EDITORIAL

This special edition draws its inspiration from the 2006 ASAANZ conference which was held in Christchurch on the topic of 'Bracketing (Belief)'. The special editors for this edition were members of the organizing committee for that meeting, and here collect together a number of peer reviewed and individually selected papers from that conference as a special edition on 'Mobility, Migration and Multi-culturalism in New Zealand'. In addition, this edition of Sites includes a section with articles on more generalised topics of interest, to which the general editor will speak at the end of this editorial.

Recent years have seen a growing interest, across the social sciences, in various questions of 'mobility'. Driven, of course, by ever increasing volumes of people moving across international boundaries – of refugees, economic migrants, tourists, and so on – much of this work has focused on the ways in which new forms of mobility challenge pre-existing understandings of social and geographical organization, whilst at the same time providing opportunities for the creation of entirely new forms of social imaginary. The present collection is offered as a contribution to this wider body of work, as an attempt to explore both the causal factors for some of these movements (such as the articles by Andrews and Dürr), as well as their impacts. In this regard, papers in this edition explore both the social issues these mobilities raise (as instanced in the paper by Morris, Vokes and Chang), and the new forms of social imaginary they help to forge (the work by Schäfer). Moreover, each of the contributions approaches this subject matter from a distinctly 'New Zealand' – or in Andrews' case, Australasian – perspective, and thus, taken together, the four articles begin to open up what New Zealand scholarship can contribute to these more general concerns within the wider social sciences. And this move would seem to be entirely appropriate to us, given that in some sense, New Zealand offers an almost unique perspective on the whole concept of mobility. After all, New Zealand has always been a nation which is made up of people on the move.

On the one hand, from the first Maori to the English, Scots, Irish, Dutch, Chinese and Indian settlers who began arriving in the late eighteenth cen-

tury onwards, all of the peoples living in these islands have always been, in a sense, immigrants of one sort or another (or else the descendents of recent immigrants). This trend has only increased in the last century. Thus, from the early 1960s onwards, the country has more or less consistently received about 10–15000 immigrants each year, most of them from Britain, Australia, and the Pacific Islands, although in recent years, from various East Asian countries as well (from South Korea, Taiwan, Japan, and elsewhere). Yet on the other hand, in addition to this story of in-migration, there is also that of out-migration. In this regard, it is significant that one in six people who were born in New Zealand no longer live here, but have instead migrated out (again, mostly to Britain, Ireland, and Australia, but also – increasingly – to the Pacific and East Asia as well). Interestingly, this gives New Zealand the second largest expatriot population, per head of capita, in the world (second only to Ireland). And if we add all those New Zealanders who are away travelling as part of their 'OEs', then we could probably say that New Zealanders travel outside of their own country more than do any other peoples in the world.

Yet we might also note here that many of those who have immigrated into New Zealand do not stay here, but also carry on to other countries (either returning to the ones from which they came, or others again). Indeed, it is perhaps ironic that a recent TV series on New Zealand immigration was called '*Here to Stay*'. This is because the vast majority of immigrants to this country do not stay. For example, census returns suggest that a majority of British migrants who 'settle' in New Zealand in fact stay for only a few years or so, before either returning to the UK, or else moving on to a third country. In addition, it is also relevant to point out just how mobile is New Zealand's 'internal population'. In this regard, the country once again tops the international rankings, New Zealanders moving internally, on average, once every nineteen months.

Thus, mobility, the general movement of people, has always been central to the New Zealand story. And it is not surprising that metaphors of movement, are central in many of the social imaginaries of this country. For example, they exist in the very idea of the New Zealand nation itself. In this regard, those two great theorists of 'nations' and 'nationalism', Benedict Anderson and Ernest Gellner, tell us that all nations are 'imagined communities', or in other words a particular type of social group in which a shared commitment to a key set of symbols and practices overcomes those differences which exist between members, thus forging a new sense of togetherness and belonging. Engagements with national flags, national anthems, national football teams, or whatever, enable people to forget their differences, and to feel a sense of 'togetherness'

with the wider national group. Now, it is interesting to note that in this regard, several of the key symbols of the New Zealand nation can be said to be 'mobile' in form. For example, as the sociologist Camilla Obel has shown, what originally made the All Blacks (one of) the primary symbols of the nation was precisely the fact that from the very beginning, the team moved around the country (either on local 'tours', or to play various international matches). In other words, during the early years of the twentieth century, in particular, in a time before New Zealand had either a national press, or a national education system – both of which Gellner sees as key to the dissemination of national symbols – the only way in which people in Southland, Palmerston North, Wanganui, or wherever, could engage with, or 'participate' in, the wider nation, could feel a sense of 'belonging to' the New Zealand nation, was by attending one of the games when the All Blacks came to town. And the All Blacks have, of course, remained important ever since.

In addition, we might also note here that the key symbolic figure of the 'national hero' is almost always someone who has travelled, or is in some other sense 'mobile'. On the one hand, some of this nation's key public figures have themselves immigrants (not least those individuals of Pacific Islands descent who have gone on to feature prominently in the All Blacks). On the other, some of the country's most important national heros have achieved fame precisely as a result of their epic journeys or travels (for example, Edmund Hillary, or Peter Blake). And of course, we must not forget here those original 'heros' of this nation, that group which in a sense first defined New Zealand as a nation (in its own right), the ANZACS, who became heros following events which occurred more than 10,000 miles away from the country's own shores, on the Gallipoli Peninsula. Thus, migration, mobility, and movements of people are fundamental, not only to the study of the society of New Zealand, but also to the very idea of this nation. Thus, just like the Anglo-Indians Andrews describes later in this volume, mobility can be said to lie at the very heart of New Zealanders' cultural identity.

Now, as anthropologists, we must of course be careful how we define the word 'culture'. Of course, we would not wish to reproduce the shortcomings of early uses of the term, as it was employed around the turn of the twentieth century, to refer to a specific outcome of evolutionary progress. After all, by this logic, 'culture' was but one thing, to which the 'lower races' of the world might well aspire, but which had only yet been 'achieved' by the 'higher' – i.e. Euro-American – 'civilizations'. Later, however, Euro-American confidence in evolutionism began to falter – not least in response to the bloody slaughters

of Gallipoli and elsewhere – and as it did so, the meaning of the word 'culture' changed. Specifically, later scholars began to think of culture not just as something which only Euro-Americans had, but instead as something which everyone, everywhere in the world, had; hence, the world as a plurality of 'cultures', a 'patchwork' of separate, and distinct, cultural groups. Moreover, over time, specific attributes began to attach to this notion of different cultural groups, not least, ideas about geography – i.e. that all members of 'a culture' are from a specific place – language – they all speak one language – various psychological dimensions – they share perspectives, 'values' – and so on. Thus, a cultural group was cast as a group of people who had a single place of origin, who spoke a single language, who had a single, shared set of perspectives and values, and so on. In some senses, it is this vision of cultural difference, which is in many ways still with us (in popular discourse, if not academic), which the new mobilities seem to challenge. As more and more people move around the world – for a variety of reasons – others feel that their own sense of cultural identity is 'under threat', that their distinctive sense of place, their language, their shared 'values' and being 'diluted' and undermined. It is this sentiment which fuels the kind of popular anti-immigration feeling, and other negative sentiments, with which so many 'Western' countries are today so familiar.

Yet in this sense, New Zealand again provides a unique perspective. Because in relation to this 'patchwork' model of culture, the New Zealand context was *always* more complicated. In other words, given that all New Zealanders have arrived here from diverse places of origin, that many have contributed different linguistic forms – in terms of accents, idioms, dialects, and so on – it has simply never made any sense (and it still does not), to define a New Zealand 'culture' in such narrow, exclusionary and internally homogenous terms. Instead, we surely must think of New Zealand as having always been an 'intercultural' milieu from the start, and as a place made up of all of the different people, ideas and values which have arrived here over the years. No where is this more obvious than in relation to (what many hold as) the 'core' values of Kiwi society – egalitarianism and the 'fair-go' mentality – both of which, the historian David Hastings has recently argued, cannot be reduced to any one of the various immigrant groups which have come to New Zealand, but which are both, instead, an outcome of the inter-cultural 'melting-pot' of the wakas and ships which brought the early groups of settlers to New Zealand.

Moreover, for these same reasons, New Zealand, as both society and culture, is better able to both engage with, and to accept, other, new cultures, than is almost any other country in the (so-called) 'Western' world. Indeed, it is for

precisely these reasons that Kiwi travellers travel to a wider range of countries than do the tourists of any other country (and why tourists from so many other places come here as Dürr's article explores for German tourists), and that Kiwis engage in more 'mixed marriages' than do people of any other country in the world. (This is not only in regard to those between Maori and Pakeha which are the subject of Schäfer's writing; but, in addition, New Zealand citizens today are married to people of no less than 160 different nationalities). Thus, New Zealand *should be* particularly well placed to respond to the 'new' forms of mobility – i.e. new types of migration – which have emerged in the last thirty years or so, in response to what is sometimes called 'globalization', (and to forge new forms of inter-culturality from this). In this regard, over the over the last three decades, various factors, including new economic realities, new high speed communications, and so on, have in New Zealand – as in all 'Western' countries (and in others besides) – resulted in increasing numbers of immigrants, from an ever growing number of source countries (particularly, in New Zealand's case, from East Asian states such as South Korea, Taiwan and Japan). However, as two of the articles here highlight (Dürr and Morris, Vokes and Chang), these new mobilities also present significant challenges. Thus, the German tourists Dürr describes, generate about 650kg of CO_2 emissions getting to their 'pristine' natural paradise, whilst in the context of the new Korean migration to Christchurch that Morris, Vokes and Chang describe, the general egalitarian and 'fair-go' ethos seems to find it limits.

Nevertheless, for all of these reasons, New Zealand represents an ideal site from which to study the 'new' mobilities, their logics and outcomes, and the new forms of social imaginary which result from them. Thus, it is not surprising that New Zealand based scholars have begun to engage such questions so carefully.

To turn now to the articles published under the general section of this volume, surprisingly there is also a coherence to these articles which emphasises this current scholarly interest in the issues of mobility and mutability, although these articles address the notion of mobility and identity from perhaps a slightly more ethereal dimension than the more concrete examples we have discussed so far. Carl Mika's exploration of the sacredness of Maori language focuses on the fluidity and mutability of the concept of mauri to argue his point that sacredness is embodied in certain acts of speaking the Reo. To pin its meaning down through literal translation in such contexts, he suggests, is to rob the world of an experience of the sacred sphere. While ably articulating this dilemma for fluent speakers of Te Reo, he leaves us all to ponder, in our

varied levels of experience with Te Reo, of the courses which speakers might take to reinvigorate appropriate speech acts with this experience of the numinous and furthermore exactly how we should theorise this aspect of language use.

Ideas of movement, change, and contestation are further taken up by Patrick McAllister with his article which studies the annual Waitangi Day ceremonies in New Zealand as a continuing performance or renegotiation of the Treaty of Waitangi between Maori and Pakeha. For McAllister, it seems the meaning of the Treaty lies precisely *in* the performance of these ceremonies – either rejected, endorsed or ignored, (and most frequently very complex and artful selections of all of these elements) the performances reveal with hair trigger precision the state of political relationships between Maori and Pakeha in successive years. While his reading suggests that Waitangi Day may not be iconic for *all* New Zealanders, his attention to the embodiment of the treaty through varied and recurring cultural performances strikes an interesting resonance with Mika's reflections as both a lawyer and an academic on the embodiment of the sacred in the act of speaking Te Reo.

A further article in this section which links to the idea of an iconic New Zealand symbol is the piece by Lloyd and McGovern on 'Blanket Man' a person living in the fluid uncertainty of life on the streets of Wellington. Blanket Man literally embodies iconic status and is the subject of several entries in Wikipedia and other internet sources of information about popularly recognisable local figures. In a brief period of fieldwork, Lloyd and McGovern study the passersby who interact with Blanket Man quite as much as they study the man himself. The result is a fine article which ruminates upon the meaning of fame in contemporary New Zealand society and the charisma of Blanket Man who attracts in equal measures both the irritating invasions of personal body space associated with fame as well as the romanticised admiration of the passersby.

The final article in this edition is written by Glover and Rousseau and deals with the issue of a variety of Maori understandings of the importance of fertility and the uses of the new reproductive technologies. One of a series of articles from a larger research project with multiple authors and research partners, this particular article suggests a fluidity and array of strategies for 'making sense' of one's connections with the wider family and ancestors and particularly with regard to how one understands one's children's place within the whakapapa when making use of such technologies.

In conclusion, once again, it is a pleasure to bring such an interesting and thoughtful series of articles to our readership. Thank you all for your continued support of *Sites* and (via this support) the advancement of reflexive scholarship both within Aoteraoa New Zealand and the wider Pacific and Pacific Rim region.

Carolyn Morris and *Richard Vokes* (Guest Editors)
and *Ruth Fitzgerald* (General Editor)