know, “we’re here to show our art, we’ve heard you guys are cool,” you know what I mean? Not just cool, but you know, “we heard you guys were okay,” you know what I mean? And we are!

Te Karanga Gallery is intended to be a place where Māori, who are not necessarily well connected to the artist community, will feel comfortable showing their art. There are clearly underlying class issues embedded in this discussion in that often the type of Māori artist that Kfm caters to is from a low income background while the artist community is infused with Pākehā wealth and privilege and therefore difficult for poor people to “break” into. Giving artists, with limited experience and access to the broader artist community in Auckland, a gallery space to show their work is very much a part of the Te Karanga Gallery mission, as is evidenced in the following statement written by Ramon Narayan:

Another way that we mentor artists is to provide our exhibition space at a very affordable price. We charge no commission and make no money from these exhibitions. We provide ongoing support and advice to the artists who are exhibiting their work and are there at the opening to help out in any way we can. For many of the artists this is the first time they have exhibited their work so there are many ways that we can provide our expertise, from installing the art to promotion and getting people along to view the work. We are one of the only galleries in the central city who provide this support to emerging artists on an ongoing basis.

Thus, we see that Te Karanga Gallery serves a dual function of giving underprivileged artists access to the broader artist communities in Auckland (emphasizing Māori and Polynesian artists within this context) and creating
connection to a broader elite art community both as consumers of the art shown there (thereby financially benefitting these new artists) and by exposing Kfm to a socio-economically diverse community.

In thinking through some of the socio-spatial/platial ramifications of Te Karanga Gallery it is productive to connect this space/place to the concept of urban creative culture. In his book City Phil Hubbard (2006) dedicates an entire chapter to issues revolving around “urban creativity.” Hubbard notes that his focus on this subject is driven partly by the fact that the fostering of “creative cities” has become “a key issue in western political circles, with policy makers seeking ways to enhance the vibrancy of cultural industries” (2006: 208). Hubbard’s goal is to “review some of the main ideas that abound about urban creativity...[and to suggest]...that while they offer some insights into the production of culture, they do not take the materiality of the city seriously enough” (2006: 208). In pursuing his goal of inserting a materiality into the urban creative city literature, Hubbard points out that most of this literature focuses on the role of creative industries to revitalize urban economies. But he also states that this focus,

ignores all sorts of creativity that goes on in cities which is not part of the formal economy in any sense. After all, economic practice comprises a rich diversity of capitalist and non-capitalist activities and it is increasingly argued that we need to make non-capitalist ones ‘visible’ lest we reify capitalism.

Applying this aspect of Hubbard’s argument to Kfm is, arguably, a bit of a stretch since it is an informal economy he is alluding to and Te Karanga Gallery does not fit into this category. Yet there are aspects of this argument that are relevant to Kfm. When looking at Te Karanga Gallery it is obvious that it does
not fit neatly into a capitalist definition of the role art galleries typically play in urban economies. Art gallery districts are often elite zones dominated by the patronage of the wealthy (SoHo in New York City for example), or they act as early catalyst for processes of gentrification, leading to neighborhoods that eventually are dominated by the wealthy (Hubbard, 2006; Latham, 2004). Art is expensive and galleries, much like high-end retail establishments, are not businesses that are welcoming to the everyday urban passerby (again issues of class are clearly evident in these discussions). But Te Karanga Gallery does not fit neatly into this category. The art is, of course, expensive by low-income standards, but the price is set entirely by the artist with no commission taken by Te Karanga Gallery. Moreover, rather than creating an exclusive environment of elite wealth, Te Karanga is situated within Kfm sandwiched between an urban hip radio station and a ta moko studio; neither of which are necessarily or typically categorized as socio-spatial/platial representatives of the wealthy elite. Perhaps more importantly, Te Karanga Gallery acts as a gateway for underprivileged artists rather than a mechanism for profiting from them.

In this sense then Te Karanga Gallery can be seen as an art space/place more akin to Bohemian values than a one of wealthy elite. According to Hubbard (2006: 224) the term bohemian carries with it a romanticized imaginary of freewheeling, countercultural experimentation and excess...often contrasted with the lifestyle and spaces of the bourgeoisie, who favour a more Protestant work ethic and adhere to a more respectable set of moral codes and conventions.

Hubbard then connects this idea of bohemian sociality to a Lefebvrian notion of “differential space:”
The distinct ‘structures of feeling’ created in bohemian spaces thus reclaim the main elements of what Lefebvre (1991) termed ‘differential’ space: it is space created and dominated by its users through bodily practices which value quality over quantity, the look over the gaze and the sensual over the scientific. Bohemian zones may also be characterised as ‘free zones’ whose functional and economic role is difficult to explain in terms of capitalist economics.

To a certain extent this argument can be extended to a characterization of Kfm as a whole in that the radio station, the ta moko studio, and even the esoteric nature of the Tea Culture café all come together to generate a creative culture and bohemian space/place. Te Karanga Gallery, however, is the most surprising of these because of the strong association of art galleries as establishments of wealthy elite. That Te Karanga Gallery can function literally with a “foot in both worlds” lends further credence to the remarkable space/place-based social project that is Kfm.

Te Karanga Gallery is also another example of Kfm’s remarkable ability to create spaces/places that demonstrate the increasingly complex intermingling of local and global forces in cities like Auckland. Clearly a critical part of the Kfm mission is to incorporate local artists into the Auckland art scene and Kfm does this quite successfully. Occasionally internationally recognized artists show their work at Te Karanga Gallery as well. The galleries first exhibition focused on moko (Māori tattoo) and traveled to Amsterdam after showing at Te Karanga. The very notion of the Western styled art gallery represents a globalized interpretation of how art is to be viewed and, especially, commodified. Moreover, the Te Karanga Gallery as an urban institution and the art itself is often as much a commentary on global forces as it is on local issues, or perhaps
more profoundly, this art symbolically represents the relationship between these two.

In concluding this section it is worth connecting the Te Karanga Gallery discussion to the Māori art featured in Chapter 5 (the Aniwaniwa and C. Company Māori Battalion exhibits in Hamilton and Gisborne respectively). It is clear from these case studies that art plays an important role in Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga. Art exhibits are as much about claiming spaces/places as they are about using symbols and representations to make social commentary. The Te Karanga Gallery represents a similar claiming of space/place by Māori artists and others, but it is also a space/place used to connect the Kfm organization to a broad range of urban creative culture networks and communities both locally and internationally. Along with Kfm radio the Te Karanga Gallery also serves as the component of Kfm most committed to social activism both as an art gallery dedicated to unknown Polynesian artists and as a space/place for progressive groups to meet, show movies and have social gatherings and fund raisers. It is this multifaceted function of the Te Karanga Gallery that marks it as on the cutting edge of Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga because it is able to integrate both Māori and non-Māori elements without compromise to either. Moreover, as Māori from a broad range of Māori urbanisms enter this gallery space/place during gallery openings Kfm becomes increasingly connected to whakamanatanga-based Māori urbanisms.
7.5 Conclusion: Space/Place Production and Practices of Everyday Life at Kfm

This chapter has been dedicated to going beyond just an understanding of how Kfm came into existence, and instead focused primarily on how Kfm exists as a continuously becoming space/place. By focusing on the different major functions of Kfm—radio station, ta moko studio, café and art gallery—and by looking at the way those most intimately involved with maintaining these functions describe their interactions and thoughts about them, an understanding of the critical relationship between sociality and materiality at Kfm is achieved.

One of the absolutely most important aspects of this discussion is the relationship between practices of everyday life and the production of a space/place like Kfm. While it has been recognized by academics that this relationship is important, there is a continuous need to demonstrate empirically how this interface actually occurs. It is, in other words, one thing to argue, drawing on Lefebvrian (1991) arguments for example, that space/place is socially produced, but it is entirely another challenge to show how this actually occurs as real people go about their day-to-day lives. This chapter demonstrates both a methodology for accessing this type of process as well as the process in action in one particular space/place.

It is clear from this chapter that the researcher must engage two components of space/place production in order to gain access to how this process occurs. On the one hand, the researcher must meaningfully become involved in the day-to-day activities in the space/place that is under investigation. In a sense, the research must develop a relationship with the space/place through physically spending time there, participating in the
activities engaged there, and simultaneously by observing the minutia of everyday life that goes on there. On the other hand, the researcher must also lean heavily on those that are most intimately involved with the space/place under investigation.

As I have emphasized throughout this chapter, Kfm is not entirely or even primarily a Māori space/place. But I have also noted that those that are most intimately connected to this organization consistently assert an important and profound Māori component inherent in how they comprehend Kfm. Thus, it is clear that for me (or any other researcher) to attempt to truly comprehend the interface between everyday life and processes of space/place becoming at Kfm it is essential to turn to the expertise of those that created this space/place and are involved in its day-to-day operations.

There is, however, one other aspect of Kfm that is an essential component of what makes it such a unique, special and, I argue, important organization in Auckland. This final aspect of Kfm, one that I have alluded to throughout this dissertation, is represented by the phrase: space/place-based social movement. This final piece to the Kfm “puzzle” is concerned primarily with the way Kfm functions as a locally based community network project while simultaneously serving as a space/place with international connections and networks. In other words, Kfm manages to function as a local-global nexus, but one that suggests a range of alternative responses to this relationship. Focusing more specifically on Kfm as a whakamanatanga-based form of Māori urbanisms, this local-global function becomes particularly important in the context of my research.

As I have argued, Kfm is one example of a Māori urban geography of whakamanatanga, but it is, I further argue, a unique representation of this
phenomenon. This uniqueness is seen through its ability to uniquely negotiate the local-global issues inherent in Māori urbanisms. What is truly remarkable about Kfm is its ability to create a space/place of comfort for Māori while simultaneously creating a space/place where Māori and non-Māori can interact with global forces successfully and unselfconsciously. In creating this type of environment Kfm represents a space/place where people can interact with forces of globalization that manifest at the level of a global city like Auckland—new technologies, multicultural environments, penetrations of global capital—without being dominated or subordinated by them. This is lofty claim is the primary focus of the final empirical Kfm focused chapter.
8. Whakamanatanga-based Māori Urbanisms and the Local-Global Nexus at Kfm

Kfm as a space/place-based social movement and Kfm as simultaneously a globally connected space/place is the central theme I explore in this chapter. I argue that Kfm is at once a product of globalism while concurrently its very existence suggests the power and importance of the local; it is at once part of increasingly complex global/local networks and communities while defining itself within the context of the cultural politics of Aotearoa New Zealand. In some cases Kfm suggests the local as a site of resistance to forces of global domination (e.g., global capitalism, global media), while at other times Kfm suggests a celebration of the coincident potential for the local to infuse the global as the global connects to the local. My analysis of this global/local engagement reveals the ways in which the people involved with Kfm’s creation and operation have produced a space/place that is able to take advantage of those aspects of globalism that they find useful and that they can utilize to further their space/place-based social movement (e.g., streaming Kfm radio on the internet, finding connections between Māori culture and Auckland’s growing multicultural environment), while at the same time rejecting those aspects of
globalism that are contradictory to their values and worldviews (e.g., consumer culture, non-sustainable economies).

To facilitate a better understanding of how Kfm is able to negotiate this global-local nexus I have broken this chapter into three interdependent discussions. The first of these looks at the way people at Kfm have created an organization and space/place based on what I refer to as kaupapa whānau-like principles. Kaupapa whānau refers to the development of communities whose interactions are based on the values and protocol developed out of Māori extended family structures. By creating this type of community the people at Kfm are able to honor and celebrate the important role Māori cultural values play in Kfm’s continuous production of space/place, and in this way Kfm is connected to the politics of indigeneity (both locally and globally). A second discussion involves the Kfm organization as community development project. Beginning with an organizational philosophy based on social entrepreneurialism, Kfm has developed community projects and networks that connect it to people and places throughout out Auckland, Aotearoa New Zealand, and internationally. Rather than just being a space/place where like-minded people can gather, Kfm has increasingly become a space/place connected to a growing regional and international community.

The third and final discussion in this chapter is the most important one because it introduces a concept—Māori urban spaces/places of difference—that draws on and binds together the three chapters on Kfm. The core meaning of this concept is the production of a space/place where Māori experience a profound sense of whakamanatanga in an environment that is outward looking and culturally productive rather than reactionary or isolating. The key to this
unique environment is the ability of the people at Kfm to honor and celebrate Māori as the first nation people of Aotearoa New Zealand while simultaneously creating a space/place that embraces Auckland’s growing multicultural environment. The result is a space/place where Māori are empowered to both express and reinforce their Māori identity while at the same time positively interact with, and contribute to, Auckland’s increasingly multicultural social milieu. Ultimately, I argue that Kfm has come to represent a Soja-esque (1996) thirdspace/place where Māori identity, difference, and otherness are able to comingle in new and socially progressive ways. From this perspective Kfm represents the cutting edge of Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga or, to put it another way, Kfm suggests the progressive possibilities that whakamanatanga-based Māori urbanisms have for creating urban spaces/places that push the boundaries of what it means to be Māori in the 21st century.

8.1 Kfm As Kaupapa Whānau Based Space/Place

If there was one dominant theme that came out during my discussions with the people most closely connected to Kfm it was whānau. Loosely translated as “family” in English, whānau is a Māori concept that is certainly not unique to Kfm in its invocation (see for example, Benton, 2002). At the same time, however, I argue that the way Kfm has constructed a whānau-like community and intertwined this with a community that embraces and celebrates multiculturalism is unique and, importantly, one possible progressive model for negotiating relationships between Māori and non-Māori in Auckland.
This discussion begins necessarily with defining more specifically what is meant by the term whānau. I draw primarily on Joan Metge’s (1995) book *New Growth from Old: The Whānau in the Modern World* to both define the concept whānau and construct a sense of this concept as it is used at Kfm. Importantly, it is argued here that the way the people at Kfm conceive and practice whānau has both similarities to aspects of Metge’s treatment of this concept as well as important differences.

### 8.1.1 Differentiating whakapapa-based whānau from kaupapa-based whānau

Joan Metge argues that whānau is one of the most important concepts in Māori culture and society both traditionally and in a contemporary context. Much of her book is dedicated to what she refers to as the “whakapapa-based whānau” or the “whānau which comes first to mind.” Metge (1995: 292) defines this type of whānau as a socio-cultural entity that is, recognized as a group by its members and others, distinguished by group symbols (notably a name) and involves members working together for common purposes on a continuing basis. Membership is defined in the first place by reference to an ancestor or ancestral couple as fixed starting point and in the second by participation on the part of the descendants, their spouses and adopted children. Whānau members hold and endeavour to live by a set of common whānau values. The whānau outlasts the life of the foundation ancestor and the death or defection of other members, but eventually breaks up, usually into new groups of the same kind.

In contrast to whakapapa-based whānau is another type of whānau that Metge refers to as “non-traditional” or “kaupapa-based” whānau. In general terms she

---

191 See chapter fourteen of her book for a summary of this concept (pp. 290-314).
defines the non-traditional whānau as occurring in one of two possible types (1995: 292; original emphasis):

some are groups with an on-going corporate life; others are one-off groupings assembled for a short term only. The central principle of their recruitment and operation is not descent (whakapapa) but commitment to one or more common purposes (kaupapa).

However, regardless of whether corporate or one-off whānau, Metge argues (1995: 292), “By choosing to describe themselves as whānau, members of these non-traditional whānau signal that they look to the whānau of primary reference as model and reference group. Lacking descent to bind them together, they lay particular emphasis on adherence to whānau values and working together for common purposes values.”

In terms of Kfm it is the kaupapa-based whānau that fits their use of the whānau concept best. This is coupled with what Metge describes (1995: 293) as “whānau which are corporate groups,” which she defines as whānau groups “whose members interact recurrently in a set of interconnected roles” (as opposed to interacting in a limited or temporary way). In defining the kaupapa-based whānau Metge (1995: 305) comes closest to describing the type of whānau that was continuously invoked by the people I spoke with at Kfm:

These kaupapa-based whānau differ from their model in one crucial respect: the main criterion for recruitment is not descent but commitment to the kaupapa. Lacking descent to serve as a unifying principle, kaupapa-based whānau place particular stress on the other characteristic features of the whakapapa-based whānau, whānau values and the ways of working derived from them. Lacking an ancestor to serve as symbol, they elevate the kaupapa or the whānau itself to that position.

Beyond this definition there are several other important elements of the kaupapa-based whānau: an emphasis on face-to-face interaction as a way to compensate for the “glue afforded by descent” (Metge, 1995: 305-306); a focus on
“those values which promote togetherness: aroha, whānaungatanga, co-operation, loyalty” (these are only a selection from a wider possible range) (1995: 306); a context where mana tangata (defined as “mana based on personal qualities and performance”) becomes the principle determinate of leadership.\footnote{Aroha is an incredibly complex Polynesian concept that is dealt with in more detail in the Glossary of Māori Terms found at the end of this dissertation. Whānaungatanga is a noun that refers to “relationship, kinship, sense of family connection—a relationship through shared experiences and working together which provides people with a sense of belonging. It develops as a result of kinship rights and obligations, which also serve to strengthen each member of the kin group. It also extends to others to whom one develops a close familial, friendship or reciprocal relationship” (Auckland University of Technology online Māori dictionary, http://www.maoridictionary.co.nz/index.cfm).}

All of these elements of kaupapa-based whānau, Metge (1995: 306) points out, “exist in a complex web of relationships of opposition and complementarity with mana in its many forms, and also with utu, which involves repayment for wrongs as well as good gifts.”

Of obvious importance to the definition of Kaupapa-based whānau is the Māori concept kaupapa. According to the website Rangahau, kaupapa is most generally used in the context of “kaupapa Māori.”\footnote{This website is located at http://www.rangahau.co.nz/about/.} Kaupapa Māori is defined by Charles Royal (nd) as,

any particular plan of action created by Māori, expressing Māori aspirations and expressing certain Māori values and principles. There might be a range of purposes for the action taking, however, it is generally held that the design of the proposed action is created by Māori reflecting Māori aspirations, ideals, values and perspectives. It also anticipates tikanga Māori,\footnote{Tikanga refers to “the right way” regarding whatever protocol, principle, or value that is being applied at the time (Metge, 1995: 87).} distinctive Māori ways of doing things, cultural behaviours and so on, through which kaupapa Māori are expressed and made tangible. This type of usage of the terms ‘kaupapa Māori’ appears in education settings, in health providers, upon marae and elsewhere to generally refer to a foundation of understanding and knowledge created by Māori and expressing Māori aspirations, values and principles.\footnote{Rangahau (http://www.rangahau.co.nz/about/).}
In both Metge’s use of kaupapa-based whānau and Royal’s use there is a strong sense that Māori are fundamentally involved in the formation, actualization, and embodiment of the plans being activated. This is a critical point in the context of discussing the use of whānau to describe Kfm. It is clear that organizations like Kfm where the kaupapa-based whānau concept is being invoked are doing so in ways that diverge significantly from how these concepts are being defined within a traditional Māori worldview.

This statement is in no way meant to undermine the validity of applying this concept to Kfm, or lesson the sense that what is happening at Kfm is important or that the people there truly feel a sense of whānau when invoking this term. Rather, this is being pointed out here in order to emphasize that the Kfm sense of kaupapa-based whānau, while akin to the way these concepts are being defined by Metge and Royal, has significant differences that must be acknowledged and addressed in order to fully understand what this all means in the context of Kfm as both Māori and multicultural space/place. It is not my intention here, nor do I think it is the intention of anyone at Kfm, to appropriate Māori concepts and apply them in an authoritative manner without regard to the cultural politics involved in the usage of Māori concepts. To understand what their intentions are in invoking key Māori concepts such as whānau it is necessary to look more specifically at how those most closely linked to Kfm used this concept in our discussions.
8.1.2 The Kfm sense of kaupapa-based whānau

As was noted at the beginning of this section, those individuals most intimately involved with Kfm consistently invoked the whānau concept when describing their relationship to this space/place. This was the case in both the many informal conversations I had with individuals I encountered during my time there and during more formal interviews. While the focus here is on the formal interviews, I cannot stress enough how powerfully this concept came through during my time at Kfm. In many cases the word whānau was used and at other times the word family, but in all cases it seemed clear to me that the connection was always to what the speaker believed to be a Māori way of understanding the extended family unit and the way this influenced their experiences at Kfm.

For example, when discussing the process Pip, the ta moko artist at Kfm, undertook to create her ta moko studio the following conversation unfolded:

Serge: Did you set up the space?

Pip: Yeah, I set it all up again…

Serge: And that’s when the radio station had already moved over here?

Pip: Yeah…

Serge: But not the tea bar or the gallery?

---

196 It not only came through intellectually as an academic observing this place, but also emotionally as I found myself developing these same feelings of familial connection and dedication to the Kfm mission as those that were being expressed to me by Kfm associated people. Thus, I found myself becoming both observer of, and participant in, this group phenomenon. I consider these contrasting perspectives to be a strength, however, because in combination they afforded me the opportunity to be both intellectually curious and analytical about this phenomenon as well as experientially empathetic. This combination allows the researcher, I argue, greater range and depth in terms of his/her ability to fully grasp the nature and meaning of any particular process or phenomenon that he/she is researching.
Pip: No, the tea shop had only just begun to set up when I moved in here… it was a great time to come on board really…and then John invited me on the Trust…the Te Karanga Trust…and, yeah, it was beautiful, real wairua based…

Serge: What does that mean?

Pip: Wairua is like…uh…spirit...you know…like the energy kind of thing…it means like we are not really business minded up here...you know it’s more like...you just get that feeling kind of thing and you just go with that...you know what I mean?

Serge: It seems to be a common theme with all the people up here I talk with.

Pip: Yeah, it’s just that real whānau...you know...family vibe...that really holds strong up here.

This statement by Pip is typical of many conversations I had with Kfm associated people and there are several themes that are immediately evident in what Pip is saying here. First, is the invocation by Pip of the word “wairua” to describe the way she perceived her involvement with Kfm and the way this links up with the idea of whānau. Wairua is one of the most profound concepts within Māori culture, so much so that, in my discussions with individual Māori deeply knowledgeable in Māori concepts and values, I was consistently told that if I intended to use this concept in my research I had better do my research well and consult the appropriate sources. I claim no expertise over this concept here and use it based on its invocation by Māori individuals such as Pip and based on the writings about this concept by writers like Joan Metge (e.g., 1995).

According to Joan Metge (1995) wairua is part of a series of interconnected concepts within Māori culture that involve the relationship between the spiritual dimension and the physical world of living beings. She writes (1995: 82),

[ d]espite variations in belief and practice, Māori generally accept three basic propositions: the existence of spiritual beings, including one supreme God; the existence of a spiritual realm which intersects with the world in which humans live; and the existence of a spiritual dimension to life in this world. In the poetic language of Māori speech-making, this
world is Te Ao-Tū-Roa (The World Standing Long), a world of space, time and mortality, where everything comes to an end. In Te-Ao-Tū-Roa, physical substance (tinana) is given life and empowered by the indwelling of mauri (life principle) and mana (spiritual power), which originate in the spiritual realm. Human beings also have a wairua (spirit) which is given by God at birth and returns to God at death, and a hinengaro, a capacity for thinking combined with feeling.

This is just a brief introduction into an incredibly complex and profound aspect of how Māori understand the nature of being and knowing (a Māori ontology and epistemology), but it gives some sense of the intensity of Pip’s statement. As a ta moko artist she has to be knowledgeable in concepts like wairua in order to correctly practice her art.197 Thus, for her to invoke this concept in describing the “energy” that she perceives to permeate Kfm is to make a profound space/place-based statement.

Pip also makes connections in her statement between associating Kfm with wairua and whānau and the link this creates between Kfm’s sense of space/place and the values and practices that are undertaken and embodied there. These include a non-capitalist approach to things (“we are not really business minded up here”), the use of intuition in decision making (“you just get that feeling kind of thing and you just go with that”), and the idea that whānau is a binding force that keeps the Kfm-associated people committed to this place (“it’s just that real whānau...you know...family vibe...that really holds strong up here”).198

197 In other words, to practice it in a way that is in keeping with Māori spiritual concepts and values as they are connected to The World Standing Long.

198 One could make the argument that invoking the family as a metaphor is not unique, that the family metaphor is used in many places and context that have nothing to do with Māori culture (think of the often quoted athlete referring to his/her team as “like a family”). However, I would argue that this is not the case. The insertion of these terms changes the meaning of what the person is saying simply because “family” and “whānau” are not directly translatable. In other words, while family is the best word to use when translating whānau into English, this does not mean that it captures the full meaning of the Māori concept. Whānau, from the perspective of a Māori worldview and value system, suggests a whole series of complex
In this sense then, it seems clear in the above series of quotes that Pip’s intention of linking whānau to the concept wairua is to suggest what types of relationships and/or obligations whānau-based groupings invoke from her perspective. The following series capture some of this:

*Serge:* It’s interesting to me because there seems to be an underlying Māori vibe here with the diversity thing layered on top of it.

*Pip:* Yeah, well that Māori vibe that you may feel is that whānau kind of feeling…you know like…how everybody is a big family up here and that’s a big thing in Māoridom is, you know, keeping the tribe strong, and then the hapū living within tribes, you know, everybody looking out for each other…

Pip makes it very clear that her use of the word whānau is directly associated with a sense that it is the Māori understanding of this concept that she believes is being practiced at Kfm. Additionally, she is stating that this suggests both an association that makes it a metaphor for a Māori iwi (tribe) or hapū (clan) (i.e., genealogically based rather than organizationally based), and that this entails a relationship that involves individuals “looking out for each other.”

Arama, a Kfm DJ and one of the Māori involved with Kfm radio’s earliest broadcasts, similarly invoked the theme of whānau at Kfm. And like Pip, he did so while responding to questions that were not intended to focus on this aspect of Kfm. In the following conversation I was asking Arama to describe the parts of Auckland that he considered more or less Māori:

*Serge:* Do you understand Auckland to have certain parts that are more Māori than others?

relationships and obligations that go far beyond any inferences of these sorts in the English word “family”. This is not to say the use of “family” in English in certain context or in its use by certain ethnic groups (for example) may not come close to the Māori concept. Rather, it is to say that when Māori or non-Māori use this word in Aotearoa New Zealand there is a sense it is the Māori interpretation of family that is being invoked even if in practice it does not perfectly reflect core Māori definitions and understandings of this word.
Arama: Statistically apparently Manurewa, I did a lot of schooling...high school and intermediate and primary school as well in South Auckland...Manurewa...and apparently, statistically...

Serge: You mean numbers wise?

Arama: Its numbers, yeah, it is...but as far as identifying places that feel Māori I come to Kfm because they have a vibe around here that feels Māori, which is family or, you know, community, where there are people you can trust, people you can hang out with... come up with creative ideas, or whatever, and see if you guys can push them through...

Arama is directly identifying Kfm to be a place that “feels” Māori; and this is so, according to Arama, because Kfm’s sense of space/place (its “vibe”) evokes a sense of family and community (while in this conversation Arama did not use the whānau term, in many other informal conversations he did). Arama then adds more dimensions to the sense of what this means by suggesting that a space/place that embodies these feelings creates an environment of trust, a gathering place for practices as simple as “hanging out” but also for more active processes of productive creativity. Arama continued these themes later in our discussion:

Serge: In what way do you consider Kfm to be a Māori place?

Arama: Ahhh...all the Māori hanging around the area, all the non-Māori speaking Māori, using Māori words and associating themselves with us...very closely, to the point of brotherhood or something. The ta moko tattoo parlor definitely has a big part to play in that, and with all of that, just that brotherhood, family feel.

Arama describes Kfm’s Māoriness as a combination of presence (Māori spending time at Kfm), action (use of Māori words, close interactions), and material/representational built-environment (the ta moko studio) all reinforce the sense of whānau (family) that was asserted by all involved with Kfm. What is really critical about this statement, especially in the context of this research, is how elegantly Arama was able to evoke many of the core principles of the
space/place conceptual framework outlined in Chapter 2. Kfm as being-in-the-world (presence), as social construction and performativity (action) and Kfm as mutually constituted material and representational components, and all of these working together to foster feelings and experiences for those most intimately associated with Kfm. Certainly this captures well the various progressive conceptions of space/place outlined in Chapter 2. Moreover, Lefebvre’s framework is evoked as well in Arama’s statement, particularly through the lens of the lived, conceived and perceived. And all of this filtered through an indigenized framework.

Ramon, DJ, administrator and early contributor to Kfm’s creation, also drew on the whānau concept in his attempt to describe what factors socially connect the people involved with Kfm:

I think where it comes down to…where there are a lot of similarities and…I guess, in Māoridom…there is a big emphasis on whānau or family…it’s the same thing with Kfm is that we are a real, real family…and when we had that competition with us and Base FM the feedback we got from everyone was that Base FM came as individuals and we came as a whole family…and we had the vibe as a family…and I guess that’s something that we really hold, and everyone really likes hanging out with each other, and we have these big occasions which are kind of centered around food…we have, like, Mary Anne who creates these big massive feasts for us, and that’s where we come together and that like plays a huge emphasis for coming around to be with each other…an emphasis on food…although there is music and drinking and other things come around that…but our relationship with food and coming around at that moment and that’s what kind of builds that bond between us.

Ramon, like both Pip and Arama, suggests that what is going on at Kfm can best be understood through the linking of Māori values, especially that of whānau, to the sense of community that is experienced by those most closely associated with Kfm. Ramon’s description of this bonding process is grounded particularly in practices of everyday life, with the sharing of food representing an especially meaningful whānau binding practice.
Zane, Kfm barista and tea distributor and marketer, reproduced this same theme in the following conversation:

Serge: One of the things I am trying to work out is how people’s interaction with a place reinforces aspects of their identity. What activities reinforce your sense of being Māori?

Zane: I suppose it is very simple things... that sense of community... that sense of family that’s here as well, even though I am not related by blood... you know... I consider these people to be involved with Kfm to be my family, which is really, really nice... Yeah, so I think it’s always about all those sorts of things... even like sitting down and sharing food with people up here and just things like that... there is a real kind of sense of naturalness and connection which links back to those kinds of experiences of Māoridom for me, those community things for me, those simple day to day practices in the respect that they kind of run through everything here.

What is particularly important about both Ramon and Zane’s descriptions of a sense of whānau and community at Kfm is the way they make a link between this whānau/community experience and practices of everyday life at Kfm. Zane’s comment that community at Kfm is produced through “those simple day to day practices in the respect that they kind of run through everything here“ is especially apropos to this point. In other words, the experience of whānau at Kfm is enacted everyday through simple acts like talking story, eating together, working together, and solving problems together and all of this is fostered, maintained, and reproduced through interacting with Kfm as material space/place.

Importantly, this argument points to the way a feeling of whānau is being produced at Kfm that is unselfconscious and un-reflexive and yet practiced on a daily basis through the simple acts of sociality integrated with materiality. In other words, people are not purposely setting out to create a sense of whānau, rather this sense has developed through the creation of the space/place itself, through the day-to-day actions and activities of the people that work and
volunteer at Kfm, and through a commitment to both the space/place and the values and politics associated with Kfm by the people that spend the most time there. These people are all involved with Kfm by choice and are deeply committed to this organization, although their level of commitment and time spent there sometimes varies with what is happening in their lives at any particular moment in their life path. The way that whānau is being invoked and lived at Kfm comes very close to Metge’s (1995: 58) description of non-traditional whānau:

Most of these non-traditional meanings refer to groups with an on-going life separate from that of individuals, who can and do move in and out of membership. By describing their group as a whānau, members signal to themselves and the world at large that they have modeled it on the whānau extended family. They use the word whānau as symbol and charter, a constant reminder of the whānau values to which they aspire.

Thus, the principles of whānau acts as a guide to how people intimately related to Kfm define and understand their relationship, and this is reinforced by the presence of Māori as well as by a general acceptance of the importance and correctness of honoring and acknowledging this cultural worldview.

In all of these comments by people like Pip, Arama, Ramon and Zane we find recurring themes pointing to the identification of Kfm as a space/place of kaupapa-based whānau as defined by Joan Metge. But we also find some significant variations from this definition that suggest important differences about Kfm. This is because the kaupapa that is being practiced at Kfm does not adhere exclusively or even primarily to a Māori driven politics or activism of any kind, and many of the people involved in Kfm’s creation and day-to-day operations are not Māori. In both Metge’s and Royal’s (see above) definitions of kaupapa-based whānau there is a clear sense that these organizations are
predominantly made up of Māori and focused on Māori issues. In the case of Kfm this would not be a correct way to describe the people involved with this organization of with the space/place itself; nor would it be a correct way to refer to the Kfm mission, or at least not in its entirety.

This marks a significant difference between Kfm’s interpretation of Kaupapa-whanau and that of more traditionally Māori oriented organizations. The people that created and run Kfm on a day-to-day basis have managed to create a space/place that functions around the basic principles of kaupapa whanau, but at the same time this same space/place is open to individuals, groups and/or organizations that are not Māori in their identity and/or orientation. As has been noted previously Kfm is a space/place that honors and celebrates Māori culture and values but is simultaneously open to the multicultural context of inner city Auckland. In this sense then, Kfm is in no way a classic kaupapa-based organization, and perhaps it is even better to say that it is a kaupapa-like organization and that it aspires to a kaupapa-like whānau. It cannot claim full kaupapa status because it is not centered primarily on a Māori-based project or primarily driven by Māori (Māori are important, but they are only one aspect of the organization).

But the people at Kfm do strive to take seriously the role Māori have as the first nation people of Aotearoa New Zealand and they are steadfastly committed to maintaining this as a core value of Kfm as a space/place-based social movement. Through this steadfastness they manage to create a context for Māori whereby communication, interaction, and shared projects can be undertaken and accomplished in an environment that strives to undermine and refute the legacy of colonialism that still exists in Aotearoa New Zealand. At the
same time, the Māori that are attracted to Kfm are, I argue, expressing through their actions and commitments Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga. They are contributing to the production of a space/place that achieves a kind of mana Māori (a space/place that fosters, maintains and reproduces Māori spiritual power) that is at once self-assured and, as a result, capable of interacting with non-Māori influences.

8.1.3 Kfm as a space/place of Māori comfort

If a sense of whānau was the most often invoked description of how the people most intimately associated with Kfm identified with this space/place, then a close second was the way they described the experience of comfort felt by Māori when they first came into Kfm. This came up in some of the most casual conversations and social environments (gallery openings, parties at Kfm, spontaneous conversations in passing) as well as during formal interviews. The frequency of this idea of Māori feeling comfortable at Kfm occurred on enough occasions that it was clearly an important part of how individuals involved with Kfm understood and experienced this environment, as well as an aspect of Kfm as space/place that was deeply valued by them. Over time, and from a lot of listening to stories by, and about, Māori at Kfm, I came to the conclusion that the term “comfort” was a kind of discursive code for a broader feeling of whakamanatanga experienced by Māori associated with this space/place and organization.

This idea of Kfm as a space/place of comfort for Māori marks Kfm as one possible manifestation of a Māori urban geography of whakamanatanga. The
essence of these types of geographies is the creation of spaces/places in Aotearoa New Zealand cities where Māori experience a sense of whakamanatanga (empowerment). This sense of whakamanatanga comes through the interweaving of a social and material environment that creates an experience of comfort, safety (through lack of judgment) and, most importantly I argue, a sense of entitlement to occupy a particular space/place. This last part links well with the Māori concept of tūrangawaewae that was described in Chapter 2. Tūrangawaewae is a Māori concept used to describe the profound sense of belonging to a specific territory felt particularly by Māori who still have knowledge of their whakapapa (genealogy).

The classic example of tūrangawaewae is the Māori marae (see Rosenblatt, 2003). But for some Māori the marae has not always worked as a successful model for creating this sense of comfort (van Meijl, 2006). On many occasions people involved with Kfm (both intimately and casually) invoked the marae as a metaphor to describe the kind of feeling they experienced when at Kfm. But what makes Kfm unique is that it is a space/place that allows for the full range of Māori to feel a sense of comfort there, whether or not they have a strong grasp of, or ties to, their whakapapa. The marae, while a profoundly sacred space/place for Māori and non-Māori alike, is ultimately an exclusive space/place. This is not meant as a critique of marae in any way. The marae as a space/place of existential insiderness/outsiderness (Relph, 1976) is a critical part of the marae’s role as a space/place of cultural mediation, ritual farewelling of the dead, and guest-host relationships. But it does suggest that there is room for conceiving other spaces/places that create similar feelings of comfort that the marae inspires that are more inclusive of a wider community. Kfm, I argue, is one such
space/place, and the feeling of comfort experienced by Māori there is an example of how this space/place manifests marae-like characteristics.

John Greet, expressed the essence of this sense of comfort felt by Māori who come in to Kfm eloquently when he stated:

*Now what...the ingredient...you’re talking about Māori here...the ingredient, the thing that makes us strong is that we subconsciously acknowledge...we subconsciously acknowledged a culture to work under which is Māori culture. It’s any...and that’s what makes us kind of attractive...attractive to Māori people that particularly like us, it is just a feeling...Māori come in there...feels right...you know, Polynesian people go on gut instinct...they walk in, the way the place is laid out, the way we look at people, you know? An accepting glance, affirmative nod, all of those things work for Māori, there’s nothing more than that; but underneath it what gives us that thing is that we have acknowledged, if you like, Māori culture as a base to work under, right, it wasn’t a question of any culture...any cultural due, it was a question of...that most of us felt strongly that this Polynesian culture is the appropriate culture for this time and place and where we are, and historically how it sits in this land that we’re in...you know what I mean? And it’s a good one...Polynesian culture!*

Here we see, from one of the most authoritative voices at Kfm, an argument for why it is that Māori feel a sense of comfort in this space/place. The people that created Kfm chose (seemingly both consciously and subconsciously) to establish “Māori culture as a base to work under,” and then translated this into a space/place that both socially and materially reinforces this base to the extent that when Māori come into Kfm for the first time they intuitively sense that this is a space/place that will accept them as Māori without judgment.

This argument is extremely provocative because it sits within the context of the legacy of colonialism and urbanization in Aotearoa New Zealand. To say that Māori, when they walk into Kfm, experience a sense of comfort is to at least tacitly acknowledge that there are other spaces/places where, when they enter, they do not feel this sense of comfort. And the explanation for this rests within the intertwining of racism and classism that exist in Aotearoa New Zealand and
the impact this has on the way Māori experience the urban context (Spoonley, 1996). During our formal interview, John Greet told me a story about an experience he had in a clinic that perfectly exemplifies this point. I have included it at length here because it so perfectly demonstrates the fact that there are still many spaces/places in Aotearoa New Zealand where Māori are treated unfairly and, as a result, they feel a sense of discomfort:

I get wake-up calls all the time now. Two weeks ago I was up in my mother’s place and her partner had heart palpitations and I thought we’d better take him to have a look. So we drove over to the clinic…drove him there…and the doctors said bring him in because his blood levels were way, way down and put him in observation, and we sat there, and we were in this room and he’s on oxygen and I’ve got a book and reading and been there for an hour, and then the door bursts open and in come two young Māori boys…one of them who is in a wretched state…an absolutely wretched state and collapses on the bed, and they say “oh excuse us there is no other place the rooms are all full,” and then the nurse is there and looking at his vitals and they’re not good, you know, they are not good; and in comes this doctor and she is a middle aged White women, and here’s this young Māori boy lying on the bed and his mate, and they look scared because this is a [expletive] hospital and there’s all these White people around here…they look horrified…and the doctor says “right, what’s going on here, what’s going on here?” And of course the guy can’t speak so his mate says, “we were at a dance lesson, we were learning hip hop dance and then he collapsed.”…”Huh? Collapsed did you? Any drugs?”…you know? “No, no, no misses, no drugs”…”huh, well come on then, what did you take? You must have taken something?” And by that point I was seething, and I almost said to that women…you cannot speak to people that way or I’m going to smack you over the head with my [expletive] book…you know what I mean? But I had Len next to me and it’s not my place, and the kids just sat there and cringed…and she went on…”Alright, what did you take last night? Did you take drugs last night? Did you smoke P?” Oh, you bitch, I thought! You know you [expletive] look at these boys…and I know that they hadn’t smoked P, these are just innocent kids that are hip hop dancers and it turned out he had a collapsed lung…that’s what had happened, he had just over exerted himself and he got a collapsed lung…the poor kid had a collapsed lung. And on she goes…and finally his teacher comes barging in…she’d driven over in another car and she says…”Oh, no, no, I should have been here! This is such and such and they’re good boys, they’ve been students of mine for a long time,” and at that point the kid just fell down and went into a cold sweat and turned all grey. And they checked him and he had a collapsed lung. And I just thought to myself, now it’s right there, if that had been a White boy that would not have happened, you know, he was prejudged…prejudged and marginalized before you start, thank you very much. No grace, no acknowledgment of the human that they’re dealing with, no…just total and absolute [expletive] marginalization in one of the services…but what you have is that happens and that kid with the lung, he was put through the first degree and he had never taken drugs in his life, you know what I mean? As it turns out his parents were real churchgoers and as it turns out it was a church dance group, and yet this [expletive] unfolds…and I said to
the teacher, because they were waiting for an ambulance to come over from Auckland, “you know, the treatment that your boy got was abysmal and this doctor should be...we should complain.” And she looked at me and said, “you know, the boys are used to it, they get this everywhere...everywhere they go they know even before they walk in that they’re going to be looked at suspiciously wherever they go whether it’s the post office or the gas station.” So you know, just again Serge, racism is alive and well, and they come into Kfm and there is none of that.

To argue that internalized identity factors such as race and class have an impact on how we experience space/place is to recognize profoundly the way the socio-cultural and the socio-geographic exist interdependently. These are arguments that have been made throughout this dissertation, but here they are particularly pertinent to understanding the way Māori experience a space/place like Kfm. This experience for many Māori is diametrically opposed to the clinic experience described by John. When Māori enter into Kfm the absence of a feeling of being judged and out of place in a space/place that, on the service at least, could easily be one where they could expect this experience, is palpable, and as a result marks the Kfm space/place as immediately different and unusual to them. Kfm is a space/place that honors and acknowledges Māori culture through its sociality and materiality and, as a result, when Māori enter into this space/place they experience whakamanatanga.

Two anecdotes can help bring clarity to this discussion. One of the Māori women I interviewed and got to know while at Kfm was a young lady named Julz (parts of her story are featured in Chapter’s 6 and 7). In terms of her Māori identity, Julz was one of the most complex individuals I spoke with while in Aotearoa New Zealand. She was clearly still in the process of coming to terms with her mixed Pākehā/Māori ancestry, especially in the sense of deciding how to balance these two sides of her identity. Julz’s physical features clearly marked
her as Māori, yet much of her upbringing was with the Pākehā side of her family (and it was a very positive experience). Her social experiences outside of her family, however, pushed her towards relating to her Māori side more than her Pākehā side. In talking with Julz she often stated that Kfm was a space/place that allowed her to learn about and understand Pākehā society better, but at the same time it was a space/place that inspired her to explore her Māori side, eventually leading her to enroll in a Māori language and cultural program.

During my second stay in Auckland, the Kfm people planned a party to be held in the Kfm space/place. Julz mentioned to me at one point that she was bringing two of her girlfriends from South Auckland as a way to expose them to Auckland’s inner city and to Kfm. She told me that she was hoping to show them that there were areas outside of South Auckland that were “cool” and therefore inspire them to explore a broader range of Auckland’s neighborhoods and experiences than they normally would. During the party I informally “observed” these two young ladies. It was clear to me that this was a new experience for them, one that they were entering into cautiously and with some trepidation (this subjective analysis was confirmed by Julz several days later during a conversation I had with her). Issues of social distance (Kuby, et al, 2007) were quite evident here in that these young ladies were coming from a part of Auckland that was isolated from the inner city both socio-economically and ethnically. But what is so important about this story is the way Julz, a young Māori woman with experience in both the more isolated South Auckland Māori context and the inner city Kfm context, believed that Kfm represented a space/place and social experience that could impact how her friends felt about non-Māori and urban areas in Auckland associated with non-Māori. In other
words, she perceived Kfm to be a space/place that had the ability to bring greater awareness and acceptance of difference to these two young Māori women and therefore, I argue, a greater level of whakamanatanga.

The second story occurred one day when John Greet (Kfm founder, patron, and DJ) and I were closing up Kfm and getting ready to head back to his home (where I was staying at the time). Right about the time we were going to lock the outside door a Māori woman came up the stairs looking both awkward and unsure of whether or not she was in the right place. John greeted her and she asked about a gallery opening. As it turned out she had gotten the date wrong (she was a week early) and it was clear that she was both flustered and embarrassed by her mistake. Politely she asked about the Kfm space/place (as was so often the case when people first entered into it) and John invited her to have some tea at the tea bar. At this point, however, she realized the time and asked if we were closing. John acknowledged that we were, but insisted that she stay, gave her a book to read, and told her to just make sure the door was locked as she left. Her first reaction was one of surprise, but she quickly assessed the situation and decided that his offer was genuine and that this was indeed a space/place where she could be comfortable and relax for a bit.

As we left together John pointed out to me that this was a perfect example of why Māori felt so comfortable at Kfm. He argued that Māori, as a result of the legacy of colonialism, were highly attuned (at an intuitive level) to being judged negatively outside of their more intimate communities. This was especially the case in spaces/places they perceived to be non-Māori businesses. But the combination of the way Kfm looks, the book that this Māori woman picked up (which happened to be a Māori oriented book), and the automatic act of trust
given to her by John all amounted to creating a feeling of non-judgment and acceptance.

What is so remarkable about these two anecdotal examples is the way they demonstrate the difference that Kfm makes. Discussions of spaces/places where Māori feel a sense of comfort and acceptance typically focus on either the traditional space/place of the Māori marae, in Māori oriented neighborhoods, in community organizations such as churches and sports teams, or in radical anti-establishment spaces/places such as those created by urban gangs. Kfm represents an alternative type of space/place where Māori can experience a sense of whakamanatanga that is neither an expression of a fundamentally Māori cultural space/place (like the marae) or one that finds group identity and solidarity through a total rejection of mainstream society.

I have found this aspect of Kfm to be at once the most fascinating and, I argue, important elements suggesting the relevance and significance of this space/place, as well as one of the most difficult to describe beyond just saying that Māori “feel” comfortable there, despite the fact that it is also a space/place where a myriad of other people (from a broad range of classes, ethnicities and backgrounds) also gain a similar sense of comfort. In attempting to bridge this gap between recognition of a phenomenon and explanation of this phenomenon I have developed the term Māori urban spaces/places of difference to describe the socio-spatial/platial atmosphere that has been created at Kfm.
8.2 Kfm as Māori Urban Space/Place of Difference

One of the most repeated assertions about Kfm by the people intimately associated with it was that it was both a space/place of Māoriness and one of cultural diversity. At first I really struggled with this way of describing Kfm, because I came into this research thinking that Kfm was primarily a Māori space/place. The name certainly evokes a Māori feeling as does much of its design and ambiance. But the people that inhabit, embody and engage in everyday life activities at Kfm were adamant about this point and, as was so often the case in this research, their perspectives dictated the development of concepts needed in order to understand what is so different, special and progressive about this organization and the space/place the people there have created. What ultimately emerges from this research is a concept—Māori urban spaces/places of difference—that attempts to capture in one phrase the ability of the people at Kfm to find a balance between honoring its Māori foundations while simultaneously celebrating Auckland’s increasingly multicultural milieu.

As a Māori urban space/place of difference Kfm offers one possible response to this multicultural milieu. This response is different from typical kaupapa Māori-based responses I came across during my research in that it eschews an either/or approach to this debate. In other words, the choices are not just biculturalism (a system based on Māori in negotiation with Non-Māori) or multiculturalism (a system where the various ethnic groups that make up Aotearoa New Zealand participate equally in the democratic process). What the people at Kfm are saying, through the space/place they created and through their actions there, is that there is another possible path to take. This alternative
path is very much about a progressive view of the urban Māori condition, but in a way that is not grounded in an either/or choice about biculturalism or multiculturalism. Rather, this view is grounded in the creation of a socio-spatial/platial context where Māori are able to come to the table fully acknowledged as the first nation people of Aotearoa New Zealand, but in a space/place that allows a simultaneous celebration of Auckland’s diverse urban population. At their best Māori urban spaces/places of difference, like Kfm, allow Māori to progressively engage the changing cultural milieu of Aotearoa New Zealand without compromising and/or assimilating to these other cultures. Instead they are able to interact with them, contribute to them and critique them, all the while maintaining and strengthening Māori urban identities and cultural politics.

Here we can begin to productively connect the concept Māori urban spaces/places of difference that are manifesting at Kfm to the way other scholars have constructed parallel concepts. Barbara Hooper and Edward Soja (1993: 183-184), for example, drawing on the work of authors such as Cornel West (1990) and bell hooks (1990), argue that a new cultural politics of difference was emerging at the end of the 20th century:

Both bell hooks and Cornel West are primarily concerned with reconceptualizing radical African-American subjectivity in a way that retains and enhances the emancipatory power of blackness, but is at the same time innovatively open to the formation of multiple communities of resistance, polyvocal political communities capable of linking together many radical subjectivities and creating new ‘meeting places’ and ‘spaces’ for diverse oppositional practices.

This argument links with what I am asserting about Kfm, with some important differences. One way to conceptualize Kfm, based on the arguments of West and
hooks, is as a space/place of whakamanatanga-based Māori subjectivity that is open to “multiple communities.” It is a space/place that is certainly polyvocal (many voices and perspectives being given equal footing), and it certainly represents a meeting space/place where diverse groups and possible “oppositional practices” can come together and productively cross-fertilize.

However, Kfm is not primarily or even significantly a space/place of resistance. While many of the people involved with Kfm certainly incorporate a politics of resistance into aspects of their identity, and while groups “fighting the good fight” like Oxfam and PETA (People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals) use the Kfm space/place to host meetings and fundraise, and while there is certainly a general sense of support for Māori sovereignty, these characteristics make up only one aspect of what Kfm is all about. This is because the people at Kfm are just too busy going about the business of creating alternative ways of living and being urban in Aotearoa New Zealand and, as a result, have to a certain extent moved beyond resistance into a process of alternative socio-cultural and socio-geographic production. The people at Kfm don’t organize protests, they organize parties; but not as a frivolous act of hedonism (although to be fair there is some of this), but as part of their project to create alternative communities and alternative ways of being in Auckland. And this touches on the essence of what I am arguing is meant by whakamanatanga-based urbanisms (Māori or otherwise). These urbanisms are represented by a critical change in perspective whereby individuals and groups are able to move beyond resistance and get down to the business of creating structures and organizations alternative to those that are focused primarily or entirely on the politics of resistance (e.g., resistance to the legacy of colonialism, to capitalist forces of domination).
It was always a singular moment during this research when I would ask Māori what happens after resistance? What happens when Māori reach a point when they can productively take advantage of decades of resistance and begin to create social, economic and political spaces/places that are fundamentally grounded in whakamanatanga? There was often a pause after this question, as if the people I spoke with had not yet considered this possibility, even though, as I have argued throughout this dissertation, this is already happening in myriad ways throughout a city like Auckland. Some of the Māori I spoke with did recognize this phenomenon and acknowledged that they were actively participating in its flowering, while others came to agree with me that this was indeed a phenomenon and perspective worth incorporating and researching even if to this point they had not thought about their activities being described this way.

But at Kfm I am arguing all of this is occurring in a unique and special way because of its ability to incorporate inclusivity and difference into whakamanatanga-based Māori urbanisms. The key to all of this being successful is that Kfm’s sense of space/place is fundamentally anchored in a respect for and celebration of Māori as the first nation peoples of Aotearoa New Zealand. Because of this, Kfm remains solidly anchored in a profoundly Māori space/place, one that can only be manifested through its indigenous connections, but simultaneously a space/place has been created where multiculturalism is allowed to blossom.
8.2.1 Kfm as space/place of multiculturalism

One of the forces of globalization that has, in particular, impacted inner city Auckland is this area’s growing multicultural demographic profile. In the latter half of the 20th century Auckland became the focus of a growing Polynesian population as a result of Aotearoa New Zealand’s close connections to Oceanic nations such as Sāmoa, Tonga, The Cook Islands and Niue. This city also, in the 1990s and 2000s, became the end point for emigrating East Asians of Chinese and Korean ancestry. Aotearoa New Zealand’s connections to the British Commonwealth also influenced significant populations of South Asians to migrate to Auckland as well. There are also pockets of other migrants including populations of Croatians and South Africans that came over as part of distinct periods of migration from those countries. What is particularly interesting about Auckland is that it is the only city in Aotearoa New Zealand with this obvious broad spectrum of people other than Pākehā and Māori. Certainly small numbers of all of these groups have moved out of Auckland, but not in numbers anywhere close to what Auckland has experienced. The end result is that Auckland is a city with a high level of cultural diversity and is unlike any other city in Aotearoa New Zealand in this respect (Johnson, et al, 2003 and 2008).

This growing cultural diversity has been challenging for Māori because it has injected a politics of multiculturalism and ethnicity into a society that was historically been about negotiating the relationship between Māori and Pākehā. Kfm represents an organization that is striving to negotiate this tension between this growing multiculturalism and Māori cultural politics, or, to put it another
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way, the people associated with Kfm are attempting to create a balance between these two forces. One way to engage this discussion is through an exploration of the Māori renaissance in relation to biculturalism in Aotearoa New Zealand. In an anthropology dissertation Daniel Rosenblatt (2003: 45-46; original emphasis) defines in his own words the Māori Renaissance:

[most succinctly, the Maori Renaissance is an attempt to put Maori ‘culture’ at the center of modern New Zealand life: it reflects a desire on the part of Maori people to be at once ‘modern’ and ‘Maori.’ Included under the rubric of the renaissance are Maori attempts to regain their land, to preserve their language, to take control over the education of their children, and to preserve the arts and customs which they believe express ‘Maoriness as a way of being in the world.’ While much of what Maori have done over the last thirty years or so had involved reviving or preserving traditions of various sorts, the renaissance as a whole is as much about the future as it is about the past. It is about finding ways to pass on to their children ngā taunga tiki iho o ngā tipuna (the treasures passed down from that (sic) ancestors), and it is about bringing into some sort of real existence the imagined ‘bicultural’ New Zealand that they see as having been chartered by the Treaty of Waitangi. This last project involves a creative imagining of what it might mean for a modern, industrial, nation state, and its accouterments, to embody a Non-Western tradition.

The idea that the Māori Renaissance is one that a) asserts the centrality of Māori culture in Aotearoa New Zealand society, b) allows for a context where Māoriness and modernity exist in a non-contradictory manner, and c) is just as much about the future as it is the past all fit well with the arguments that I am making in this research. Part of this engagement with modernity involves the forces of globalization that, like international migration to Auckland, continue to break upon Aotearoa New Zealand’s shores.

However, the final part of this argument, that some real form of biculturalism should be the logical or idealized end product of this conversation, I find somewhat problematic. The problem with biculturalism in Aotearoa New Zealand, and this is especially the case in Auckland, is that it is losing ground to
the reality of multiculturalism that is beginning to take shape. True, at this point it seems that this is really only the case in Auckland, but one suspects that it is only a matter of time before multiculturalism spills out of Auckland into other parts of the country (this is already happening of course, but it is an issue of scale and intensity at this point). This multiculturalism is a direct result of globalization in the form of a diaspora of peoples from countries throughout, in particular, the less wealthy parts of the world wanting to partake in Aotearoa New Zealand’s greater opportunities and standards of living.

Some of the staunchest Māori (in the sense of being absolutely dedicated to improving conditions for Māori in Aotearoa New Zealand) I spoke with were quite at pains to emphasize that they now speak of Māori and Non-Māori (as opposed to traditionally speaking of Māori and Pākehā) when discussing biculturalism. This seemed to me to be an attempt to rein in the impact of multiculturalism and the perceived threat that these new globally generated demographic patterns bring to Māori politics. It is perceived as a threat because it has the potential to undermine the sharing of power suggested by biculturalism (between Māori and Pākehā) by inserting other ethnically based interests groups into the fray. The fear among Māori, I suggest, is that the Crown (government) will use this multicultural element to assert that Māori are just one of many ethnic groups in Aotearoa New Zealand attempting to carve out a power base thereby undermining the position of Māori as primary “players” in the politics of biculturalism. Moreover, inherent in this discourse is an underlying ideology of Aotearoa New Zealand as a multiethnic state evolving towards a nation-state where there is no longer the need to assert ethnicity due to
the converging of groups into one national identity (Kuby, et al, 2007; also see Dirlik & Prazniak, 2001: Introduction for a broader discussion of this issue).

This type of ideology certainly flies in the face of contemporary Māori cultural and socio-economic politics, and it is this argument that seems to be missing in the above Rosenblatt quote. The fact is that, in Auckland at least, multiculturalism is alive and well and is not only an undeniable component of Auckland’s socio-economic, socio-spatial, and socio-cultural context but is one that is growing rather than diminishing or becoming stagnant. Auckland’s multicultural context is increasing and will continue to do so. This is an inevitable component of Auckland’s status as a global city.

Given this argument it seems critical to rethink the politics of biculturalism in Aotearoa New Zealand in ways that do not undermine the successes achieved by Māori so far and, more importantly, shift these successes in adaptive ways that incorporate a growing multicultural milieu. In other words, how can Māori continue to assert the politics of mana whenua (using this term broadly to encompass all Māori rather than individual hapū or iwi) in ways that productively and progressively engage multiculturalism without simultaneously undermining the politics of Māori first nation status? I would argue that this is a critical question for Māori as they continue the Māori Renaissance into the 21st century and, in the direct context of this dissertation and especially this chapter, I am arguing here that Kfm serves as one possible progressive response to this emergent issue.

What is interesting and critical to the success of Kfm as a space/place where Māori experience whakamanatanga is that it does this through both an acknowledgment of a Māori ‘way of doing things’ and through creating a
space/place that embraces difference. The brilliance of Kfm for Māori, especially in the context of the biculturalism-multiculturalism debate discussed above, is that it uses aspects of both these arguments in ways that are inviting and inspiring to Māori. It manifests the most important aspects of biculturalism through its honoring and acknowledging of Māori as first nation people of Aotearoa New Zealand. It manifests the most important aspects of multiculturalism by creating a space/place of heterogeneity that breaks down the forces of racism that are part and parcel of the legacy of colonialism in Aotearoa New Zealand, thereby creating a space/place where Māori are given an opportunity to shrug off the burden of a colonial consciousness as they contribute to a multicultural conversation unselfconsciously and in a context of cultural whakamanatanga.

8.3 Kfm As Globally Connected Space/Place

The previous sections demonstrated the intense way in which Kfm is grounded in space/place through its indigenous connections and through its ability to create a space/place of inclusivity and tolerance to difference while simultaneously honoring Māori culture and politics. In this section I look at the ways the people at Kfm are creating networks and communities that extend beyond the confines of this specific space/place. These linkages extend to the immediate K’ Road area, throughout Auckland, to cities in other parts of Aotearoa New Zealand, and internationally. It is this aspect of Kfm that suggests its presence on the extreme margins of what it means to claim it is an example of Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga. By “margins” I do not mean to
imply that Kfm is in any way subordinate or less worthy of this characterization. Rather, Kfm represents an organization and space/place that is pushing the boundaries of this concept. It is doing this by creating a socio-spatial/palatial context where Māori are able to productively engage forces of modernity at both local and global scales without in any way compromising their sense of identity or cultural politics.

It is useful here, as a way to demonstrate the difference that Kfm makes, to restate Massey’s (1994: 154) arguments about a global sense of place first introduced in Chapter 2:

[i]nstead then, of thinking of places as areas with boundaries around, they can be imagined as articulated moments in networks of social relations and understandings, but where a large proportion of those relations, experiences and understandings, are constructed on a far larger scale than we happen to define for that moment as the place itself, whether that be a street, or a region, or even a continent. And this in turn allows a sense of place which is extroverted, which includes a consciousness of its links with the wider world, which integrates in a positive way the global and the local.

Up to this point the main focus has been on Kfm in a way that has emphasized its boundedness. The question of how Kfm came to be did extend out to include Karangahape Road (see Chapter 6), but for the most part discussions of how it came to be were inward looking. The discussion in Chapter 7 of how Kfm is experienced and performed in a process of continuous space/place becoming also presented a bounded perspective on the nature of Kfm. But throughout these sections were also hints, allusions and outright statements about Kfm’s urban, regional and global connectivity. Building on this theme of connectivity the remainder of this section focuses on two main ideas. On the one hand, the focus is on how Kfm is an “articulated moment” encompassing “networks of
social relations and understandings” that extend from this space/place all the way out to the international scale. On the other hand, the focus is on how Kfm’s Māori foundations create a global/local nexus at Kfm that allow Māori involved with this organization to positively and productively engage this nexus.

8.3.1 Kfm as a socio-spatial/platial network of community development

On the one hand, Kfm is insular in the sense that it is a space/place that people enter into and experience as a self-contained entity. On the other hand, many of the people I spoke with that worked at or were in some meaningful way involved with Kfm noted the importance of its location on K Road (see Chapter 6), as well as its connections to many other places and people in the Auckland, greater Aotearoa New Zealand and international communities. These connections exemplify what Massey means (see above quote) when she refers to “articulated moments in networks of social relations.” Ramon (Kfm DJ, administrator, bartender and board member) expressed the development of these networks to me perhaps better than anyone I spoke with:

"Yeah, the thing too within this whole thing…the whole of Kfm could really be looked at as a community development project because all the DJs up here…there are a lot of young DJs…like there are a lot DJs that are young parents…there are a lot of DJs that are…who are doing other work and then through coming into Kfm have built their skills up to a certain point where they can then make a living doing gigs out in the city…getting shows on Alt.TV music station, getting shows on other radio stations which then builds their profile and then they’re able to go make money from the kinds of things that they like…in the same way that we were doing te reo [Māori language] classes, we were doing women’s self defense classes some nights, we do theater on a Thursday night for actors which wouldn’t have another space to practice their art form, we do film nights organized around building social consciousness, around animal rights, feminism, social activism, things with Oxfam, all sorts of things we do, things with like…with young people…helping with social development stuff…building their ideas around social consciousness and global issues…there is a whole premise about what we do if someone comes along and says “oh, can we do this? Is this your thing?” we say okay…it’s a real easy yes or no for us in terms of is it what we are about, is it going to help us achieve
what we want to achieve? And even in terms of our gallery it’s focused on emerging artists…supporting emerging artists…because once they get their first exhibition they are able to access funding to get their next exhibition, so that’s the whole premise, we really act like a spring board for a lot of people to go on and then further develop their skills.

This statement by Ramon as to the many ways Kfm connects to a broader community in Auckland, as well as to issues and politics at a global scale, speaks volumes as to the extroverted aspects of Kfm. While the people at Kfm are going about the business of fostering, maintaining and reproducing a specific space/place they are simultaneously forging connections to a broader set of social relations and movements by opening their space/place to groups with parallel agendas of progressive social change. In this way the Kfm space/place itself becomes a concrete location from which these movements can launch their projects.

One way to understand Kfm as a global/local nexus of networks and communities is to diagram these linkages based on my observations and interviews. Inspiration for this approach came from Phil Hubbard’s (2006) writings about the “creative city” as a site of social networks of creativity.200 Hubbard argues that it is critical to recognize ways in which “networks…sustain and support artistic production” (2006: 226). Hubbard (2006: 226) goes on to argue:

\[t\]his take on creativity implies that artistic creativity may be embedded in social networks which are spatially localized. The idea that creativity benefits from the dense spatial concentration of creative workers in particular locales might thus lead us to describe...[these]...areas...as a milieu of creativity.

\[200\] See Solnit (2000) and Grenfell and Hardy (2003) for more in-depth case studies of these sorts of networks.
Kfm, too, is a spatially localized social network within a milieu of creativity.

Figure 44: Networks of Creativity and Place Production at Kfm. This schemata was developed through my observations at Kfm and through the interviews with Kfm employees. It is intended to demonstrate the way that Kfm’s space/place extends outside of its physical boundaries connecting to an ever expanding network of people, spaces/places and communities.

However, Kfm’s network includes individuals, groups and organizations well beyond just the limited scope of artists, and its scale, unlike the example given by Hubbard, extends beyond the scale of K’ Road all the way out to the international. Figure 44 (below) demonstrates that Kfm’s socio-spatial network is one that includes individuals, organizations with a broad spectrum of progressive social agendas, businesses, artists from a broad range of mediums (e.g., visual, music, tattoo), and political activists. As I developed this model of the Kfm socio-spatial/platial network I would show it to people involved with
Kfm. Invariably they would make suggestions for additions or edits, and thus the version shown here is truly a collaborative effort to demonstrate the broad scope of Kfm’s connections in Auckland, in Aotearoa New Zealand, and globally.

It is difficult to understate the importance of spaces/places like Kfm for organizations with progressive agendas but, perhaps, not expansive budgets. Lefebvre (1991; 166-7) made this clear when he argued “Any revolutionary ‘project’ today, whether utopian or realistic must, if it is to avoid hopeless banality, make the re-appropriation of the body, in association with the re-appropriation of space, into a non-negotiable part of its agenda.” Kfm is doing this, not only for those most intimately associated with this space/place, but also for a much wider network of people with agendas that are deemed by the people at Kfm to be in sync with their social agenda.

An important element of Kfm’s ability to function as a space/place of community development involves the notion of social entrepreneurialism: a philosophy for funding organizations that embrace capitalism but with the purpose of using profits to further a group’s social agenda rather than using those profits to increase the monetary wealth of an individual or corporation. This philosophy was explained to me when I was speaking to John Greet about the possibility of reproducing the Kfm model. His response on how a space/place like Kfm is able to maintain itself financially:

Oh absolutely, absolutely reproducible...that’s where we want to be, it’s like the model we sort of work towards...we have our trust meetings where we all get together...there you see Andrew, Mary Anne, Julz, Ramon, Pip...and when you see us sit down what you are looking at is the face of New Zealand in twenty years time...that’s it right there, you know, in terms of age, in terms of cultural identity, in terms of ethnic make-up and all of those sorts of things...it’s right across the board from young Carla right through to me...a twenty two year old to a fifty year old here we all are...and it’s totally reproducible, it’s a totally reproducible thing and that ultimately is one of the goals is to set a model...basically three years ago when we were looking for a bit of guidance in
terms of how we were going to be…Ramon stumbled on a whole series of DVDs about trusts that had been formulated in England around Brookson…without government funding…people that couldn’t get funding but wanted to do something…good people, well minded people who wanted to do something…whatever…went ahead and did it anyway and got a lot farther than if they had got government funding in the first place. So a template was put in place…I watched that DVD again, and again and again and Ramon watched it, we all watched it, Julz watched it…and the very person that produced that video happened to be Toni and she came along and we had long talks with her…so there was a template there and we made a conscious decision to work in the community, to work with at risk youth, and you know to motivate and mentor, and do what we do without government funding…we will fund ourselves through our own entrepreneurial endeavors…that’s the model. Now within that model has to be a total acceptance of different cultures…it’s no good saying well this is what we’re about…we’re a Chinese organization, or we’re an Indian organization…ours is a multicultural environment because it’s all about learning from that sharing, and acknowledging…acknowledging the presence of that person and the culture that they bring in the door with them and not imposing our own.

The model John is referring to here is based on social entrepreneurialism where organizations are designed based on capitalist principles (i.e., the goal is to make a profit), but with the profits going directly to fund whatever social activism the organization is linked to. One of the advantages of this model, as John notes above, is that activist trusts can be formed that do not have to rely on funding from larger organizations. The advantage here is that these larger organizations may have their own agendas and/or restrictions that they might try to impose on the organizations they are funding. Social entrepreneurialism circumvents this type of restriction and power relationship and puts the power that money allows in the hands of those seeking funding. The main point in bringing this aspect of Kfm up in the context of its community development project is to argue that social entrepreneurialism allows Kfm to circumvent one form of network (for example, funding from the state) so that it can participate in and facilitate other
networks (for example, allowing progressive groups to use their space/place for meetings).\textsuperscript{201}

\paragraph{8.3.2 Kfm's global/local nexus as a vehicle for Māori modernity}

In this final section the relationship between Kfm as a nexus of global/local connectivity and Māori modernity is considered. In many ways this final discussion is profoundly connected to all else that has been discussed about Kfm up to this point, particularly the idea of Kfm as an example of one type of Māori urban geography of whakamanatanga. If indeed, as I have argued throughout this chapter, the people at Kfm have managed to create a space/place that simultaneously honors Māori culture and society and the growing multicultural context of inner city Auckland, then it stands as both example and vehicle for Māori modernity. This term is used to reference much of the activities of the many Māori discussed throughout this dissertation. As Māori migrated to cities throughout the 20\textsuperscript{th} century they entered aggressively into urban industrial capitalist society as it was being expressed in Aotearoa New Zealand. It is easy to imagine this historical demographic shift leading to socio-geographic change within the Māori community defined more by assimilation than anything else. But one of the arguments I have been making throughout all these chapters is that assimilation, as it turns out, is not the only or even the dominant story of Māori urbanization and urbanisms.

\textsuperscript{201} A year after I last engaged in research at Kfm I was informed by John Greet that the Te Karanga Trust had ratified a plan to buy a restaurant just down the road from Kfm named Verona. After some work and retraining the Kfm workers began working at Verona and have turned this business into a successful profit-making restaurant. As a result a lot of the funding for Kfm is coming from this new business venture.
Māori have taken advantage of the urban context to improve and change their lives in a myriad of ways, but importantly many of them have done this while still consciously maintaining and even strengthening their Māori identity. Equally importantly the creation of spaces/places in Auckland (and other cities) has played a critical role in this process of Māori modernity, and Kfm stands as a unique but important example of this phenomenon. Kfm, however, also serves as an example of how the formations of Māori modernity in urban areas can push the boundaries of how this concept is defined and understood. This is the case because Kfm represents the creation of a space/place where Māori can confidently and progressively engage the complex assortment of forces coalescing in Auckland without compromising their sense of Māori identity.

In this sense, then, Kfm represents a cutting-edge expression of what is meant by the phrase Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga. This is the case because it goes beyond the creation of an exclusively Māori space/place like a marae, and instead acknowledges that some Māori no longer need to regroup or protect their cultural resources, but rather have reached a moment where they can actively and progressively participate in Kfm’s rapidly evolving global/local nexus without fear of cultural loss or compromise. In doing so these Māori, I argue, are not only participating in this nexus, but are going beyond this to contribute Māori ways of understanding global/local relations in Auckland and beyond. At Kfm they are doing this through art, through music, and through the building of community networks and in the process giving all of us a glimpse of one possible model for Māori/non-Māori cultural politics in Aotearoa New Zealand.
8.4 Conclusion: Māori Urban Spaces/Places of Difference and Kfm’s Global/Local Sense of Space/Place

When I began graduate school in the early 1990s the debate between David Harvey (1993) and Doreen Massey (1993) concerning space and place was reaching a crescendo. As a result this debate became an important part of what shaped my geographic perspectives. In many ways I think this is what has made Kfm so remarkable to me, and why it is a space/place I recognized as important to understand. As I got to know Kfm and the people most intimately connected to this space/place I began to realize that I was experiencing a manifestation of the very spaces/places that Harvey and Massey were debating so vigorously about. More specifically, I was experiencing a space/place that exemplified Massey’s arguments for place as simultaneously locally grounded, globally connected, and progressive.

At the same time I also began to recognize that Kfm was a space/place that had come closer to creating Lefebvrian differential space or, alternatively, Soja’s thridspace than any example I had read in the literature. Here was a space/place that really seemed to be accepting of difference and Otherness; that was able to create a gathering place for people that, although incredibly diverse in background, could still productively come together under the banner of music, art, and tea to create community. Kfm also represented a scale that truly incorporated everyday life experiences, so that it was possible to intricately access the way this space/place came into being, was experienced as dwelling, and was continuously performed into being. Moreover, Kfm’s ability to find progressive linkages to its local community as well as finding ways to access and “tap into” forces of globalization, and to do this in ways that kept it removed
from some of the more egregious “logics” of capitalism has never ceased to amaze and inspire me. For all these reasons I have found Kfm a worthwhile and important space/place to understand and attempt to relate to a wider audience.

My hope is that this chapter, and the two that preceded it, allowed the reader to comprehend how dynamic and fascinating a space/place Kfm really is. It is also my hope that these chapters demonstrated at the most intimate of empirical scales the efficacy of the indigenized space/place conceptual framework outlined in Chapter 2. Finally, this chapter was also intended to demonstrate ways in which Māori, particularly those that are living, working and creating within the context of whakamanatanga-based urbanisms, could be involved in the creation of a space/place that simultaneously honored their culture while allowing them to productively and progressively interact with the myriad forces that are flowing into Auckland as a result of globalization.
CHAPTER 9
SOME FINAL THOUGHTS ON MĀORI URBAN GEOGRAPHIES
OF WHAKAMANATANGA

9. Research as Transformative Experience

I would argue that the best qualitative research in human geography does not begin with a clear structure or outline, or with fully explicated theory and methodology, but rather that these develop through the process of the research itself. In many ways this runs counter to the research process as it is taught, yet this may come closer to what actually happens for many researchers. Allowing this process to unfold, and allowing yourself as researcher to develop and modify theory, methodology and structure creates a research context within which the researcher is far more open to the stories and activities and forces that he/she is attempting to understand and analyze. This openness is critical because it honors those individuals and groups involved in the research in that it allows them to critically influence the direction, content and spirit of the research being done with and about them. It is also important because it forces the researcher to remain deeply aware that it is never truly possible to objectively approach the study of human processes and phenomenon. Any claim to do this is an act of appropriation and artificial division that will not only seriously compromise the researcher’s conclusions, but also mark the researcher as positioning himself/herself in a superior position vis-à-vis the people and organizations that are the focus of the study.
This attitude towards research is particularly pertinent in the context of indigenous studies, because indigenous peoples have for so long been subject to research theories and methods generated out of colonialism and its legacy (Smith, 1999). From this perspective the act of a non-indigenous person proposing and undertaking research involving indigenous communities is one that must be approached with the utmost respect for, and honor of, the group he/she is focusing on. Moreover, any act of research by a non-indigenous person that engages in critique of, or criticism about, or even problem solving within indigenous communities is highly problematic from the outset. This will be the case unless this research is, at the very least, being done in partnership with an indigenous researcher from the group under study. While some might object to such a radical standpoint, my work with Māori in Aotearoa New Zealand justifies this stance in my mind without conflict.

I did not enter into this research with this mindset. My initial research focus was “inspired” by the movie *Once Were Warriors* (Tamahori, 1994)—a particularly brutal representation of the relationship between Māori and cities—and my intention was to focus on how the city negatively impacted Māori, and on ways in which Māori were resisting this impact in a contemporary context. However, reading Linda Tuhiwai Smith’s (1999) book *Decolonizing Methodologies* gave me a period of profound pause, and made me question at the most fundamental level my right to engage in research about the relationship between Māori and cities in Aotearoa New Zealand, particularly research that had a fairly negative focus, even if the outcome of the research was considered positive or useful in addressing the real or perceived negative aspects of the Māori urban condition.
Despite my doubts about my position as a non-Māori to engage in this research, I decided to venture down to Aotearoa New Zealand to explore possibilities for this type of research. From the moment I began to engage with Māori an awareness started to creep over me, slowly at first but more rapidly the second time I went there in 2007, that I did not really understand in the least bit the complexity of what the city means to Māori. More importantly, I began to realize that part of this lack of understanding stemmed from a gross misrepresentation of this relationship that I accrued from the movie Once Were Warriors. In fact, it became increasingly apparent to me that many of the Māori I met and spoke with were anything but oppressed or repressed by city life. That in fact Māori from a wide variety of backgrounds had turned the city into a positive and productive space/place for themselves and their families, and that they had done this in a way that reinforced their Māori identity rather than as an act of compromise or outright acculturation. Even more importantly, my coming to this awareness was a direct result of the knowledge I received from the Māori I had the privilege to speak with. My theory and methodology was modified as a result of this interaction.

As I attempted to find convergence between these new perspectives on the relationship between Māori and cities and Smith’s cautions to non-Māori such as myself about doing research involving the Māori community, I eventually came to a compromise. Since I knew the limited time I had in Aotearoa New Zealand would make it difficult to develop co-researcher relationships with individual Māori or with a Māori organization, I decided that the next best thing I could do was to focus on positive aspects of Māori society. At least, I concluded, if I could not do cooperative research, I could do research that honored and celebrated
Māori efforts to overcome and move beyond the constraints that the legacies of colonialism and the advent of Western forms of industrial capitalism put upon them.

Thus, my Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga thesis began to take shape. A combination of the desire to engage in positive research and the influence of the Māori I spoke with about their urban experiences. As a human geographer I was particularly interested in the role of space/place on individuals and groups, so it was an easy step to develop a theoretical framework that took the materiality of the city seriously when looking at ways Māori are making the city a positive, productive milieu where Māori identity and culture can flourish. But even having created this level of focus it is important to note that every step of the way I found my ideas honed and modified by the many Māori (and some non-Māori) I had the opportunity and privilege to speak with, interview formally, and participate with in ceremonies, social gatherings, and work. This dissertation is as much their work as it is mine.

9.1 Overview of dissertation

The end result of this process at this point is this dissertation. Eight chapters with the goal of showing how Māori are creating positive spaces/places for them selves in cities like Auckland, with an insistence from the outset that the material aspects of this process are absolutely essential to any analysis or comprehensive understanding of how Māori are actually going about doing this. In Chapter 1 the main goal was to develop a working idea of how Māori interpret empowerment, with the end product being the concepts
whakamanatanga and ka tau puawai. It became clear from my discussions with Māori that for whakamanatanga to be a useful working concept it had to incorporate both traditional meaning and more contemporary interpretations, but ultimately must always be filtered through a uniquely Māori way of approaching the idea of how people bring power into their lives. Clearly community, particularly in the form of whanau (whakapapa-based or constructed), is an essential aspect of this definition, as is the notion of meaningful participation in this community. The concept of mana was also shown to be essential to this concept, although the process of how mana is fostered, maintained and reproduced in the lives of individuals and groups was shown to have both traditional and contemporary interpretations. Ka tau puawai was added to this discussion, a concept gifted to me by a Māori artist who seemed to quickly grasp the spirit of my research, as a way to suggest that whakamanatanga-based Māori urbanisms, while not new, were entering into a new phase of profound becoming. That this was something that was happening now, in many different ways and by Māori from many different backgrounds.

In Chapter 2 I departed for a period from specifically talking about Māori and turned to the important process of building a conceptual framework for studying Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga. I argued that the development of space and place in geography had reached a critical moment whereby these two concepts have converged to such an extent as to merit developing a concept, written as space/place, that insisted on always treating these two concepts as mutually constituted and ever present in a context of simultaneity. It was also argued that a space/place framework was one that insisted on including the materiality of human existence within any ontological
framework. This conceptual framework was further developed by insisting that an indigenous perspective can and must add significantly to the way space/place is understood and applied, especially in the context of research involving indigenous issues.

In Chapters 3 and 4 this idea of whakamanatanga occurring in a moment of ka tau puawai was attached to the process of Māori urbanization, a process fraught with challenges, but also with opportunities. The notion of the city as a colonial space/place, one that, to a certain extent, was part and parcel of the colonial process was also explored. The fact that Māori were able to overcome this aspect of the city—as a space/place of colonial domination—is a testament to their strength and resilience. The result of this strength and resilience was the formation of Māori urbanisms—a process that is ongoing in contemporary Aotearoa New Zealand. While it was noted that these urbanisms are extremely diverse in nature I nonetheless attempted to construct a typology of Māori urbanisms as an analytic tool for studying the relationship between Māori and cities. It was further argued that within this typology of Māori urbanisms was an overlapping typology referred to as whakamanatanga-based Māori urbanisms—defined as Māori urban ways of life grounded in empowerment and positive cultural production that was in no way contradicted by the urban context.

Having developed a working definition of whakamanatanga-based Māori urbanisms, I was then able to turn to my empirical research. The veracity of this definition allowed me to feel confident that I had developed a framework from which to demonstrate in Chapter 5 how and where whakamanatanga-based Māori urban geographies were being lived and expressed in the context of everyday life in urban Aoteroa New Zealand. Chapter 5 was a far ranging
chapter whereby vignettes of whakamanatanga-based Māori urbanisms were illustrated both through my own observations and experiences and through the voices and stories of Māori manifesting and articulating these urbanisms. Ultimately, the goal of this chapter was to show how diverse processes of whakamanatanga-based urbanisms really are.

In Chapters 6 and 7 my focus settled onto one specific space/place in Auckland—Mana Moko-Te Karanga (Kfm). There were several goals embedded within these chapters. On the one hand, my intention was to demonstrate in some detail how a space/place that embodies many of the most important characteristics of Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga actually comes into being. On the other, my goal was to show how, once a space/place like Kfm is created, the people that are most intimately connected to this space/place actively foster, maintain and reproduce it through a mutually constitutive relationship with its materiality. In a sense, these two chapters are designed to show how historicality, sociality and materiality all interdependently act to form space/place, and once formed these three ontological aspects of existence continue to be produced through the people interacting with a particular space/place like Kfm.

In Chapter 8 Kfm remained the focus, but I moved away from an insular analysis of Kfm (i.e., how Kfm can be understood within the confines of its specific boundaries) to a more extroverted approach to understanding this organization. This perspective afforded me the opportunity to discuss how Kfm represents a space/place that is profoundly rooted in its local context while simultaneously being connected to other scales of space/place-ness, from its immediate neighborhood all the way out to the international. The goal of this
chapter was to show how Kfm represents a global/local nexus occurring at the scale of an individual organization and space/place, as well as to show ways in which Māori urbanisms play a critical role in this phenomenon. The concept Māori urban spaces/places of difference was introduced in this chapter as a way to encapsulate in one phrase the way in which the people at Kfm managed to create a space/place that embraces traditional Māori values and worldviews while simultaneously celebrating multiculturalism. It was shown that these two perspectives do not have to be contradictory, and in fact Kfm can function as a space/place of whakamanatanga for both Māori and others practicing everyday life there. Ultimately, it was concluded, Kfm serves as one possible model for fostering, maintaining and reproducing Māori values and worldviews in the urban context while simultaneously creating a context where these values and worldviews can productively and progressively interact and engage with Aotearoa New Zealand’s growing heterogeneous social context.

9.2 Why Do Whakamanatanga-Based Māori Urbanisms Matter?

While it is hoped that this dissertation has gone a long way towards answering this question, some final thoughts are still merited. I have noted throughout this document that my whakamanatanga-focused thesis in no way is meant to refute or minimize the socio-economic and socio-cultural issues facing many Māori living in cities. These problems do exist for many Māori (both urban, small town, and rural) and there is without a doubt the need for continued work to influence policies (both private and public) that will minimize and, eventually, eliminate these internecine problems. However, at the same
time it is my intention to refute and disrupt the discourse of the Māori urban problem. This discourse was not only apparent in much of the literature I researched, both Māori and non-Māori generated, but also in the popular media I perused while in Aotearoa New Zealand and, more significantly, in the stories and attitudes I came across when talking to Māori and others.

Thus, one of the central ideological goals of this dissertation, in its broadest sense, is to begin the process of developing a counter discourse centered on the positive Māori urban experience. Those of us involved in academic research that takes discourse analysis seriously must acknowledge the power of words (both spoken and written) and representations in the symbolic and material realm as a core assumption embedded in our work. Yet, it seems we spend so much of our time attempting to disrupt discourses of domination and unequal power relations that we neglect to acknowledge people and spaces/places where counter discourses are being produced and, more importantly, lived. And not as forms of resistance, but rather as genuine examples of new discourses forming that are alternative and productive rather than resistant and reactionary. This shift in focus stabs at the very heart of why I chose to undertake this research.

It has been argued throughout that whakamanaatanga-based Māori urbanisms are already being produced by Māori going about the business of making the city a productive space/place for them selves, for their families, and for groups and organizations they are associated with. These urbanisms are found in the growing number of Māori urban marae in Aotearoa New Zealand

---

202 Afterall, discourses must be lived in some concrete sense for them to have any real meaning.
cities, in the many Māori owned and operated businesses found throughout a city like Auckland, in the creative urban networks of Māori artists and in the work they are producing, in the burgeoning Māori studies programs and Māori schools, and in seemingly unlikely spaces/places like Kfm. And this must be acknowledged because it is from these examples that are already in existence that Māori can continue to think about how the city serves as a platform, across a spectrum of possible manifestations that only the city can afford, for whakamanatanga-based Māori urbanisms.

9.3 Why Do Geographies of Māori Urban Whakamanatanga Matter

One of the most fundamental arguments running throughout this dissertation is that space/place matters when considering any socio-cultural phenomenon. If the application of Henri Lefebvre’s (1991) theories to this research has taught me anything, it is that for whakamanatanga-based Māori urbanisms to continue to be successful they must command the body and space/place. Thus, whakamantanga-based Māori urbanisms must always take seriously the need to anchor these urbanisms in practices of everyday life and in material spaces/places. And this too is happening in cities like Auckland. Certainly the marae stands as one of, if not the most, profound example of how Māori can anchor a whakamanatanga-based identity in an urban material context. Personally, I will never cease to be “blown away” by the mana of these structures even when they are surrounded by concrete and steel, by underpasses and automobiles.
But the marae also has limitations. Its uses are fairly circumscribed within an overtly traditional Māori context (both socially and physically). As a result marae cannot contain within them the full potential expression of whakamanatanga-based Māori urbanisms outlined in this dissertation. A metaphor might be useful here. If Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga are thought of as a body, then marae are the heart: absolutely essential to the function of the body but meaningless without it. Everything else that makes up the body—flesh, muscle, bones and nerves—represent in this metaphor all of the myriad other possible ways that we can think about Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga manifesting in cities like Auckland. The core element running through all of these examples, and the many more that can come out of further research, is the interdependent relationship between material spaces/places and the fostering, maintaining and reproducing of whakamanatanga-based Māori urban ways of life.

9.3.1 Revisiting An Indigenized Space/Place Conceptual Framework

It is useful here, given the above discussion, to return once again to the indigenized space/place conceptual framework proposed in Chapter 2 and applied throughout this dissertation. It was argued in Chapter 2 that this framework was essential to any consideration of whakamanatanga-based Māori urbanisms. In the empirical chapters (five through eight) this framework was utilized as a means to better comprehending the relationship between Māori living urban ways of life and the material spaces/places occupied and/or created by these Māori. In essence this framework asserted that it is not
ontologically or epistemologically possible to disconnect the sociality of Māori urbanisms from their materiality; or, to put it another way, that any attempt to create this sort of disconnect is artificial and, more importantly, results in research that does not fully comprehend the critical role that space/place plays in fostering, maintaining and reproducing Māori urbanisms.

The construction of an indigenized space/place conceptual framework involved a closer look at the literature in geography and associated fields on the nature of space and place. Ultimately it was argued in Chapter 2 that contemporary research is demonstrating the interdependent relationship between these two concepts, and this has resulted in the discursive shift in this dissertation to discussing space/place rather than treating these two concepts separately. It was further argued that the application of a space/place framework to research involving indigenous peoples like Māori must acknowledge the inherently Western-dominated treatment of these concepts in the academic literature. As a corrective to this perceived problem it was argued that it is necessary to engage in a conversation between ways in which indigenous peoples conceive of space and place and the Western treatment of these concepts. My conclusion was that this engagement, at its most productive, results in an indigenized space/place conceptual framework where both indigenous perspectives on space and place and Western perspective influence one another and, ultimately, create a more sophisticated and progressive conception of these concepts.

One way to better understand this argument is to diagram it in a series of increasingly complex models. In the following pages a progression of models are proposed (Figure 45-48). The first two are designed to demonstrate the
artificially separate ways of understanding space and place from a Western perspective. The third model attempts to infuse contemporary notions of space and place resulting in a space/place framework. In the final model Māori conceptions of space and place are further incorporated suggesting the possibility of a Māori version of an indigenized space/place conceptual framework. While this framework was the model applied throughout this dissertation it is worth taking the time in this conclusion to reconsider the possibilities that this model presents for further research.

In Figure 45 (below) a basic model of place is presented. This model represents the different ways that place has been conceptualized in Western academia: place as being-in-the-world, place as socially constructed, and place as performativity (see Chapter 2 for more detailed discussions of these three approaches to place). The basic building block of this model is the two spheres that represent individual experience and structural forces as a framework for understanding the human condition. Place as being-in-the-world is placed within the individual experience sphere to represent the way this perspective emphasizes the subjective, phenomenological aspects of place. Place as socially constructed is placed within the structural forces sphere to represent the way in which this perspective emphasizes forces beyond that of individual experience that profoundly influence how places are created and perceived. Place as performativity straddles these two spheres as a way to represent
how this place perspective suggests the interdependency of agency and structure in the creation and perception of place. It is also, however, located slightly outside of these spheres as a way to represent how performativity is understood to occur, at least partially, at the level of pre-cognition. Identity is placed in the middle of this model to connote the impact of all the forces and place perspectives have on the construction of individual and group identity. The arrows are included to suggest that all the different conceptions of place are, in their most progressive treatments, understood as mutually constitutive aspects of the place-making process.
A second model is shown in Figure 46 to represent Lefebvrian notions of space (see Chapter 2). As was noted in Chapter 2, Lefebvre’s double layered trialectic is a complex theory of the social production of space. In the model presented here the overlapping spheres represent the two layers of this trialectic. The sphere on the left encompasses the lived-perceived-conceived trialectic representing the phenomenological moments embedded in socially produced space. The sphere to the right encompasses the second trialectic: representations of space, spaces of representation, and spatial practice. This second trialectic encompasses the role structural forces interdependently play in the production of space. Overlapping these are the three aspects of space—physical, social and mental—with arrows depicting the synergistic nature of these aspects of space.
Straddling both spheres is the Lefebvrian notion of practices of everyday life. The placement of this last element of Lefebvrian socio-spatial theory is critical because it reflects his assertion that both of his trialectics and all three aspects of space are influencing everyday life while everyday life is simultaneously reproducing space.

Figure 47: The Space/Place Conceptual Framework in its fullest expression.

The space/place conceptual framework applied in this dissertation begins as a fusion of the place model and Lefebvrian model (see Figure 47). The goal here is to show through this fusion the parts of each that relate and connect, and in doing so demonstrate that space and place are so deeply intertwined ontologically that they must at all times be treated as fundamentally interconnected parts of a single concept. It should be noted that in this
framework both Lefebvrian and place-based concepts have been modified to reflect a space/place thesis. Lefebvre’s phenomenological moments (lived-perceived-conceived) are closely aligned with phenomenological approaches to place (place as being-in-the-world) and reside solidly within the sphere of individual experience. Likewise the sphere of structural forces is aligned with Lefebvre’s structural trialectic. *Place as performativity* still straddles and sits slightly outside of the two spheres. Importantly, *identity* and *practices of everyday life* cross each other reflecting the profound relationship between practice and identity.

![Diagram](image)

**Figure 48:** A first attempt at modeling a Māori-imbued space/place conceptual framework.
A final model is necessary, however, in order to fully represent an *indigenized* space/place conceptual framework. This final model is the most important because it is the one that attempts to find a meeting point between, in this case, Māori understandings of space and place and the space/place conceptual framework proposed in this dissertation. I make no claim here that this model is definitive or without fault. Quite the contrary, and in fact this is not the point. This model is intended more to suggest the potential of this type of linkage. I leave it up to further research in further collaboration with Māori cultural experts to fully explore the potential of this fusion. Thus, this model is a first attempt to visually depict an indigenized space/place conceptual framework building upon the space/place model shown above.

In this final model (Figure 48 above) a fully conceptualized indigenized space/place framework is represented. As with all models of this type it makes more sense to focus on the perspectives and worldviews of one particular indigenous group than it does to propose a universal indigenous worldview. In this sense, then, it is more appropriate to refer to this particular example of an indigenized space/place model as a *Māori-imbued space/place conceptual framework*. All of the elements described in the previous space/place conceptual framework model are still in play in this model, the difference being the addition of key Māori concepts (highlighted in red) that relate to space and place. The most radical difference that occurs when a Māori worldview is included is the insistence on a spiritual aspect infusing and interacting with all other aspects of existence. At the top of this model, in recognition of this spiritual component, is *ATUA*. This Māori concept refers to ancestors with influence over major
domains such as earth, forest, ocean, etc.; Māori whakapapa (genealogies) generally trace back to a particular atua. From a Christianized Māori perspective this concept is often translated alternatively as God. Either way the point is to acknowledge in this model forces in the spiritual world that infuse and interact with all aspects of the material world.\textsuperscript{203}

Located just below \textit{ATUA} is \textit{Taha Wairua}, one of the most powerful Māori concepts that I have come across during my research. I was once told by Rau Hoskins (the Māori architect highlighted at the end of Chapter 5) that if I wanted to include wairua in my research I had better be sure I did “my homework” extremely well. Taking this to heart I only include it here to represent its importance, but make no claims to full understanding, knowledge and/or expertise of this complex Māori concept. However, I can say that this concept came up often in my conversations with Māori, so much so as to make it clear to me that it has deep cultural importance, even for those Māori who do not have deep cultural knowledge and/or strong traditional Māori connections. As wairua is being used in this model its main meaning is “soul” or “spirit”. From a Māori cultural perspective all humans have wairua as an essential component of their ontological being, as do all things. This is a critically important point because, as noted previously, from a Māori perspective, it makes no sense to discuss issues of space/place without acknowledging and honoring the spiritual component implicit within the material and experiential aspects of these concepts. In this sense all of the case studies included in this dissertation, from

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{203} All of the definitions of Māori concepts given in order to explain this model are derived from my conversations with various Māori cultural experts (e.g., Dr. Rapata Wiri, Dr. Merata Kawharu), as well as from various Māori dictionaries (Williams, 2002; Ngata, 1996; Ryan, 1994; Tauroa, 1990) and books about Māori culture (e.g., Metge 1964, 1976 and 1995).
\end{footnotesize}
the marae to Kfm, are infused with wairua and cannot be considered outside of this framework. The vertical arrow located directly below *Taha Wairua* is meant to represent the inherent and ineffable linkage between the spiritual and material worlds.

Three other Māori concepts—*Tapu, Noa* and *Mana*—are also included in this model. *Tapu/Noa* (sacred/profane), two concepts that are central to a Māori worldview and to everyday life for Māori, are located within the material realm (i.e., inside the box), but the arrows connote the way in which these concepts are understood as inherently about connecting the spiritual and material realms; the horizontal arrow is meant to show the dualistic nature of these concepts, and the single diagonal arrow is designed to show that *Tapu* connects people and things in the material world to the spiritual realm, while *Noa* represents things in the material world that lack a deep spiritual connection. Within a Māori worldview all things are either tapu or noa and thus these two concepts are located outside of the two spheres to suggest that they are infused in all aspects of the material world. *Mana*, another central Māori concept, is located at the bottom of the model, but note that it is located on the border between the spiritual and material realms. This has been done strategically to suggest the way in which mana infuses all aspects of the material world, but that it is also simultaneously connected to the spiritual world. In other words, mana “swims” in the same “sea” as *tapu* in this model to suggest the profound linkage between these two concepts.

*Ira Tangata*, located in the *Individual Experience* sphere, is the Māori concept that comes closest to conceptions of the physical body in Western philosophies. But more than just the physical body, this concept suggests the “life principle”
that can be passed on from one person to another through the act of procreation (Mead, 2003).204 The location of Ira Tangata also links it to the phenomenological approaches to place (Place as being-in-the-world) and Place as performativity as well as to Levebvre’s lived/perceived/conceived trialectic. The importance of the physical body, of corporeal action in space/place was a dominant theme throughout this research. Whether it was Lyonell Grant’s physical carving of the Unitec marae, Melanie Wall’s assertion that Māori space/place is created wherever her and her Polynesian friends socially interact, or through the interaction of Māori and non-Māori in Tāraihiti’s C Company exhibit or Brett Graham and Rachel Rapeka’s Aniwaniwa exhibit, the bodily presence of Māori as individuals and as part of groups is essential to the production of Māori space/place.

A related Māori concept that further reinforces this idea is ahi kā.205 Translated as “burning fires of occupation” this concept was one that several Māori referenced during our conversations. The traditional meaning relates to the role of physical occupation of territory by Māori groups in order to establish and maintain the cultural and spiritual “right” to claim that territory. In more casual usage the Māori I spoke with would use it when speaking about ways in which they maintained connections to marae, to hapū and to organizations. Regardless which of these was being referenced, however, the meaning was always that one had to physically interact with a space/place to claim legitimate connections. Thus, one’s Ira Tangata, one’s physical body, becomes a critical instrument for both cultural and geographic connection.

204 Hirini Moko Mead argues that in modern parlance this life principle is akin to Western scientific notions of genes (2003: 42).
205 Auckland University of Technology online Māori-to-English dictionary.
Tūrangawaewae and Whakapapa are located in this model on the Structural Forces side. While, on the one hand, these concepts are profoundly connected to individual Māori identities, on the other, they are connected to forces that stretch well beyond any one individual and connect them to various scales (in terms of both space/place and time) of physical geography and group identity. Tūrangawaewae, a concept that has been invoked often in this dissertation, connects Māori as individuals and groups to defined physical geographies, and this tie is at least partially understood and defined through Whakapapa. Again, while many of the Māori I spoke with throughout this research no longer had deep knowledge of their whakapapa and/or tūrangawaewae, they nonetheless often used these concepts to refer to connections they felt with urban spaces/places and with groups and organizations. In this sense, then, whether one is speaking in terms of more traditional Māori world views held by Māori still profoundly connected through knowledge and interaction with whanau, hapū and iwi, or those held by Māori that have lost these connections, connection to groups and spaces/places are still important.

Finally, the Māori concept Tuakiri is included as an alternative to the English concept “identity”. Translated into English as “personality” or “identity”, Tuakiri is placed in the middle of the two spheres to connote the way in which all of the forces and process within these spheres, within the rectangle and within the spiritual realm coalesce to forge an individual’s sense of self. Just below the placement of Tuakiri is the Māori concept Pūmanawha, which is translated into English as the “natural” talents or “intuitive cleverness” that are
passed on to an individual through their genes or Ira Tangata.\textsuperscript{206} Pūmanawa is placed alongside Place as Performativity as a way to suggest the connection between pre-cognitive action and a person’s innate talents. Ultimately, one’s Tuakiri, based on this model, is a complex combination of corporeal action and ability, connections to geographies and groups, and connections between the material and spiritual aspects of existence.

As previously noted this Māori-imbued space/place conceptual framework model is in no way presented here as definitive. Rather, the point of this exercise is to demonstrate the potential ways in which we can begin to think through what it means to suggest a fusion of Western and indigenous ways of conceiving space/place. Many questions emerge from this endeavor: why is it that place has resonated so much more with indigenous studies than has space? How can researchers apply Lefebvrian socio-spatial theory beyond a critique of capitalism? And how can place be inserted into a Lefebvrian theoretical framework? How effectively does a space/place conceptual framework address the false divide between conceptions of space and place, and does the development of this framework allow for a better convergence with indigenous worldviews? What impact can the application of indigenous ways of understanding space/place have on Western notions of these concepts? Ultimately, as I have argued throughout this dissertation, both Western and indigenous notions of space/place are a critical part of understanding this concept but, more importantly, it is through the fusion of these ways of understanding that the most powerful understandings of space/place emerge.

\textsuperscript{206} Auckland University of Technology online Māori-to-English dictionary. See also Meade (2003: 44).
Moreover, it is imperative that any application of space/place concepts to indigenous studies take seriously indigenous understandings of these concepts rather than bringing Western concepts to bear, willy-nilly if you will, into these studies.

9.5 Some Thoughts On Further Research

This dissertation only begins the process of understanding what it means to argue from a Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga perspective. While I think it is a good beginning, like all good research, it suggests possibilities for further research that dwarf in scope this initial foray into this topic. In the first place, the indigenized space/place conceptual framework is one that remains a work in progress. I think geographers, and others, have done a good job of developing a theoretically sophisticated framework showing how these space and place are mutually constituted, but research that applies this type of framework to empirical studies in a way that rigorously insists on this connection being maintained are still too few. In particular, the ability to find a meaningful and workable connection between Lefebvrian socio-spatial theory and contemporary theories of place still needs a great deal of thought and work. It could have been done better in this research, but the potential is, I argue, vast in terms of showing how space/place are implicated ontologically in human geographies.

Furthermore, and very importantly, the conversation between indigenous ways of understanding space and place and Western notions of these concepts must continue. Specifically, there is fantastic potential to more specifically
attempt to link Lefebvrian theory to indigenous knowledge. As I argued, the potential for indigenous knowledge to take Lefebvrian theory to new levels of theoretical potential are vast. More broadly, this involves developing not only an indigenized Lefebvrian theory but also, concomitantly, a humanistic Lefebvrian theory. Where is, for example, the meeting point of dwelling and Lefebvrian conceived social production of space? This work was only begun in this dissertation, but is a research focus that should be continued in future research.

The development of a working typology of Māori urbanisms also is in its nascent form in this dissertation. It is a subject that needs to continue to be developed, but I think it is up to Māori to add the necessary “meat” to the bones of this approach as it has been presented here. Typologies are inherently problematic because of their easy tendency to be essentialized. This was not the intention in this research and should be staunchly guarded against in future research. They serve as useful analytic tool, but must always be treated as easily tossed aside if they ever limit or constrain our understanding of how Māori have gone about the business of constructing progressive Māori urban ways of life.

Along these same lines of reasoning, the city must also be taken seriously as a key element of understanding contemporary Māori life, but should never be conceived deterministically; cities expand some opportunities and limit others, but agency is always at play with the structure of the city. To take seriously the precepts of the indigenized space/place conceptual framework is to argue that cities have created unique spaces/places that offer both challenges and opportunities for those attempting to establish urban ways of life. For Māori, the legacy of colonialism has made this a more nuanced and, in some cases, more difficult challenge. But Māori have demonstrated time and again that they are an
incredibly strong and resilient people who, as has been shown throughout this dissertation, are already finding ways to make the city a positive and productive space/place to further Māori cultural values and worldviews.

Finally, the potential for research focusing on Māori urban geographies of whakamanatanga is, I argue, tremendous. One of my greatest hopes is that this research stimulates other researchers, particularly Māori scholars, to look at the relationship between Māori and cities from a new perspective and, in so doing, conceive and discover myriad other ways that whakamanatanga-based Māori urbanisms are manifesting in Aotearoa New Zealand cities. This type of research is already being done in the context of other indigenous peoples, so there is also the potential for a continuing network of indigenous urban-focused scholarship that Māori can productively contribute to. Whakamanatanga-based urbanisms are happening among indigenous peoples in many other spaces/places and the Māori experiences can both be better understood through comparative studies and significantly contribute to them. Māori tend to be leaders in the indigenous world, and I think in the context of urban-based indigenous research they will continue this trend. City life will continue to play a prominent role in Māori society, and as such research focusing on whakamanatanga-based Māori urbanisms must continue in order to not only better understand how Māori are progressively engaging the urban experience, but also to foster the positive aspects of this experience. It is time for the old dominant discourse of the “Māori urban problem” to be replaced by a new discourse of “Māori urban possibilities and opportunities.”
Glossary of Māori Terms

(Unless otherwise noted, all definitions come directly from the Auckland University of Technology online dictionary: Te Whanake—http://www.maoridictionary.co.nz/index.cfm)

Ariki: (noun) paramount chief, high chief, chieftain, lord, leader, aristocrat, firstborn in a high ranking family - qualities of a leader is a concern for the integrity and prosperity of the people, the land, the language and other cultural treasures (e.g. oratory and song poetry), and an aggressive and sustained response to outside forces that may threaten these.

Aroha: 1. (verb) (-tia,-ina) to love, feel pity, feel concern for, feel compassion, empathise. 2. (noun) affection, sympathy, charity, compassion, love, empathy.

Atua: 1. (noun) ancestor with continuing influence, god, demon, supernatural being, deity, ghost, object of superstitious regard, strange being - although often translated as 'god' and used for the Christian God, this is a misconception of the real meaning. Many Māori trace their ancestry from atua in their whakapapa and they are regarded as ancestors with influence over particular domains. These atua also were a way of rationalising and perceiving the world. 2. (noun) God.

Haka: 1. (verb) (-a,-hia,-tia,-ina) to dance, perform the haka, perform. 2. (noun) performance of the haka, posture dance - vigorous dances with actions and rhythmically shouted words. A general term for several types of such dances.

Hapū: 1. (stative) be pregnant, conceived in the womb. 2. (noun) kinship group, clan, tribe, subtribe - section of a large kinship group. (This second meaning is the one intended throughout this dissertation).

Hoani Waitit marae: A pan-tribal marae located in West Auckland.

Hui: 1. (verb) (-a) to gather, congregate, assemble, meet. 2. (noun) gathering, meeting, assembly, seminar, conference.

Ira Tangata: (noun) human genes, human element, mortals.

Iwi: 1. (noun) extended kinship group, tribe, nation, people, nationality, race - often refers to a large group of people descended from a common ancestor. 2. (noun) strength, bone.
Kapa haka: (noun) concert party, haka group, Māori cultural group, Māori performing group.

Kaumatua: 1. (verb) (-tia) to grow old, grow up. 2. (noun) adult, elder, elderly man, elderly woman, old man. 3. (adjective) be elderly, old, aged.

Kōhanga reo: (noun) Māori language preschool.

Mana: 1. (noun) prestige, authority, control, power, influence, status, spiritual power, charisma - mana is a supernatural force in a person, place or object. Mana goes hand in hand with tapu, one affecting the other. The more prestigious the event, person or object, the more it is surrounded by tapu and mana. Mana is the enduring, indestructible power of the atua and is inherited at birth, the more senior the descent, the greater the mana. The authority of mana and tapu is inherited and delegated through the senior line from the atua as their human agent to act on revealed will. Since authority is a spiritual gift delegated by the atua, man remains the agent, never the source of mana. This divine choice is confirmed by the elders, initiated by the tohunga under traditional consecratory rites (tohi). Mana gives a person the authority to lead, organise and regulate communal expeditions and activities, to make decisions regarding social and political matters. A person or tribe’s mana can increase from successful ventures or decrease through the lack of success. The tribe give mana to their chief and empower him/her and in turn the mana of an ariki or rangatira spreads to his/her people and their land. Almost every activity has a link with the maintenance and enhancement of mana and tapu. Animate and inanimate objects can also have mana as they also derive from the atua and because of their own association with people imbued with mana or because they are used in significant events. 2. (stative) be legal, effectual, binding, authoritative, valid. 3. (verb) to be effectual, take effect. 4. (noun) jurisdiction, mandate, freedom.

Manaaki: 1. (verb) (-tia) to support, take care of, give hospitality to, protect, look out for. 2. (noun) support, hospitality.

Manuhiri: (noun) visitor, guest.

Māori: 1. (stative) be native, indigenous, normal, usual, natural, common, fresh (of water), belonging to Aotearoa/New Zealand, freely, without restraint, without ceremony, clear, intelligible. 2. (noun) aboriginal inhabitant, indigenous person, native.

Māoritanga: (noun) Māori culture, practices and beliefs.

Miro: 1. (verb) (-a,-hia,-ia,-tia) to spin, twist, twirl. 2. (noun) thread, twisted cord, cotton. (Used in this dissertation as a metaphor to describe a common element—cultural, spiritual—that marks Māori, individually and in groups, as distinct from other people in Aotearoa New Zealand).
Ngā Puhi: (personal noun) tribal group of much of Northland (North Island).

Ngāti Pikiao: (personal noun) tribal group located on the Bay of Plenty (North Island) near Rotorua.

Ngāti Tuwharetoa: (personal noun) tribal group located on the North Island around Lake Taupo.

Ngāti Whātua o Ōrākei: (personal noun) tribal group who’s territory corresponds with large sections of Auckland.

Pā: 1. (verb) (-ia) to block up, obstruct, dam, close off an open space. 2. (noun) fortified village, fort, stockade, screen, blockade, city (especially a fortified one). 3. (noun) inhabitants of a fortified place. 4. (noun) weir to trap eels.

Pākehā: 1. (noun) New Zealander of European descent. 2. (noun) exotic - introduced from or originating in a foreign country.

Rangatira: 1. (stative) be rich, well off, noble, esteemed, revered. 2. (noun) chief (male or female), chieftain, chieftainess, master, mistress, boss, supervisor, employer, landlord, owner, proprietor - qualities of a leader is a concern for the integrity and prosperity of the people, the land, the language and other cultural treasures (e.g. oratory and song poetry), and an aggressive and sustained response to outside forces that may threaten these.

Rangatiratanga: (noun) sovereignty, chieftainship, right to exercise authority, chiefly autonomy, self-determination, self-management, ownership, leadership of a social group, domain of the rangatira, noble birth.

Moko: (noun) Māori tattooing designs on the face or body.

Tāmaki Makaurau: (location) Auckland Isthmus, Auckland. (Often translated as “land of a thousand lovers;” this is a metaphor for how desirable this area of the North Island was to Māori because of its plethora of natural resources and defensible sites).

Tapu: 1. (stative) be sacred, prohibited, restricted, set apart, forbidden, under atua protection. 2. (noun) restriction - a supernatural condition. A person, place or thing is dedicated to an atua and is thus removed from the sphere of the profane and put into the sphere of the sacred. It is untouchable, no longer to be put to common use. Tapu was used as a way to control how people behaved towards each other and the environment, placing restrictions upon society to ensure that society flourished. Making an object tapu was achieved through rangatira or tohunga acting as channels for the atua in applying the tapu. Members of a community would not violate the tapu for fear of sickness or catastrophe as a result of the anger of the atua. Intrinsic, or primary, tapu are those things which are tapu in
themselves. The extensions of tapu are the restrictions resulting from contact with something that is intrinsically tapu. This can be removed with water, or food and karakia. A person is imbued with mana and tapu by reason of his or her birth. High-ranking families whose genealogy could be traced through the senior line from the atua were thought to be under their special care. It was a priority for those of ariki descent to maintain mana and tapu and to keep the strength of the mana and tapu associated with the atua as pure as possible. People are tapu and it is each person’s responsibility to preserve their own tapu and respect the tapu of others and of places. Under certain situations people become more tapu, including women giving birth, warriors travelling to battle, men carving (and their materials) and people when they die. Because resources from the environment originate from one of the atua, they need to be appeased with karakia before and after harvesting. When tapu is removed, things become noa, the process being called whakanoa. Interestingly, tapu can be used as a noun or verb and as a noun is sometimes used in the plural. Noa, on the other hand, can not be used as a noun.

**Tautoko:** 1. *(verb)* (-tia,-na,-ngia) to support, prop up, verify, advocate, accept (an invitation), agree. 2. *(stative)* be agreed - also used as an exclamation to show agreement. 3. *(noun)* support, backing.

**Te Arawa:** a region of the North Island around the city of Rotorua that contains many sub-iwi. These sub-iwi all can trace their genealogy back to a single Te Arawa waka (canoe). Throughout my discussions with Māori and non-Māori in Aotearoa New Zealand Te Arawa was often referred to in ways that suggested a collective identity.

**Tika:** 1. *(stative)* be correct, straight, true, direct, keep on a direct course, upright, right, just, fair, accurate, appropriate, lawful, proper. 2. *(stative)* correctly, directly, fairly, justly. 3. *(noun)* truth, correctness, directness, justice, fairness, righteousness. (The third of these definitions is the one used in this dissertation).

**Tikanga:** 1. *(noun)* correct procedure, custom, habit, lore, method, manner, rule, way, code, meaning, plan, practice, convention. 2. *(noun)* correct, right. 3. *(noun)* reason, purpose, motive.

**Tohunga:** 1. *(stative)* be expert, proficient, adept. 2. *(noun)* skilled person, chosen expert, priest - a person chosen by the agent of an atua and the tribe as a leader in a particular field because of signs indicating talent for a particular vocation. Those who functioned as priests were known as tohunga ahurewa. They mediated between the atua and the tribe, gave advice about economic activities, were experts in propitiating the atua with karakia and were experts in sacred lore, traditions and genealogies of the tribe. Tohunga mākutu, or tohunga whaiwhai, specialised in the occult and casting evil spells. Those chosen to specialise in carving were
tohunga whakairo, in tattooing were tohunga tā moko, etc. Tohunga were trained in a traditional whare wānanga or by another tohunga.

Tūhoe: (noun) tribal group of the Bay of Plenty, including the Kutarere-Ruātoki-Waimana-Waikaremoana area.

Utu: 1. (verb) (-ngia,-a) to repay, pay, make a response, avenge, reply. 2. (noun) revenge, cost, price, wage, fee, payment, salary, reciprocity - an important concept concerned with the maintenance of balance and harmony in relationships between individuals and groups and order within Māori society, whether through gift exchange or as a result of hostilities between groups. It is closely linked to mana and includes reciprocation of kind deeds as well as revenge. While particular actions required a response, it was not necessary to apply utu immediately. The general principles that underlie utu are the obligations that exist between individuals and groups. If social relations are disturbed, utu is a means of restoring balance. Gift exchange, a major component of utu, created reciprocal obligations on the parties involved and established permanent and personal relationships. Traditionally utu between individuals and groups tended to escalate. Just as feasts were likely to increase in grandeur as an exchange relationship developed over time, so could reciprocal acts of vengeance intensify. Utu was not necessarily applied to the author of the affront, but affected the whole group. Thus utu could be gained through a victory over a group where only the most tenuous of links connected the source of the affront with the target of the utu. Any deleterious external influence could weaken the psychological state of the individual or group, but utu could reassert control over the influences and restore self-esteem and social standing. Suicide could even reassert control by demonstrating that one had control over one’s fate, and was a way of gaining utu against a spouse or relative where direct retaliation was not possible. Such indirect utu often featured within kin groups.

Wairua: (noun) spirit, soul, quintessence - spirit of a person which exists beyond death. To some, the wairua resides in the heart or mind of someone while others believe it is part of the whole person and is not located at any particular part of the body. The wairua begins its existence when the eyes form in the foetus and is immortal. While alive a person’s wairua can be affected by mākutu through karakia. Tohunga can damage wairua and also protect the wairua against harm. The wairua of a miscarriage or abortion can become a type of guardian for the family or may be used by tohunga for less beneficial purposes. Some believe that all animate and inanimate things have a whakapapa and a wairua. Some believe that atua Māori, or Io-matua-kore, can instill wairua into something. Tohunga, the agents of the atua, are able to activate or instil a wairua into something, such as a new wharenui, through karakia. During life, the wairua may leave the body for brief periods during dreams. The wairua has the power to warn the individual of impending danger through visions and dreams. On death the wairua becomes tapu. It is believed to remain with or near
the body and speeches are addressed to the person and the wairua of that person encouraging it on its way to Te Pō. Eventually the wairua departs to join other wairua in Te Pō, the world of the departed spirits, or to Hawaiki, the ancestral homeland. The spirit travels to Te Reinga where it descends to Te Pō. Wairua of the dead that linger on earth are called kēhua. During kawe mate, or hari mate, hura kōhatu and other important occasions the wairua is summoned to return to the marae.

Waka: 1. (noun) canoe, vehicle, conveyance, spirit medium, medium (of an atua), long narrow receptacle, box (for feathers), water trough. 2. (noun) allied kinship groups descended from the crew of a canoe which migrated to New Zealand.

Wero: 1. (verb) (ngia,-hia) to pierce, spear, challenge, stab, poke, jab, bite, puncture, sting (of an insect), inject. 2. (noun) piercing, stabbing, injection, spine (of a stingray). 3. (noun) challenge at a pōhiri.

Whakamana: 1. (verb) (-a,-hia,-ia,-ngia,-tia) to give authority to, give effect to, give prestige to, confirm, enable, authorise, legitimise, empower. 2. (noun) warrant.

Whakamanatanga: this word was created for this dissertation as a Māori translation of the English word, empowerment. See Chapter 1 for a full explanation of this concept.

Whakatauaki: 1. (verb) (-tia) to utter a proverb. 2. (noun) proverb, saying, aphorism - particularly those urging a type of behaviour.

Whakapapa: 1. (verb) (-hia,-tia) to lie flat, lay flat, recite in proper order (e.g. genealogies, legends, months), recite genealogies. 2. (noun) genealogy, genealogical table, lineage, descent.

Whakatika: 1. (verb) (-ia,-ina,-ngia,-ria,-hia) to straighten, set out, stand up, arise, correct, edit, solve, fix, rectify, prepare, amend. 2. (noun) solution, correction, preparation. 3. (verb) (-hia,-ia,-ina,-ngia,-ria) to rise up, set out (on a journey).

Whānau: 1. (verb) (-a) to be born, give birth. 2. (noun) extended family, family group, a familiar term of address to a number of people - in the modern context the term is sometimes used to include friends who may not have any kinship ties to other members.

Whare nui: (noun) meeting house, large house - main building of a marae where guests are accommodated, Traditionally the wharenui belonged to a hapū or whānau but modern meeting houses have been built for non-tribal groups, including schools and tertiary institutions. Many are decorated with carvings, rafter paintings and tukutuku panels.
Whare rūnanga: (noun) meeting house. (Runanga means “to discuss in an assembly”).

Whare whakairo: (noun) carved house, meeting house. (Whakairo means “to carve”, “be carved”, “carving”).
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