

Co-existing Indigenous and Settler Worlds: Ontological Styles and Possibilities¹

AVRIL BELL

Abstract

Settler colonialism involves processes of destruction and substitution aiming to replace indigenous with European/western worlds. But indigenous worlds persist in numerous spaces, moments and interactions where distinct ontologies and ways of being-in-the-world prevail. In Aotearoa New Zealand these spaces of the Māori world persist most obviously on marae. Māori and western worlds also briefly come together in public contexts where Māori protocols are used to mark openings of various sorts, temporarily governing public space and sociability. In this paper, I explore a different case where, I argue, Māori and western worlds are entangled or knotted together in the carved pou in the atrium space of a new community building in Kaitaia.

The old woman stopped short of the sliding glass doors, pausing to examine the strong profile of a Māori warrior. I saw her lips move, a greeting perhaps ...

The doors parted and she entered the atrium. Her gaze travelled upwards to the migratory birds suspended from the ceiling, drifting back down to the ancient stingray illustrated on the floor. Again, her lips moved, slightly, slowly ...

She walked towards the carved pou at her right and stopped short, admiring, acknowledging. She moved forward and raised her right hand, placing it gently at the side of the carving, standing silently for a short time before moving on to the next pou. In the same manner she repeated her greeting at each carving, until the final pou stood before her ...

A deep sigh left the old lady and she straightened. Something appeared to shift; she nodded, and an almost palpable energy emerged between them. She seemed united with this pou in a way somehow different from the others, her incantation increasingly audible. After a time she approached the pou, engaging the grand carving in a hongi, pressing her nose against it/him and sharing her breath with that of her ancestors, those who had walked this ground for centuries before her.

Later I had the pleasure of speaking with her. She was raised in the area, but had moved away and lived elsewhere. She had returned to visit her son and his family, and wished to return permanently to her home community and the land of her ancestors. The old lady had been told of Te Ahu by friends, and made a special journey that day to see for herself, and to share what she found with her grandchildren. The pou reminded her of the stories of her own grandparents, the stories of the beginnings of her own people. Was it by chance, or by design, that the last pou she greeted was that of her own people? I still wonder. She said she knew as she stood before that pou that the spirit of her people was finally before her, for in this pou, she could hear her ancestors' voices when she had not heard them in the others.²

Michael and I were carrying out a visitors' survey in the atrium space of Te Ahu, a new community complex in the small, rural town of Kaitaia in the Far North of New Zealand.³ The pou (carved poles) stand in a circle around the edge of the atrium, which acts as the main entranceway to the complex. At their most obvious, these pou are material-semiotic objects, representing the identities and belonging of the seven peoples of the community – five Māori tribes, Pākehā (British settlers who arrived 180 years ago) and Dalmatians (descendants of migrants from Croatia over 100 years ago). On their surfaces are carved images of ancestral figures (human and non-human), key historical events and representations of scenes of labour, harvest and community life. The pou represent something of the genealogy of each of the seven peoples, the story of their becoming, their relationships with each other and their relationship to this place.⁴

Within Māori tradition, carved pou can serve a number of purposes.⁵ Pou paenga, pou rahui or pou whenua, for example, mark territorial boundaries and sites, while pou pou of various sorts are located within, on and around Māori meeting houses. As well as representing ancestral figures (human and non-human), such pou can represent a range of “others” with whom the people of the marae have a relationship. The pou within Te Ahu follow longstanding traditions within Māori art practice of marking relations between iwi, and between iwi and Pākehā.⁶ Since early colonial contact, Māori art practice has continually innovated to incorporate the new people, things, ideas and politics of the times. From at least the mid-nineteenth century, for example, whareniui have included pou and artwork representing diverse iwi, in situations where a message of political unity was required.⁷ And from early colonial contact, Pākehā figures have appeared in Māori art and carving.⁸ In these cases, pou and other artforms acknowledge the historical and contemporary connections between peoples, creating inclusive spaces in which dialogue – and contestation – can take place. The seven pou in Te Ahu continue in this line of tradition, representing the relationship of multiple peoples to each other and to the region.⁹ While the site may traditionally be Te Rarawa land, standing together within this public building they represent the relationship of each of the seven peoples to the broader territory of the Muriwhenua region, the town, Kaitaia, and the surrounding area.¹⁰

The vast majority of members of this community will be able to identify with one or more of these pou as representing their ancestors, their people, their relationship to this place. As a Pākehā descendant of the community, I experience the Pākehā pou in my hometown as a powerful affirmation *from Māori* of my identity and claim to this place as my home – while also acknowledging that this inclusion is not necessarily a sign of harmonious, “settled” relationships between our peoples. And in ways that are both similar and distinct, for the Māori members of the community also, the pou powerfully affirm who they are and their claim of belonging to this area. In fact, representing the identities and belonging of the five Māori tribes within the community was a particularly important aim for the building's developers.

The conceptualization and building of Te Ahu was the work of a volunteer-run community trust, The Te Ahu Charitable Trust, and a crucial aim for the trust was to create a public building that gave Māori of the community, in particular, a sense of belonging and right, to encourage greater use, by Māori, of the community's cultural resources – especially the library and museum. Within a context in which settler colonialism has, over the last 175 years, sought to push te ao Māori, the Māori world, to the margins of New Zealand society, and in a community in which Māori are the poorest and overrepresented in myriad negative statistics, the vision of the trust was to contribute to turning this around, to instil pride, belonging and a sense of ownership of the community and its resources.¹¹ In this respect also, located not on a marae but in a public building, these pou contribute to the reversal of the historical marginalisation of te ao Māori in this community. They enact and facilitate a reclaiming of public space by Māori in Kaitaia.



Details of six Te Ahu pou currently in place (from top left):
Te Rarawa, Te Aupouri, Ngāti Kuri, Ngāi Takoto, Pākehā, Dalmatian.
Photos by Bell and Jeff Rowe.

The evidence suggests that the building's designers have been successful in their aim to create a place that signifies their rights and belonging to the Māori sectors of the community. Library memberships and usage in particular rose markedly with the opening of Te Ahu.¹² The atrium space and the circle of pou have played no small part in this success. During our week surveying visitors it was clear that the beauty and cathedral-like qualities of the vaulted atrium space and the carved pou were crucial contributors to the pleasure of visitors, both locals and tourists. The pou within Te Ahu signify that the five local Māori tribes are at the heart of this community.¹³

But the atrium space and pou do more than merely signify the identities of the seven people of the north. Māori and western worlds are entangled or knotted together in the atrium space at Te Ahu. In what follows, with reference to work on indigenous ontologies, new materialism and Lévinasian ethics, I follow various threads of how the seven pou do more than simply mark the identity and belonging of each of these peoples, but entangle Māori and western worlds. The pou enact a reclamation of public space for Māori, long marginalized within the community. More profoundly, they bring a Māori ontology into the building, an ontology with its own space-time relationality evident when Māori address the ancestors carved on the pou. Finally, the co-existence of Māori and western ontologies is an invitation to the non-Māori community to consider their own relationship to the Māori world.

The Presence of Māori Ontologies

Considered as material-semiotic objects, the pou have contributed to a recentring of the Māori community of Muriwhenua and mark the identities and belonging of all “seven people of the north.” However, the encounter between kuia and pou points to the way in which the pou do more than “represent” the identities of local tribes. The pou are not just carvings, the ancestors are not just “represented” in the grain of the wood. Rather, the presence of ancestors continues to be felt and experienced through them. Alison Jones and Te Kawehau Hoskins have said in relation to a different object, the tā moko signature¹⁴ of Ngāpuhi chief, Hongi Hika, on an early land deed, that:

His face and its embodied authority is before us, it encounters us; we are face to face with Hongi Hika. His presence carries an invitation to mihi – to speak greetings and make genealogical connections; to tangi – to remember and lament this dead relative and others; to hongī – to press noses and intermingle hau, breath, in a solemn enactment of a relationship, a joining of forces.¹⁵

Similarly, here, the ancestors' presence is felt and demands a response, a greeting – a hongī and an exchange of hau.

These pou then also embody a Māori ontology in which relationships with ancestors, and ancestral authority and purposes, continue to unfold through the lives of people in the present. This is an ontology in which things generally, animate and inanimate, natural and cultural – carvings, rocks, trees, birds, animals, fish and so on – have their own life force, their own mauri or hau, “the breath of life, the force in people and things that impels utu, or reciprocal exchanges.”¹⁶ Things have power, a kind of agency that demands or “impels” a response. And this is an ontology in which relations come before beings, unity before diversity. Every thing that is, is the result of the unfolding of prior relations and interactions in the movement of mauri and hau that animates all life.¹⁷

The pou in Te Ahu then exist differently in both Māori and Pākehā ontologies and worlds, acting as material reminders of the long co-existence and entanglement of those worlds. They can be approached and experienced from within the framework of either, as artworks representing identities, or as the embodied presence of ancestors. These worlds are overlapping, co-existing in this space – and everywhere in New Zealand, although the ongoing

life of the Māori world is largely invisible to non-Māori New Zealanders, apart from public performances such as the All Blacks' haka, or pōwhiri to welcome distinguished visitors. In this way, the pou constitute a small act of resistance to the settler colonial project of erasure, an act of indigenization of public space, of bringing te ao Māori back into the centre of civic life.¹⁸

What does this material entanglement of worlds mean to me and to other Pākehā (and Dalmatians) of the community? What can I/we learn from the kuia and her mihi? In the remainder of this paper I want to begin to explore these issues. What can I learn from observing the kuia mihi her ancestors, standing, as we do, outside te ao Māori? I do not know what she knows and cannot be what she is. My relationship to *my* ancestral pou is a different one. But the existence of the Pākehā pou in this circle of pou is a reminder of our/Pākehā relationship with te ao Māori, and an invitation to “approach” and develop a relationship with the Māori ontology and knowledge system present in the pou and the encounter between kuia and pou.¹⁹

Relating Indigenous and Metropolitan Knowledges and Ontologies

There is a body of literature, now reasonably extensive, that engages with the co-existence of multiple bodies of knowledge and ontologies. These new areas of scholarship, in various ways, reject the post-Enlightenment assumptions that the modern, western, science-based knowledge and ontology, with its subject/object and nature/culture binaries, supersedes all other epistemological and ontological traditions. The modern, western knowledge tradition is being “provincialised,” its limitations and specificities highlighted as it is put alongside other knowledge traditions and ontologies.²⁰ Eduardo Vivieros de Castro, for example, argues that modern western thought is ontologically impoverished:

The Cartesian break with medieval scholasticism produced a radical simplification of European ontology by positing only two principles or substances: unextended thought and extended matter. Modern thought began with that simplification; and its massive conversion of ontological into epistemological questions (questions of representation) is still with us. Every mode of being not assimilable to obdurate matter has had to be swallowed up by mind. The simplification of ontology has led to the enormous complication of epistemology. Once objects or things have been pacified – retreating to the exterior, silent, and uniform world of nature – subjects begin to proliferate and chatter: transcendental egos, legislative understandings, philosophies of language, theories of mind, social representations, the logic of the signifier, webs of signification, discursive practices, politics of knowledge, and, yes, anthropology of course.²¹

Vivieros De Castro is one of a number of anthropologists challenging those of us steeped in the modern, western tradition to take the matter of ontological difference seriously.²² It is not, he argues, a matter of relativism, of different perspectives on a common reality, but of distinct realities. Within what Vivieros De Castro calls the “objectivist ontology,” the pou in Te Ahu are material-semiotic objects in a world of human subjects and myriad objects/matter; within a Māori ontology they are embodied ancestral presences in a world of relationships and exchanges that bring different forms (human and other-than-human) into being.

There is a second component to this lesson about the provincial nature of the modern, western ontology, which is to learn about the violent history of the relationship of the western tradition with these other ontologies, which have been categorised and dismissed as “primitive,” “superstitions” and “myths,” disregarded and devalued except as fodder for children's story books and museum cases. Together, learning these lessons is what Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak calls “doing our homework”²³ and what Juanita Sundberg describes as the

first step in learning to learn *from* rather than *about* indigenous ontologies and knowledges, the first step to decolonizing our own theorizing.²⁴ The second step is to learn about these other traditions and ontologies *in light of that critique of the colonising violence of western thought*. Juanita Sundberg describes this as learning to “walk with,” which she says also has two components, “respect for the multiplicity of life worlds” and “learning to learn about multiplicity.”²⁵

Again, there is a now extensive literature on what changes are required of those of us steeped in the modern, western tradition to allow us to walk with and learn “as an *engagement with*”²⁶ (rather than about) indigenous traditions and ontologies. An integral component is humility and awareness of the limits of our ability to know and to understand: for example, Ian Henderson talks of the distinction between “approaching” and “having” knowledge; Alison Jones talks of the “productivity of ignorance.”²⁷ She asks “Do we have a cultural incapacity to recognize that we assume we can know (everything)?”²⁸ One of the most profound lessons for those of us steeped in the western tradition is to come to see the fantasy of mastery woven into our subject/object ontology in which we consider ourselves to be able to fully know and to dominate the things of the world, a fantasy that involves also the objectification of other ontologies as earlier discussed. We need to develop an ability to be *in relation with* other ontologies rather than to be in charge.

Co-existing Worlds or Co-existing Ontological Styles?

In her paper on the “ontological quarrels” between “Euro-American modernity” and te ao Māori, Anne Salmond comments on the continuing confidence of Māori, despite much evidence to the contrary, that the gifts they offer Pākehā will be reciprocated; that the hau of things exchanged will impel a return.²⁹ This links with my sense of the Pākehā pou as an invitation, an offer that I and other Pākehā can take up or ignore, an offer to see ourselves in relation to te ao Māori, already entangled as evidenced by this Pākehā pou standing within a circle of six others, and further evidenced by the appearance on the Pākehā pou of the leading Rarawa chiefs who signed the Treaty of Waitangi with our ancestors.³⁰

I also take my cue here from the work of Emmanuel Lévinas who argues that an ethical obligation is the first demand in our relationship with the difference of others. The presence of another person demands our response. For Lévinas, to be an “I” is to be responsible to others, to care for their difference.³¹ This difference, for Lévinas, comes from “beyond being,” but here I am transposing his ethical injunction to an inter-ontological relationship.³² Applying Lévinas’s philosophy to this context suggests that the ethical Pākehā response to the presence of Māori ontology is to allow our own ontological presuppositions to be unsettled/affected by it, to bring our western, science-based ontology into question, to be prepared to think (and be) differently, to think of our path of becoming in relation to it.³³

Having said that, Anne Salmond, for example, argues that to talk of distinct western and Māori ontologies is to continue to operate within the western approach, which wants to separate and define bounded objects. Rather than distinct ontologies, she speaks instead of “ontological styles” to highlight the fact that varied styles are available to all people, indigenous or western.³⁴ Similarly, Ghassan Hage outlines three distinct “human modes of existence” that he argues are constitutive of the lifeworld of all peoples.³⁵ While western ways of being have long been dominated by the “domesticating mode,” which instrumentalizes, objectifies and dominates both other humans and things (in line with the earlier quote from Vivieros de Castro), what Hage calls the reciprocal and the mutualist modes are also evident, but marginalized, within our ways of being in the world. We might then view the kuia’s mihi to her ancestral pou as unsettling the domesticating mode that sees the pou as inert objects, and an invitation to consider the pou from within the reciprocal and/or mutualist modes of existence.

The reciprocal mode has long been associated with Mauss's analysis of gift logic, and Hage reminds us that gift exchange cannot simply be reduced to instrumental self-interest, but also involves a surplus, a sense of the "giftness of [the] presence" of other beings (human, animal, thing), the idea that their mere presence is a gift that enhances our being.³⁶ Within this reciprocal mode of existence then, an ethical Pākehā response would be to engage with Māori in this light, to consider our co-existence as an enhancement, a surplus, enriching us all (against the colonizing version of this mode of existence, which seeks to diminish and deny the worthiness of Māori difference as somehow an affront to our own).

Hage takes his terminology to describe the mutualist mode of existence from Marshall Sahlins' work on kinship, which "highlights an order of existence where people (and animals, plants, objects and so on) exist in each other.... Mutualism is this sense that others are 'in us' rather than just outside us."³⁷ He links this with Lucien Lévy-Bruhl's work on "participation": "a mode of living and thinking where we sense ourselves as *participating* in each other's existence, where the life force of the humans and the non-humans that surround us are felt to be contributing to our own life force."³⁸ From within this mutualist mode, against the long history of Pākehā denial and turning away from the Māori invitation to relation, we/they might consider the ways in which Māori are in fact part of who Pākehā are, that to enhance the mana of one is to enhance the mana of the other, and that harm done to Māori also diminishes our/their own flourishing (against the colonizing version of this, which views Māori existence as a threat and considers co-existence with Māori as diminishing and thwarting Pākehā becoming).

Returning to the Pou

Given this discussion of ontological styles and modes of existence that all people can engage in, how might non-Māori act in "respect for the multiplicity of lifeworlds" in the presence, or face, of these pou?³⁹ Here I briefly consider the work of two Pākehā scholars grappling in very different ways with the issue of speaking to or with carvings and/or buildings. In a paper on Māori architecture, Michael Linzey has reflected on the Māori practice of speaking *to* their architecture and the difficulty of this for Pākehā, a difficulty he traces back to Plato.⁴⁰ He argues that overcoming what he calls our "linguistic impediment" or the "prohibition" against speaking to things, if it were possible, would be "a positive and necessary step towards forming a healthy pluralistic society."⁴¹ His explanation of the value of this shift highlights again the dominating style within western ontology, and is worth quoting at length:

There are many kinds of thing, strange things, new things, unborn things, beautiful things and numinous things, that we experience difficulty in talking about because to talk about them requires us to name them, to fix them in the system of unified signs, demands that we know their name; and in attempting to name them it is as if their very meaning dissolves and shifts awkwardly. There are situations it may be wrong to talk about, for to do so requires us either to *pretend* to know the name or to *misname* something that may be intrinsically unnameable. It is also highly inappropriate to blandly ignore these things, to turn one's back on them. A more appropriate and respectful comportment to take towards nameless things is to address them directly, to draw them into imaginative dialogue, to find out who they are by speaking to them. Because speaking to is the one mode of address that does not demand an explicit name.⁴²

I am drawn to the way Linzey's argument parallels Lévinas's concerns with the violence of epistemological categories, and what Amiria Salmond calls "the casual ontic violence of dismissing certain kinds of others as the subjects or artifacts of *mere* representations and

beliefs.”⁴³ And I am drawn to Linzey’s suggestion that to learn to overcome our “linguistic impediment” and to speak to things would be politically positive. At the same time, though, the carvings in Te Ahu do incorporate known ancestral figures – both human and non-human – appropriately addressed by name. Here Damian Skinner’s recent account of his own evolving practice of greeting carved ancestors is apposite, particularly given that he already has some knowledge – and names – for the carvings he addresses. Describing his first experience of this, Skinner explains:

I didn’t know I was going to talk to Pūkāki before I arrived.... I walked up to him, and I immediately knew it would be rude not to say anything – to just stroll up and stare. I had only started learning the Māori language, but it occurred to me that Pūkāki had spent a lot of time with Pākehā and would no doubt be fine with English. I said to him “Hello Pūkāki. My name is Damian Skinner and I have come to see you. I hope that is okay.”⁴⁴

While Skinner now greets such ancestors in te reo Māori, he argues this is not “one of those stories of going native.” He does not claim to replicate a Māori relation to and experience of such ancestral figures, and says that he addresses these ancestral figures both personally (as “he” or “she”) and as artworks, that is, as both subjects and objects, switching ontological styles as the situation requires. But he does argue that this is a meaningful practice and that non-Māori can form a relationship with such architectural and artistic entities. He writes in the thick of his thinking about this practice and how he might translate it into how he writes about whare whakairo.⁴⁵

Pulling these various threads together, I am left with a powerful sense of the profundity of the entanglements present in the Te Ahu pou – of ontological styles, of past and present, and of people with each other, with things and with place. The seven pou standing together do far more than statically mark the co-existence of seven distinct peoples in an “empty” present time. These things – and peoples – are not as discrete, or inert, as they appear, but are rather imbricated and enmeshed in a mutual becoming. Tim Ingold argues that a place is a knot in the flow/meshwork of life, a site of dense intersection of lines of life/becoming.⁴⁶ In re-centring possibilities for a Māori ontological style to be expressed in this new public space in Kaitaia, the pou in Te Ahu both contribute to decolonising settled/settler space and invite non-Māori to begin to learn to “walk with” ontological alterity.⁴⁷

Notes

¹ This work arises out of a larger project funded by three different university grants. I would like to acknowledge the Massey University Research Fund (Grant RM15947), the Faculty Research Development Fund of the University of Auckland (Grant 3702644), and the University of Auckland Summer Scholarship programme, which funded Michael McKinley to work with me as a research assistant on this project. I would also like to thank the two anonymous reviewers for their helpful feedback and suggestions.

² Michael McKinley, personal communication. Here I also wish to thank Michael for his work with me surveying visitors to Te Ahu and for sharing this story of his encounter with this particular visitor.

³ The complex houses the community library, museum, tourist information centre, a café, the community hall, movie/theatre facilities, meeting rooms and local government offices (www.teahu.org.nz).

⁴ At the time of writing, six of the seven pou are in place, with the seventh – the Ngāti Kahu pou – still in progress. The carving of this pou is being led by the tohunga whakairo, Paul Marshall (Ngāti Kahu), who has overseen the entire carving project, and who was also lead carver of the Te Rarawa and Dalmatian pou. Duncan Kapa (Te Aupōuri) was lead carver of the Aupōuri and Ngāi Takoto pou, Te Taonui-a-Kupe (James) Rickard (Ngāti Kuri) was lead carver of the Ngāti Kuri pou and Peter Griffiths (Pākehā) the lead carver of the Pākehā pou.

⁵ In using the term ‘tradition’ here, I am aware of the problematic history of its use to signify the stagnant and unchanging, and have in mind Ngarino Ellis’s definition of tradition as ‘formed over time by innovation as well as repetition’ in *A Whakapapa of Tradition: 100 Years of Ngāti Porou Carving 1830-1930* (Auckland: Auckland University Press, 2016), 6. I also wish to thank Ngarino for her guidance on sources on the history of Pākehā pou.

⁶ See, for example, Leo Fowler, *Te Mana o Turanga* (Auckland: New Zealand Historic Places Trust, 1974), 26; Roger Neich, *Painted Histories: Early Māori Figurative Painting* (Auckland: Auckland University Press, 1994); Bernie Kernot, “An Artist in his Time,” *The Journal of the Polynesian Society* 90, no. 2 (1981): 159.

⁷ For example, see Neich *Painted Histories*, 176-185, for a discussion of the project of reconciliation between Tawhiao and Te Kooti underpinning the design of Te Tokanganui-a-Noho in the 1870s.

⁸ For some nineteenth-century examples, see Neich, *Painted Histories*, 215, 255, 270, 274. Note also that this continues to be a minor tradition within Māori carving. In 1974, discussing the carving of Pākehā, Agnew Brown, in *Te Mana o Turanga* (opened in 1883), Leo Fowler stated that, to his knowledge, this was “the only Pākehā ever to be represented in the carvings of a meeting house” (*Te Mana o Turanga*, 26). Although, from Neich’s research, this must have been incorrect, it says something about the rarity of such figures. Representations of Pākehā within whareniui continue to be relatively rare and can be a matter of contention, understandably given our unresolved colonial history. See, for example, Pa Henare Tate’s discussion of the inclusion of Pākehā ancestors in the Motuti whareniui, in his interview with Paul Diamond in 2000, cited in Avril Bell, *Relating Indigenous and Settler Identities: Beyond Domination* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014), 81.

⁹ However, the history of Pakehā representation within Māori art aside, I don’t know of any other such pou representing non-Māori communities as collectives, as in Te Ahu.

¹⁰ I say that the site “may” be Te Rarawa land in acknowledgment that Ngāti Kahu also lay claim to this site. However, Te Rarawa owns some of the land on which Te Ahu stands and has been the iwi most closely involved with the development of Te Ahu.

¹¹ For example, see Agnes Brandt, *Among Friends? On the Dynamics of Māori-Pākehā Relationships in Aotearoa New Zealand* (Gottingen: V & R Unipress, 2013); Natacha Gagné, *Being Māori in the City: Indigenous Everyday Life in Auckland* (Toronto: Toronto University Press, 2013).

¹² Te Ahu Charitable Trust. *TACT Annual Report, 2013/2014* (Kaikohe: Far North District Council, 2014), 4, viewed 2 July 2014, www.fndc.govt.nz/your-council/meetings/record-of-meetings/2014-archive/2014-10-16-audit-finance-and-risk-committee-agenda/2014-10-16-AFR-3.3-TACT-Annual-Report.pdf.

¹³ Avril Bell and Michael McKinley, *Te Ahu Visitors Survey, 2013* (Auckland: University of Auckland, 2013).

¹⁴ Hongi Hika’s signature on this land deed in 1819 is an early example of how Māori leaders used their facial tattoos as signatures in the time before they took up writing.

¹⁵ Alison Jones and Te Kawehau Hoskins, “A Mark on Paper: The Matter of Indigenous-Settler History,” in *Posthuman Research Practices in Education*, ed. Carol A. Taylor and Christina Hughes (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016), 80.

¹⁶ Anne Salmond, “Ontological Quarrels: Indigeneity, Exclusion and Citizenship in a Relational World,” *Anthropological Theory* 12, no. 2 (2012): 121.

¹⁷ Māori Marsden, *The Woven Universe: Selected Writings of Rev. Māori Marsden*, ed. Charles Royal (Masterton: Te Wananga-o-Raukawa, 2003), 44. Marsden noted the resonances between Māori ontology and that discovered by quantum physics, 64-65. These resonances are evident in recent new materialist theories on the lively nature of matter/things. See Jane Bennett, *Vibrant Matter: A Political Ecology of Things* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2010) for her concept of “thingly power.” See Karen Barad, *Meeting the Universe Half-Way: Quantum Physics and the Entanglement of Matter and Meaning* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2007), 170, for her argument that “matter is a dynamic intra-active becoming.” Also see Hoskins and Jones, “A Mark on Paper,” for an exploration of the connections between Māori and new materialist ontologies.

¹⁸ Lorenzo Veracini, *Settler Colonialism: A Theoretical Overview* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010); Bell, *Relating Indigenous*.

- ¹⁹ “Approach” in the sense given in Ian Henderson, “Stranger Danger: Approaching Home and *Ten Canoes*,” *South Atlantic Quarterly* 108, no. 1 (2009): 68.
- ²⁰ This term is adopted from Dipesh Chakrabarty, *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference*. (New York: Princeton University Press, 2000).
- ²¹ Eduardo Viveiros de Castro, “Exchanging Perspectives: The Transformation of Objects into Subjects in Amerindian Ontologies,” *Common Knowledge*, 10.3 (2004): 484.
- ²² For an overview of the “ontological turn” in anthropology see Amiria Salmond, “Transforming translations (part 2): Addressing Ontological Alterity,” *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 4, no.1 (2014): 155-87. Here Salmond distinguishes between three strands of the turn to ontology within anthropology: Tim Ingold’s “ecological phenomenology,” which seeks to re-embed humanity and culture in the world of things; Philippe Descola’s “ontological cartography,” which seeks to map distinct “indigenous ontologies”; and the recursive anthropology of Viveiros de Castro, herself and others, which seeks to transform the ethnographic method and analysis in response to ontological alterity, 163-68.
- ²³ Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, *The Post-Colonial Critic: Interviews, Strategies, Dialogues*. (New York: Routledge, 1990), 62.
- ²⁴ Juanita Sundberg, “Decolonizing Posthumanist Geographies,” *Cultural Geographies* 21, no. 1 (2014): 39.
- ²⁵ Sundberg, “Decolonizing Posthumanist,” 40.
- ²⁶ Sundberg, “Decolonizing Posthumanist,” 40, emphasis in original.
- ²⁷ Henderson, “Stranger Danger,” 69, note 5; Alison Jones, “The Limits of Cross-Cultural Dialogue: Pedagogy, Desire and Absolution in the Classroom,” *Educational Theory* 49, no. 3 (1999): 315-16; and Alison Jones, “Cross-Cultural Pedagogy and the Passion for Ignorance,” *Feminism & Psychology* 11, no. 3 (2001): 279-92.
- ²⁸ Jones, “Cross-Cultural Pedagogy,” 288.
- ²⁹ Salmond, “Ontological Quarrels,” 121-22.
- ³⁰ I use “ancestors” here in Raimond Gaita’s sense to refer to our political, rather than biological ancestors. The British men who signed the Treaty of Waitangi are the political ancestors of contemporary Pākehā in that they created the foundations of the nation and of Pākehā becoming (A *Common Humanity: Thinking About Love and Truth and Justice*, 2nd ed., London: Routledge, 2002).
- ³¹ Emmanuel Lévinas, *Emmanuel Lévinas: Basic Philosophical Writings*, ed. Adriann T. Peperzak, Simon Critchley and Robert Bernasconi. (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1996), 55.
- ³² Lévinas, *Emmanuel Lévinas*, 74.
- ³³ Lévinas, *Emmanuel Lévinas*, 17.
- ³⁴ Salmond, “Ontological Quarrels,” 125.
- ³⁵ Ghassan Hage, *Alter-Politics: Critical Anthropology and the Radical Imagination* (Carleton: Melbourne University Press, 2015), 186-89. By “modes” he means “a human mode of inhabiting, being enmeshed in and relating to the world that is part and parcel of constituting the world”: 187.
- ³⁶ *Ibid.*, 188.
- ³⁷ *Ibid.*, 188-89.
- ³⁸ *Ibid.*, 189, emphasis in original.
- ³⁹ Sundberg, “Decolonizing Posthumanist,” 40.
- ⁴⁰ Michael Linzey, “Speaking To and About: Māori Architecture,” *Interstices: Journal of Architecture and Related Arts* 1 (1991): 48-60.
- ⁴¹ Linzey, “Speaking To,” 60.
- ⁴² Linzey, “Speaking To,” 59.
- ⁴³ Lévinas, *Emmanuel Lévinas*, 11-12; Salmond, “Transforming Translations,” 168.
- ⁴⁴ Skinner, *The Māori Meeting House*, 11.
- ⁴⁵ Skinner, *The Māori Meeting House*, 12-13.
- ⁴⁶ Tim Ingold, *Being Alive: Essays on Movement, Knowledge and Description*. (London: Routledge, 2011), 151.
- ⁴⁷ Sundberg, “Decolonizing Posthumanist,” 40.