

NGĀHUIA HARRISON

## ***Coastal Cannibals: Industry and Occupation on Whangārei Te Rerenga Paraoa***

### **Abstract**

*Coastal Cannibals is a photographic series exploring the impacts, contradictions, and possibilities of “development” within Whangārei Te Rerenga Paraoa (Whangārei Harbour). Located on New Zealand’s northeastern coast, Whangārei Harbour is a site of significant cultural, ecological, and historical significance for the different iwi (tribes) and hapū (subtribes) who have resided—and continue to reside—there. For these tribes, maintaining unbroken occupation has not been straightforward; the harbour is a contested and still-consumed space. Iwi and hapū contend with heavy industry, residential developments, and regional policies that both disregard tribal authority and disrupt kaitiakitanga (guardianship relations). Coastal Cannibals focuses on the harbour’s shoreline developments, where industry is both a source of tension for iwi and hapū, as it places huge pressures on the ocean and surrounding environs, and of necessary jobs and income for a historically underserved region. For those committed to Indigeneity, occupation is never a straightforward affair. In the postcolonial tradition of “speaking back,” the photo series draws its title from a description used against the great Ngātiwai rangatira Paratene Te Manu prior to his and his tribe’s eviction from the nearby Te Hauturu-o-Toi (Little Barrier Island), asking us today: who is eating away at what?*

**Keywords:** *Aotearoa, harbours, kaitiakitanga, Māori land rights, Indigenous art, image sovereignty, photography, First Nations*

This essay looks at a body of work titled *Coastal Cannibals*, a lens-based project I developed during my doctoral research. As a series of photographs and video works, it explores the histories, tensions, and relationships that *mana whenua* (local Indigenous authorities) experience with industry surrounding Whangārei Te Rerenga Paraoa (meaning “Whangārei Gathering Place of Whales and Chiefs”), commonly known as Whangārei Harbour, in Aotearoa New Zealand. The industries there include the Marsden Point Oil Refinery, the Northport commercial sea port, Reotahi Freezing Works, and Portland Cement.



Figure 1. Ngāhuia Harrison, *First Cinema Camera 8*, 2021. Photograph, 445.5 x 297 mm. Courtesy of the artist

My intention for *Coastal Cannibals* is to show that *mana whenua* (local authority, authority of land through occupation) survive amongst industry—surviving despite the industrial imperialism and, perhaps, due to the creation of jobs in a historically underserved area. In the image *First Cinema Camera 8* (Fig. 1) we see the fluctuating, ever-present mountain of wood chips beside Northport’s timber yard. The cranes that move logs and the machinery that turns them to wood chips, both seen in the photo, are just two elements that *mana whenua* contend with along the shoreline of their once-clean harbour. The port, under different names and in previous iterations, has also provided work to locals, including *mana whenua*.

I draw the series’s title *Coastal Cannibals* from writing by colonialist James Cowan about Ngātiwai chief Paratene Te Manu (c. 1807–1897). In 1894, Cowan met Paratene on the Ngātiwai island of Hauturu-o-Toi (Little Barrier Island). In two articles published in *New Zealand Railways Magazine*, Cowan described Paratene as a “still vigorous specimen of the cannibal canoe-men”<sup>1</sup> and “a wonderful ancient relic of the cannibal days.”<sup>2</sup> By using the word “cannibal,” Cowan communicated a description that proved Māori savagery to European settlers and,

therefore, legitimised the act of colonisation, especially through the introduction of Christianity. The same year, Ngātiwai were evicted by the *Little Barrier Island Act of 1894*, which removed the tribe from the island for the British Crown to take Hauturu-o-Toi as part of the conservation estate.

The Martinican poet Aimé Césaire considered the effects of colonisation on the coloniser rather than the colonised, writing that it was the coloniser rather than the native who was “decivilised” by the colonisation process, which diminished the humanity of its enforcers. He describes the effect as a “gangrene” that has set into the coloniser’s body as they “proceed toward savagery.”<sup>3</sup> Half a century later, American theorist Nancy Fraser coined the term “cannibal capitalism” to describe capitalism as eating away at the conditions it relies on for survival.<sup>4</sup> Fraser points out that the success of capitalism is due to the exploitation of the environment and marginalised groups. I have used these ideas of cannibalisation as a starting point, asking, in the case of Whangārei Te Rerenga Paraoa, who is eating away at what?

### Enclosure Through Legislation

*The Oyster Fisheries Act of 1866* was the first statutory regulation on a fishery in New Zealand. It regulated Māori oyster interests to non-commercial pursuits, despite evidence demonstrating the extent of Māori trade in fish and shellfish at the time. For example, in 1857, Charles Hursthouse reported on Māori trade: “In three months, in 1853, there visited Auckland alone . . . 442 canoes, navigated by 1592 men and 590 women bringing produce to the value of nearly £4000.” Hursthouse calculated that these trades included “18 kits” of oysters and over five tonnes of fish.<sup>5</sup>

The enclosure or limitation of Māori economic opportunity continued through the *Treaty of Waitangi (Fisheries Claims) Settlement Act of 1992*, which simultaneously “settled” and hamstrung Māori fishery interests. Under the act, *iwi* (tribes) entities, or *rūnanga* (tribal authorities), favoured establishing asset-holding companies to receive quotas and monies. The restrictions set out in this act devastated cottage-industry fisheries in New Zealand’s Northland, most of which were operated by Māori who could not compete against more prominent entities, tribal or otherwise, in the quota management system.<sup>6</sup>

The *Marine and Coastal Area (Takutai Moana) Act 2011* (MACA 2011) replaced controversial 2004 legislation called the *Foreshore and Seabed Act 2004* (FSA 2004). The *FSA 2004* had severed Māori proprietary rights in marine areas,

claiming them as Crown-owned. The late scholar Moana Jackson recognised that the same inequities existed in the newer *MACA 2011*, though they were concealed in different language. While *MACA 2011* created opportunities for Māori to prove “customary” rights and marine titles, the Crown determines these definitions, which obliges Māori to redefine ourselves within the limited scope of Crown legislation.

Those most affected by the controls placed upon fisheries have been *whanau* (family) and *haukainga* (home people), who are permitted “customary fishing,” defined as nonfinancial harvesting for *hui* (gathering) or *tangi* (funeral).<sup>7</sup> *MACA 2011* continues the marginalisation of Māori interests begun by the previous laws, foreclosing perceived or potential economic benefits for Māori. These global controls of Indigenous resources use different methods, yet each has operated for the shared goal of creating the conditions of scarcity that break Indigenous ways of being. As Karl Polanyi writes,

Whether the colonist needs land as a site for the sake of the wealth buried in it or whether he merely wishes to constrain the native to produce a surplus of food and raw materials, is often irrelevant; nor does it make much difference whether the native works under the direct supervision of the colonist or only under some form of indirect compulsion, for in every and any case, the social and cultural system of native life must be shattered.<sup>8</sup>



Figure 2. Ngāhuia Harrison, *First Cinema Camera 7*, 2021. Photograph, 445.50 x 297 mm. Courtesy of the artist

Māori are frozen in the realm of “noble savage,” fixed at the Crown-appointed date of 1840, the year Te Tiriti o Waitangi was signed between *rangatira* (chiefs) and Queen Victoria. To prove a “customary practice” under *MACA 2011*, Māori must show they have enacted the practice in line with *tikanga* (tribal protocol) since 1840. Meanwhile, the Crown can today capitalise on ocean resources and marine areas utilising modern technology that was not available in 1840 and in ways that Māori have been legislatively blocked since the *Oyster Fisheries Act of 1866*. *First Cinema Camera 7* (Fig. 2) shows an example of these modern technologies in the form of oil storage tanks that line the beach, creating a new horizon line at the mouth of the Whangārei Harbour.



Figure 3. Ngāhuia Harrison, *E rere kau mai te awa nui, mai i te kāhui maunga ki Tangaroa*, 2022. Photograph, 1502 x 474 mm. Courtesy of the artist

### Industry Surrounding the Whangārei Harbour

Over the last century, industrial development has irrevocably changed Whangārei Harbour. The first cement works were built on Matakohe (Limestone Island) in 1894, the same year that Paratene was evicted from Hauturu-o-Toi. Portland Cement produced the first cement in New Zealand there using coal extracted from nearby Te Kamo and Hikurangi. Later known as Golden Bay Cement, the company moved from the island to the harbour shores in 1918 due to a decreasing limestone supply. In the triptych *E rere kau mai te awa nui, mai i te kāhui maunga ki Tangaroa* (Fig. 3), I emphasise how the landscape is being worked against itself for the purpose of extraction, joining the pipelines of the Golden Bay Cement company so they flow together as if a river by inverting images and placing them together. The work’s title comes from a well-known Whanganui *pepeha* (proverb, saying): *E rere kau mai te awa nui, mai i te kāhui maunga ki Tangaroa. Ko au te*

*awa ko te awa ko au* (The river flows from the mountains to the sea. I am the river, and the river is me).<sup>9</sup>

In a landmark international case, the Whanganui River was granted personhood in 2017, becoming the first waterway internationally to achieve special legal status. As the triptych's images invert the landscape by stitching together a reversed photograph to create the seamless pipeline, so too is the *pepeha* upended, to consider the genuineness of legislative promises such as legal personhood. A recent concept in Western thought, taken from Indigenous ontology, considers the efficacy or life-force of nonhuman beings. However, even with these legal rights, inadequate challenge has been mounted against the unbridled appetite of global capitalism, which continues to extract and exploit our environments—whether legally recognised or not. Certainly, the use of Indigenous knowledge systems is the latest form of extraction of native resources; activists Vandana Shiva and Maria Mies consider the use of non-Western thought as the “spiritual icing on top of the material cake of the West.”<sup>10</sup>



Figure 4. Ngāhuia Harrison, *Beyond Ruin*, 2022. Video stills showing the Reotahi Freezing Works remains; a fire destroyed it in 1921. Courtesy of the artist

In 1911, the Reotahi Freezing Works was built at the mouth of Whangārei Harbour. At its peak, it slaughtered six hundred sheep and fifty bullocks daily. The video work *Beyond Ruin* (Fig. 4) presents the skeletal remains of the industrial slaughterhouses. Now a marine reserve, the freezing works sit on land assumed by the Northland Harbour Board and given to early settler Alfred Bevins, a previously bankrupted entrepreneur. The freezing works burnt down in 1921, but the 1920s saw more development with the creation of the harbour's first seaport, Port Whangārei. First situated in the upper harbour, Port Whangārei moved to the mouth in the 1960s. Renamed Northport, it sits opposite the ruins of the Reotahi Freezing Works.

In the 1970s, a horse called Think Big won consecutive Melbourne Cup Races. At the 1977 National Party Conference, Minister of Racing Allan Highet used the winning thoroughbred's name to describe the government's energy expansion plans. Prime Minister Robert Muldoon's "Think Big" industrial projects included the Marsden Point Oil Refinery, whose expansion was approved in 1981. The refinery was a significant project that employed five thousand people.

*First Cinema Camera 3* (Fig. 5) follows the same logic as *E rere kau mai te awa nui, mai i te kāhui maunga ki Tangaroa*; the image has been flipped to create an adjacent structure out of the oil refinery's dock. Oil ships dock here to pump out crude oil that is refined at the Whangārei Harbour site. From there, a pipeline travels 321 kilometres to Auckland, where a large portion of the oil is used at the domestic and international airports. A bizarre cycle of capitalism trumps the harbour's natural life cycles, such as the *pīpī* beds, which are nearing extinction in the harbour.



Figure 5. Ngāhuia Harrison, *First Cinema Camera 3*, 2021. Photograph, 475.50 x 317 mm. Courtesy of the artist

### ***Kaitiaki* Does Not Equal Stakeholder**

My research is part of a larger project called *Listening to the Voices of Our Harbours* (hereafter referred to as "Three Harbours Project") conducted by the James Henare Māori Research Centre. The Three Harbours Project investigates flax-roots *kaitiakitanga* (a term I will define shortly) in three North Island harbours: Kāwhia Harbour, Manukau Harbour, and Whangārei Harbour.<sup>11</sup> Incorporated into the Resource Management Act of 1992, *kaitiakitanga* is commonly understood in New Zealand as stewardship focusing on protecting the natural environment.<sup>12</sup> The Three Harbours Project team builds on the work of

Dame Ngāneko Minhinnick, Carmen Kirkwood, Reverend Māori Marsden, Dr Merata Kawharu, and others, who have described a more accurate understanding of the concept of *kaitiakitanga* than the Resource Management Act illustrates.<sup>13</sup> As Dr Kawharu advises, in “any analysis of *kaitiakitanga* in legal or political contexts, first of all, it is necessary to consider its original meanings as well as the rights and responsibilities of those who customarily apply the principle.”<sup>14</sup>

*Kaitiakitanga* is an entangled concept that relies upon *whakapapa* (genealogical connection) to a particular place. Kirkwood writes, “everybody on this planet has a role to play as guardian. But if you use the word *kaitiaki*,<sup>15</sup> that person must be Māori because of the depth and meaning of the word and the responsibilities that go with it.”<sup>16</sup> *Kaitiakitanga* denotes dwelling in or having intimate knowledge of a place, which is why the Three Harbours Project pays attention to the flax-roots voices, the *haukainga* (home people) voices. Because of *whakapapa*, *haukainga* occupy these harbours, just as their ancestors did. Like their ancestors, they are dealing with the everyday realities of these sites.



Figure 6. Ngāhuia Harrison, *Points North*, 2021. Photograph. 420 x 594 mm. Courtesy of the artist

In *Points North* (Fig. 6), we see the Northland Harbour Board's propaganda magazine *Points North*. The Northland Harbour Board has a dubious history of land theft in the Whangārei Harbour. On the left, the volcanic peaks of our *tupuna maunga* (ancestral mountain) Manaia can be seen above the Northport site. The phrase "Deep Water" appears below. The Whangārei Harbour site was initially chosen by Northport for its depth. Today, the amount of dredging required to maintain the depth necessary for shipping is ruining the seabed. The objective of this image, as with other images in the body of work *Coastal Cannibals*, is to speak to continuous occupation through the presence of Manaia. All Manaia's descendants are the *kaitiaki* of the harbour due to the *whakapapa* we share through this descent line. As with the Whanganui River to the Whanganui Tribes, this significant mountain is evidence of our belonging.

Daily realities often misalign with Crown definitions or legislation that tell the Māori who and how to be. The ancestral connections Māori maintain through *whakapapa* ensure that we preserve our long memory and responsibility of place and people. This *whakapapa* catalyses *kaitiakitanga*. However, our memories now connect to the industry surrounding Whangārei Harbour. These industries provided jobs for disenfranchised Māori while also being a destructive force to the environment. They are memorials to the deliberate exclusion of Māori from economic opportunity beyond becoming factory fodder, as well as to land loss experienced by the Māori.

### Looking Through Our Lens

Crown definitions of customary marine practice designate Māori to the caricature of the "noble savage" who live or at least should live in harmony with ancestral lands as they have since 1840. This stereotype excludes Māori from the economic growth created from ancestral lands as was seen in aforementioned Oyster Fisheries Act 1866, and ignores the realities of having to work for companies destroying one's lands and waters, while the same economic potential has been afforded to Pākehā through racist legislation and land theft.

American photographer Allan Sekula committed to presenting the "everyday" of harbour life. In writing about Sekula's work, Laleh Khalili notes that he "had a way of foretelling futures, not because he had a utopian or dystopian vision of what was to come, but because he was so alive to the quotidian realities of the every day."<sup>17</sup> *Coastal Cannibals* began with interviewing those living in long-

occupied *kainga* (homes), where the Crown continues to define relationships to land, natural resources, and neighbouring *whanaunga* (relations). A *Whaea* (aunty, term of respect) Mere Kepa who lives on the harbour, when I asked if she felt any difference between the land and sea—if perhaps one area was more significant—answered an emphatic “no.” “It is no different,” she continued. “You just go down the hill and into the sea. They’re the same. Only you can get different *kai* (food) from each area, and one’s covered in water, which will soon be covering the other!”<sup>18</sup>

*Whaea* Mere emailed me her photographs documenting the different colours and thickness of smog hanging above the industry in front of her ancestral home. Walking hills in her *kainga* each morning with her dog, Aroha, she observes the harbour air. Walking her land to watch, and document, the pollution that hangs thick in the sky—as much a part of her home as the ocean below it and the people in-between. Documenting the constant pollution is part of the “quotidian reality” of being Indigenous in the provincial places that industries are pushed out to and established. Vandana Shiva writes that the impacts of industry upon one’s lands and waters, “are the struggles of people taking place in the ruins wrought by development to regain a sense of selfhood and control over their destinies.”<sup>19</sup>

Image sovereignty—the use of the image to self-determine—is an essential tool of resistance. The Crown’s attempts at defining Māori identity and restricting the potential of Māori economic activity make it essential to present the reality of the environments that harbour tribes occupy. Ngāti Apa filmmaker Barry Barclay has demonstrated the importance of claiming our image, of image sovereignty. Though not the first to use the phrase “Fourth Cinema,” meaning Indigenous cinema, Barclay is best known for his explanation of the term. He described the metaphoric First Cinema camera as the one on the ship’s deck or an objective outsider, while the Fourth Cinema camera is inside, an ally lens, on the shore in the hands of those for “whom ashore is their ancestral home.”<sup>20</sup>

Native North American artist Hulleah Tsinhnahjinnie has written about the importance of visual sovereignty and making an ally of the lens.<sup>21</sup> Self-representation and definition for Indigenous artists involves making the camera a friend rather than a weapon to resist tropes such as the “hapless native” or “noble savage.”<sup>22</sup> The camera-as-weapon reflects the historical use of the image to restrict who Indigenous peoples are and what Indigenous people do. Tsinhnahjinnie emphasises the importance of multi-layered images in the statements made by the work and the analysis made of them.

Ngāti Porou artist and scholar Natalie Robertson enriches the Fourth Cinema methodology through her more recent idea of a “whakapapa lens.”<sup>23</sup>

Continuing Barclay's conversation, Robertson challenges the binary of the Fourth Cinema camera, which splits people into being either on the shore (Indigenous) or on the ship (settler). In contrast, thinking through a *whakapapa* lens incorporates relationality and connectivity—what Reverend Māori Marsden calls the “woven universe”—to allow for the complexity, contradictions, and diversity of entangled peoples living and working in place.<sup>24</sup>

My initial access to this project is *whakapapa* to the harbour: to Manaia, our *tupuna maunga* (ancestral mountain) standing at the harbour mouth. Manaia connects me to various natural formations as well as to the *hapū* and *iwi* who occupy the harbour. My family also have *whakapapa* to the harbour industries, particularly Northport and the Marsden Point Oil Refinery. Granddad, a welder, worked building the Refinery's first chimneys in the 1960s. In the 1980s, my dad and uncles worked at “The Point,” as it was called, and they dismantled the chimneys my granddad built. My cousins worked on the subsequent construction of new chimneys. A *whakapapa* lens provides a way to acknowledge positionality through my family's entanglement with this place. It also disrupts notions of being an objective observer and of binaries: in or out, shore or ship, noble savage or stevedore (port-sider, longshoreman).

In the photographs titled *First Cinema Camera*, part of the *Coastal Cannibals* body of work, the “First Cinema camera” is in my hands; I am a person traditionally placed on the shore. In these works, I shoot an industrial horizon. The aforementioned *First Cinema Camera 8* (Fig. 1) shows a woodchip pile at Northport, where my *whanau* worked as stevedores. Their work put food on their tables, but I was also shooting on the ocean above beds of now-extinct shellfish, ones that had been traditionally harvested by our ancestors—a “customary practice.” Under MACA 2011, only the latter can be claimed as a customary practice under the law.

By complicating the binary of First Cinema camera and Fourth Cinema camera, my work reveals the contradictions that Indigenous people live with—contradictions not of our own making. *Pātaka Kai* (Fig. 7) presents a bed of Pacific oysters, a shellfish that colonised the harbour seabed in the 1950s after travelling on the hulls of container ships from overseas into the harbour. Although these oysters are harvested by *mana whenua*, a recent arrival would not be customary food by the Crown. In the diptych they are presented with refinery tanks, a new *pātaka* or storehouse for oil. This relationship shows the duplicity of citizenship in New Zealand; the Crown allows cultural and material development for non-Māori, whilst Māori are relegated to customary practices and natural resources set at 1840.



Figure 7. Ngāhuia Harrison, *Pātaka Kai*, 2018. Photograph, 110 x 80 mm. Courtesy of the artist



Figure 8. Ngāhuia Harrison, *Ka Mua, Ka Muri*, 2021. Photograph, 1498.50 x 1180 mm. The image shows a failed residential development neighbouring the *kainga* of *iwi* Patuharakeke. Courtesy of the artist

In 2017, Winston Peters, leader of the political party New Zealand First and Patuharakeke, Ngātiwai tribal member, said of the proposed plan to move Auckland’s port to Whangārei, “Aucklanders want their harbour back while Northlanders want the jobs.”<sup>25</sup> Five years on, the conversation to move the port and expand Northport are ongoing.<sup>26</sup> Allan Sekula foretold the debates surrounding harbour frontage in his book *Fish Story*: “Harbours are now less havens . . . than accelerated turning-basins for supertankers and container ships. The old harbour front, its links to a common culture shattered by un-employment, is now reclaimed for a bourgeois reverie on the mercantilist past.”<sup>27</sup> *Ka Mua, Ka Muri* (Fig. 8), a photograph taken in the residential area of Marsden Cove and the unrealised Marsden City development, demonstrates the tensions Sekula describes in his harbour study.



Figure 9. Ngāhuia Harrison, *Tauranga Waka*, 2021. Photograph, 1498.50 x 1180 mm. Courtesy of the artist

Looking at a horizon that will one day be submerged under a rising ocean, the desire to live in an ocean paradise is balanced against the capitalist values of

extractive industry and “progress.” Developments sprawl across the land behind Northport and the oil refinery. These sub-divisions have been built in response to Whangārei’s rapidly growing population, which is predicted to increase 45% by 2051.<sup>28</sup> In the photographs *Tauranga Waka* (Fig. 9) and *Coastal Cannibals* (Fig. 10), the viewer can observe how *waitai* (ocean, tidal water) is re-routed through residential developments in Ruākākā, on the southern side of the Whangārei Harbour. In the latter photograph, the tips of oil refinery chimneys are visible behind the row of houses. Suburban developments are another sign of “progress” that *mana whenua* contend with, especially in desirable coastal areas. As Sekula states, “the backwater becomes a front water. Everyone wants a glimpse of the sea.”<sup>29</sup>



Figure 10. Ngāhuia Harrison, *Coastal Cannibals*, 2020. Photograph, 1498.50 x 1180 mm. Courtesy of the artist

A suburban development occupies most of the horizon of the photograph *Coastal Cannibals*. The area and the *mana whenua* Patuharakeke prepare for the

swelling population. The tribe watches their land being carved up so that each house can have a boat launch on a manufactured coast, in water that shouldn't be there. And above this all, emerging above the new build, is Manaia. His ever-identifiable peak is our beacon of home: *tū tonu, tū tonu* (continues to stand, continues to stand).<sup>30</sup>

*Ngāhuaia Harrison (Ngātiwai, Ngāpuhi, Ngāti Pukenga, Pākehā) is an artist and researcher. She completed her master of fine arts degree at Elam School of Fine Art in 2012, and is currently a doctoral candidate at Elam and the James Henare Māori Research Centre, University of Auckland. Working with lens-based media, Harrison produces images that consider Māori occupation on and around bodies of water. This includes the environmental and economic realities that mana whenua (local Indigenous authorities) contend with, and the national and local government policies that Māori are controlled by on their own lands and waters. Her successive solo and group exhibitions have considered the past and future histories of iwi (tribal) and hapū (subtribe) landscapes, examining the Māori worldview of responsibility and reciprocity in community.*

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> “The Maori Warrior’s Way | NZETC,” accessed September 15, 2021, [http://nzetc.victoria.ac.nz/tm/scholarly/tei-Gov10\\_09Rail-t1-body-d7.html](http://nzetc.victoria.ac.nz/tm/scholarly/tei-Gov10_09Rail-t1-body-d7.html).

<sup>2</sup> “A Tapu Isle of Birds — Hauturu and its Inhabitants — Old Maori Memories | NZETC,” accessed July 2, 2020, [http://nzetc.victoria.ac.nz/tm/scholarly/tei-Gov13\\_10Rail-t1-body-d5.html](http://nzetc.victoria.ac.nz/tm/scholarly/tei-Gov13_10Rail-t1-body-d5.html).

<sup>3</sup> Aimé Césaire and Robin D. G. Kelley, *Discourse on Colonialism* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 2000), 36.

<sup>4</sup> Nancy Fraser, *Cannibal Capitalism* (New York: Verso Books, 2022).

<sup>5</sup> Charles Hursthouse, *New Zealand, or Zealandia, the Britain of the South*, 1857, Vol. I, Chapter VIII, “NATIVES,” 179, <http://www.enzb.auckland.ac.nz/document/?wid=845&page=0&action=null>.

<sup>6</sup> New Zealand and Waitangi Tribunal, Report of the Waitangi Tribunal on the Muriwhenua Fishing Claim (WAI 22), 2013, 118, [https://forms.justice.govt.nz/search/Documents/WT/wt\\_DOC\\_68479315/Wai0019%20W.pdf](https://forms.justice.govt.nz/search/Documents/WT/wt_DOC_68479315/Wai0019%20W.pdf).

<sup>7</sup> Fiona McCormack, “Interdependent Kin in Māori Marine Environments,” *Oceania* 91, no. 2 (2021): 204, <https://doi.org/10.1002/occe.5308>.

<sup>8</sup> Karl Polanyi, *The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time* (Boston: Beacon Press, 2001), 187.

<sup>9</sup> Whanganui is an area in the lower North Island, New Zealand.

- <sup>10</sup> Maria Mies and Vandana Shiva, *Ecofeminism* (London: Zed Books, 2014), 19.
- <sup>11</sup> The James Henare Māori Research Centre team uses the term “flax-roots” to signify local community and movements. Influenced by the notion of “grass-roots,” this is a Māori-centric image acknowledging the importance of flax or *harakeke*.
- <sup>12</sup> This paper recognises that New Zealand and Aotearoa are often different places sharing, or struggling over, the same islands. This paper uses the titles “New Zealand” and “Aotearoa” accordingly.
- <sup>13</sup> Several Māori scholars and *tohunga* (experts) have written and described *kaitiaki* and *kaitiakitanga* at length; for example, Reverend Māori Marsden, Dr Margaret Mutu, Dr Anne Marie Jackson, and Dr Manuka Henare.
- <sup>14</sup> Merata Kawharu, “Kaitiakitanga: A Maori Anthropological Perspective of the Maori Socio-Environmental Ethic of Resource Management,” *The Journal of the Polynesian Society* 109, no. 4 (2000): 349–70.
- <sup>15</sup> *Kai-* (prefix that introduces an agent) and *tiaki* (to guard, to care); *kaitiaki* means “guardian.” *-Tanga* is a suffix that emphasises the quality of a noun; *kaitiakitanga* means “guardianship.”
- <sup>16</sup> M. Roberts, W. Norman, N. Minhinnick, D. Wihongi, and C. Kirkwood, “Kaitiakitanga: Maori Perspectives on Conservation,” *Pacific Conservation Biology* 2, no. 1 (1995): 7–20.
- <sup>17</sup> Allan Sekula, Laleh Khalili, and B. H. D. Buchloh, *Fish Story*, 3rd revised English edition (London: MACK, 2018), 12.
- <sup>18</sup> Mere Kepa, interview by Ngāhuia Harrison, September 13, 2019, interview at Whaea Luana Piripis home in Takahiwai. Transcript and recording, James Henare Māori Research Centre, researcher’s private collection.
- <sup>19</sup> Mies and Shiva, *Ecofeminism*, 99.
- <sup>20</sup> Barry Barclay, “Celebrating Fourth Cinema,” *Illusions* 35 (July 2003), 7–11. An abridged version of a lecture given by Barclay at the University of Auckland Film and Media Department, September 17, 2002.
- <sup>21</sup> H. J. Tsinhnahjinnie and V. Passalacqua, eds., *Our People, Our Land, Our Images: International Indigenous Photographers* (Berkeley, CA: Heyday Books, 2006).
- <sup>22</sup> Ngarino Ellis and Natalie Robertson, “The Iwirākau Project: A Collaborative Waiapu Approach,” *History of Photography* 42, no. 3 (July 3, 2018): 239–48, <https://doi.org/10.1080/03087298.2018.1537099>.
- <sup>23</sup> Natalie Robertson, “Nga Whatu-ora: We the Living Are the Eyes of Our Sleeping Ancestors,” *Public* 27, no. 54 (Winter 2016), 132–45, <http://www.publicjournal.ca/54-indigenous-art/>.
- <sup>24</sup> Maori Marsden and Charles Te Ahukaramū, *The Woven Universe: Selected Writings of Rev. Māori Marsden* (Otaki, N.Z.: Estate of Rev. Māori Marsden, 2003).
- <sup>25</sup> “Move the Port, and Watch Rates Rise – Auckland Mayor Phil Goff,” *Newshub*, sec. Election, accessed February 1, 2022, <https://www.newshub.co.nz/home/election/2017/08/move-the-port-and-watch-rates-rise-auckland-mayor-phil-goff.html>.

<sup>26</sup> “Northport Getting Ready to Expand, without Ports of Auckland Move,” *Stuff*, July 17, 2021, <https://www.stuff.co.nz/business/125771827/northport-getting-ready-to-expand-without-ports-of-auckland-move>.

<sup>27</sup> Sekula et al., *Fish Story*, 12.

<sup>28</sup> “Whangārei: New 30-Year Growth Strategy for One of New Zealand’s Fastest-Growing Districts,” *RNZ*, September 26, 2021, <https://www.rnz.co.nz/news/national/452335/whangarei-new-30-year-growth-strategy-for-one-of-new-zealand-s-fastest-growing-districts>.

<sup>29</sup> Sekula et al., *Fish Story*, 12.

<sup>30</sup> This is a common saying to express ongoing occupation or endurance, combining *tū* (hold, stand, endure) and *tonu* (unceasing, simply, continue).