

Maori Architecture: Transforming Western Notions of Architecture

Bill McKay

This paper summarises concepts developed in the study of post-contact Maori architecture, particularly the buildings of religious and political movements during the colonial and post-colonial periods. The focus is not so much on what this architecture is, but how an understanding of Maori architecture can lead to a questioning of Western architectural values. In New Zealand this would seem to be particularly pertinent if the two main cultures, bound to a relationship by the Treaty of Waitangi (1840), are to formulate a way to happily cohabit in this land.

It is no longer sufficient to bring Western notions or theoretical frames to indigenous architecture. Indigenous architecture has something to teach the West and particularly those of us who live in the region. We can discern underlying architectural conceptions related to culture, which may suggest possibilities for the development of an understanding of architectural form more appropriate to a South Pacific milieu than a European background.

An examination of Maori architecture and the buildings of the South Pacific should not aim to take and incorporate Maori architecture and art into the body of Western knowledge or conventional notions of architecture. Rather this architecture can influence and transform Western ideas of architecture, time, space and our methodology, open up the possibilities of new architectural form and enrich our understanding of how one can live in the world of the South Pacific.

A New World

In New Zealand, European settlers found a new world full of strange new flora and fauna, new landscapes, a different climate, and a new race — the Maori. It is conventionally believed that New Zealand settlers, builders and architects have worked to develop an architecture responding to this new world — an architecture reflecting vernacular and indigenous structures, suiting the local climate, built of native materials, and with social concerns framed around the needs of the New Zealand family.

However it can be argued that Pakeha (New Zealanders of European descent) culture has not grown a new architecture in a new land, rather it has rebuilt the landscape to suit a largely transplanted architecture. By the time New Zealand was colonized, late in terms of world history, the colonial process was efficient and well practiced. It can be argued that European colonists in nineteenth-

century New Zealand did not so much build to suit the new land but altered the land to suit the buildings they imported. In the mid-nineteenth century changes to the landscape were vast and swift—forests were felled, land was cleared, new grasses replaced the native, introduced animals supplanted the indigenous, roads and railways were driven through hills. By the end of the nineteenth century the process of transforming New Zealand into a little England was largely complete and Samuel Hurst Seager could look around and pronounce “that we have no style, no distinctive forms of (architectural) art ... our cities are chiefly made up of architectural quotations”.¹ In their 1949 tract ‘The Modern House’ Paul Pascoe and Humphrey Hall found that “except for the typical carving on early Maori buildings, there is little in New Zealand architecture that can be said to be distinctive or indigenous.”²

Although Maori communities based in rural areas maintained their culture, to many Maori it was as if they found themselves in a new world: the grassy hills, rolling pastures, market gardens and pine forests of New Zealand are a Northern Hemisphere reconstruction of the landscape. In addition, the social and political landscapes shifted as well. A new system of land use and ownership was imposed and new laws and institutions established: Maori had a new world thrust upon them and had to make a way to live in it. It is in Maori architecture that we must look therefore to find the architecture of te ao hou, “the new land”, New Zealand. Many Maori strongly resisted Pakeha encroachment yet their buildings also incorporated Western forms and motifs for their own ends. They took what they wanted from each culture to forge a way ahead, creating new buildings for new needs in a new land, staking a claim in a new world.

Pakeha and Maori

New Zealand is unusual in that a Treaty was established in 1840 setting out the arrangement by which the two peoples would cohabit in the land. The application and precise detail of this contract continues to be debated and there is ongoing argument over the precise nature of the relationship between the two peoples. Pakeha have always been involved in the study and discussion of Maori architecture, indeed they have dominated it. Recently it has been argued that Pakeha should not be involved due to a lack of cultural, contextual and detailed knowledge, the impossibility of fully understanding the motivating ideas and beliefs of Maori, and the dominance of the Pakeha majority over the Maori minority.

Much Maori architecture is however linked to Pakeha through the use of common forms or methods or authors. There has been almost as much architectural trading of ideas, symbols, forms and technology between the cultures as that of material goods. For example the Maori meeting house developed partially as a result of European contact, through new functional requirements, for new social reasons, in competition with Pakeha churches and through the possibilities of new technology. For example Rua Kenana’s council house, Hiona, was inspired by the Dome of the Rock in Jerusalem, and several buildings of the Ratana movement involved Pakeha in their design and construction. Much Maori architecture of the last 200 years is a response to Pakeha presence in Te Ao Hou, the New World.

Maori Architecture

As sites of cultural representation and as assertions of Maori values, these buildings are best understood and explained by Maori, but they are also often sending a message to Pakeha. Both peoples are linked in a complex architectural relationship, whether we like it or not, and Pakeha can usefully report on the view from their side, as part of our cultural dialogue and our cohabitation of the land. We are well aware of the hazards of cultural misunderstanding or misreading these days, but we are also aware through contemporary theory that the response and interpretation of an audience can be as justifiably valid as the original intention of the author.

Historically, years of Pakeha scholarship have proved inadequate at explaining Maori architecture and art. The Pakeha role should not be the traditional Western one of observing, interrogating, attempting to dissect, explain and understand. These days Pakeha scholarship in the field of historiography—how histories have been constructed and how buildings have been represented—is often proving more revealing than attempts at history itself.

Representation

As Priscilla Pitts has written:

The New Zealand landscape is a hotly contested site – of physical possession, of naming, mapping and journeying, of warring and of tribal, racial and personal memory. It is in truth, an occupied zone whose constantly reread and rewritten histories do not lie in quiescent layers but jostle, shift, and thrust, as changing and unstable as the land itself.³

A number of histories of New Zealand art trace representations of Maori through the three centuries since European contact and a variety of viewpoints are apparent such as Maori as noble savage, blood thirsty warrior, fine craftsman, sad remnant of once proud race, etc.⁴ Through New Zealand art one can trace the classic Western picture of a traditional tribal society, who once were warriors, who produced objects of fine craftsmanship; a society that reached a peak, became sullied by contact with Westerners, learnt bad ways and fell into decay. However there have been few attempts at a similar analysis of representations of Maori architecture in museums, texts, illustrations, books and histories, and how this has coloured and shaped our perception of them.

Generally Westerners have admired the highly crafted whare whakairo (meeting house) and are baffled by some other buildings such as the Ratana churches, Rua Kenana's buildings or the niu poles of the Pai Marire movement for instance, that seem to lack traditional motifs or indigenous authority. The processes of Pakeha selection and representation have reflected the political and cultural concerns of the times. For example, our knowledge of Maori architecture in the post-contact period has been channelled by politics, museums and texts into a focus on a stereotyped form of meeting house, rather than exploring the diversity of buildings, structures and flags that often trade forms, materials and motifs across cultures. This diversity has troubled Westerners and been perceived as the loss of indigenous authenticity, rather than being viewed as a constant process of change and adaptation that all societies go through. These works have consequently often been marginalised as “folk art”,⁵ considered illegitimate, not properly Maori. Indeed these buildings are not a Pakeha's idea of what Maori

architecture is, but nevertheless it is what Maori have been doing for much of the last 200 years.

The Meeting House

Pakeha have considered the meeting house as the most authentic form of Maori building. However a wide variety of meeting houses demonstrate a variety of materials and motifs and a surprising fluidity of form as each generation seems to adapt the building for its own particular needs, and the same building can go through several incarnations. New Zealand architectural history largely sees the meeting house, particularly the Arawa example of the highly carved *whare whakairo* centred round Rotorua, as the primary architectural form or archetype of an homogenous group, the Maori people. This view does not recognise the comparative youth of the meeting house form (it is largely a nineteenth-century invention), the diversity of meeting houses (springing as they do from a variety of tribes and displaying architectural, regional authorial and generational differences), and the variety of buildings produced by many Morehu or pan-tribal movements of the last 150 years.

The meeting house is a structure that has evolved from earlier chiefs' houses during European settlement of New Zealand and is a communal building for a *whanau* (extended family group) or *hapu* (sub-tribe) to gather in. Known as *whare nui* (big house) or *whare whakairo* (carved and decorated house), the meeting house is a structure consisting of one large space entered through a gabled porch. This internal space is often highly decorated with carvings, *tukutuku* (woven panels), *kowhaiwhai* (painted patterns on rafters), and has few if any windows. The carvings or illustrations all have symbolic meaning and usually depict ancestors. The house is also often metaphorically a body, the personification of an ancestor, with the ridge beam and rafters often seen as spine and ribs for instance.

Meeting houses were seen as suitable exhibits for New Zealand's museums and each main centre acquired a meeting house. However these houses were often altered: for example Auckland Museum's meeting house *Hotunui* (1878) had its original corrugated iron roof replaced with thatch and a coat of red paint covered its polychrome carvings. This had the effect of emphasising generic similarities and typicality of form, setting up the notion of a norm or standard against which the authenticity of others can be compared, rather than exploring the richness and diversity of architectural, authorial, regional and generational difference.

The meeting house is not an ancient form: it is a late eighteenth-century, largely nineteenth-century development and the product of interaction with Pakeha culture, an assertive response to the forces of colonization and settlement. As traditional tribal structures, forms of authority and social organisation were eroded during the colonial period, the meeting house was developed through new functional requirements, for new social reasons, and through the possibilities of new technology. It quickly became the focus of Maori social organisation and cultural representation. Meeting house is an appropriate name: it developed in a time of intertribal contact and realignment, when much discussion occurred regarding land, politics and religion. It competed with churches, both in size and scale and the provision of a large communal interior space. The meeting house

Maori Architecture

became a repository of tribal mana (prestige, power) and history in a time of change, loss of land and cultural erosion.

There are many published texts and books on meeting houses but these easily slip into a Western focus on construction, materials, decoration and craft, which have historically characterised most texts on this subject. But Western taxonomy with its formal classifications works only to imply a sense of physical order and standardisation, giving the impression of homogeneity in meeting house form and Maori society and culture. Of course the reverse is true: traditional Maori society is tribal, and there is a lot more variety in the house tradition, encompassing large and small houses, painted and carved varieties and a diversity of forms, intentions and purposes.

By the twentieth century few Maori movements advocating the return of customary lands, rights and mana (such as those led by Tahupotiki Wiremu Ratana and Rua Kenana) were using the architectural form of the meeting house: they had turned to different forms. However the parliamentarian Apirana Ngata was one who did believe in the need to preserve the customary arts and skills and he was a major force in the establishment of the first national school of Maori arts and design in Rotorua. Pakeha Arts & Crafts architects (reflecting a global interest in the crafts of other cultures) were enthused by the local example of the carved meeting house, and the 1920s also saw a New Zealand nationalism and search for symbols and emblems of nationhood such as native flora and fauna, Maori and Maori motifs and forms that by now posed no threat to the Pakeha majority. The 1940 Centenary of the Treaty of Waitangi also marked a Government interest in supporting construction or restoration of meeting houses such as that at Waitangi and Tama-te-Kapua at Ohinemutu in Rotorua.

By the mid twentieth century New Zealand architects (along with artists and writers) were seeking the development of a distinctive New Zealand voice and identity. A part of this was consciousness of the architectural history of their own land: indigenous and vernacular buildings such as the meeting house, the settlers buildings, and the farm shed provided these local expressions of building fit for the climate, constructed of local materials and supposedly untainted by the influence of imported styles or middle class tastes. The meeting house form occasionally appears or is referenced in modern New Zealand architecture such as churches (for example John Scott's Futuna Chapel, Wellington (1958), Richard Toy's All Saints Church, Auckland (1959), Paul Pascoe's Chapel at Arthur's Pass (1956)). Whether this reference to the meeting house form is called assimilatory or supportive or appropriative, one result is that it again had the effect of stereotyping Maori architecture in the eyes of Pakeha. Repeated reference to the meeting house implied that this was the sole authentic example of Maori building. In addition modernist stripping of detail and stylisation of form in architectural allusion, suppressed what was the essence of the meeting house. To John Scott, one of the first Maori to study architecture, the literal representation of the meeting house was pointless:

The wharepuni [sleeping house] has a spiritual basis and the building itself is unimportant. The Maori will not worry about buildings but he will worry about those particular kinds of things he has around—the carvings, the teko-teko [tukutuku] work.⁶

Here we have an example of how modern New Zealand architecture absorbed and transformed the meeting house, seeing it in the conventional Western modernist terms of primary architectural form and secondary interior decoration, rather than acknowledging the different architectural concepts embodied in the meeting house. Much of the house's purpose is symbolic or mnemonic, rather than being aesthetically driven. It is not a decorated shell in the way that Western architecture divorces interior design. The carving, painting and weaving are not embellishments, they are essential to the house.

The Diversity of Maori Architecture and Design

Without doubt the meeting house is seen by both Pakeha and Maori as the pre-eminent architectural form of Maori and iwi (tribe). However the meeting house has become stereotyped as the sole form of Maori architectural expression by Pakeha museums, histories and architectural references. This view does not recognise the comparative youth and diversity of the meeting house form and the variety of buildings produced by many Morehu (non-tribal-specific or pan-tribal) movements of the last 150 years. These movements were opposed to the Government and actively sought the restoration of Maori lands, rights and mana. Just as they put down the taiaha (traditional weapon) and took up the musket, Maori seem to have often eschewed customary practice in their buildings, and evolved new techniques and forms to face the challenge of a radically changing world. Examples of this include the niu poles of the Pai Marire movement (also known as Hau Hau) led by Te Ua Haumene, buildings at Parihaka, buildings of the Kingitanga movement, Rua Kenana's settlement at Maungapohatu in the 1910s and T W Ratana's hall and church building of the 1920s through to the 1950s, not to mention the hundreds of symbols and flags devised. These all eschew the use of any meeting house forms or customary motifs. Many of these structures are not well known, perhaps because of the political views of their architects.

Meeting house building was matched by the patterns of building of these Maori movements opposed to the Government. Many Maori leaders of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries were prophets, claiming visions and messages from a divine source. This allowed them to claim an authority and to establish credentials for leadership that they would not have under traditional tribal organisation. Likewise, appropriating new forms and symbols allowed a more universal identification or pan-tribal appeal rather than the tribal signatures apparent in traditional forms. The niu pole is one of the first appropriations of a European form for political purposes. Before that, of course, Maori adapted Pakeha items such as tools, clothing or food for practical purposes. But the political aims of Pai Marire make it clear this is not assimilation, but an appropriation, taking European forms and using them for Pai Marire's own ends.

Many of the buildings and designs of Maori have been categorised as folk art and neglected in New Zealand architecture—that is they were not considered properly Maori or authentically indigenous. Partially this was because they had been viewed without consideration of the context of their times and the motivating ideas and beliefs of their crafters. It wasn't until the late twentieth century that these buildings came to be seen as a response to Pakeha incursion, a counter-colonial gesture rather than an attempt at assimilation or an aping of

Maori Architecture

Western style.⁷ Many Maori strongly resisted Pakeha encroachment yet their buildings also incorporated Western forms and motifs for Maori purposes. This statement by Jill Malcolm in an *Air New Zealand* magazine, accompanying photographs by Robin Morrison and Laurence Aberhart, is a typical summation of the conventional view and confusion as to what constitutes Maori architecture and design—a debate that continues among Maori as well:

In the far north of New Zealand are the remnants of much of the country's early history ... some churches are styled after the Ratana temple or simply on the whim of some pious individual ... the Tempara [Temepara] Ratana is built of concrete ... but most of the churches that copy it are crudely constructed ... there are no Maori designs or decorations ... the whetu marama symbol is crudely painted on the wall of this tiny isolated church found in a field ... it looks alone and abandoned⁸

This text makes these buildings out to be odd, dead, alone, and the product of eccentric individuals. It also purports to tell Maori what is or is not Maori design. Many Maori movements took what they wanted from each culture to forge a way ahead, creating new buildings for new needs, staking a claim in a new world. The political tone of these groups may have helped marginalise them in New Zealand history, but these buildings reflect the most radical hopes and beliefs of their times. They are not a Pakeha's idea of what is Maori, but they are what Maori have been creating.

Time and Space

Western notions of space, time and terrestrial reality may affect the perception of building form in other cultures, and have constrained our understanding of the indigenous architecture of the South Pacific. It is fair to say that the Western perception of architecture is primarily visual and the building is seen as an object sitting in space whereas indigenous and pre-Modern buildings offer a more haptic experience of architecture.⁹

Several writers have discussed the Western concept of linear, strictly measured time as a colonial tool. For example Donna Awatere, in her 1984 book *Maori Sovereignty*, wrote on the concepts underlying “white culture's” conflict with Maori values and remarked on the West's conception of time as a colonial tool:

Spatialisation of Time: In this concept the present is all important. The dimensions of time have been collapsed into space. This occurred when time began to be measured and quantified. It was no longer tied to the cyclic rhythm of nature and to the ancestor's rhythm of life and death.¹⁰

Therefore, Maori are not just physically separated from their land under colonialism, the Western concept of time serves as a mechanism to dislocate Maori from their culture as well. Awatere goes on to state:

... the intimate, mimetic reciprocal relationship between the human being, nature and the living past of the ancestors, was replaced by a time experienced as space and mediated by a history ‘frozen’ into a mechanically measured dimension by genealogically unrelated people.¹¹

In other words, that the land “lost its spiritual meaning”, crucial for its transfer to Pakeha and the beginning of industrialisation.¹² The “squeezing of time into the

spatial present"¹³ also leads to a devaluing of the past, knowledge of the past, and experience, then consequently a devaluing of old people, of old ways, and of old things, and finally (as we know from critiques of capitalism) a devaluation of the human being into a temporary source of labour.

The Maori conception of time has been characterized by terms such as cyclic, spiral and resonant. Certainly we are well aware of the notion that agricultural, hunting and gathering societies are more attuned to the rhythms of the tides and seasons as opposed to the Western focus on progress and development. The industrialised society's sense of divorce from the natural world is well known, but we still tend to read 'Maori time' more as an affinity with the natural world (akin to 'village time' or 'rural time') rather than, as Maori say, a deeper engagement with time than space. Westerners think of their location in time as similar to a stream, backs turned to the past, poised in the present, facing the future, being carried relentlessly into the future, but never arriving. The Maori space-time construct can be thought of more 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.

The Maori word for future is *muri*, also meaning behind, because it cannot be seen. The Maori word for the past is *mua*, also meaning in front. As Ranginui Walker writes:

So the Maori faces the present and the past which are in front of him. In this time-frame he has before him the living, their forebears, the dead, the founding ancestors, the cultural heroes of mythology and the gods back to the primeval pair Ranginui and Papatuanuku. This time-frame is the basis of *marae* protocol¹⁴

Apart from showing an attitude to time diametrically opposed to the Western, this implies the primacy of both relationships and links in time (as opposed to the purely physical or spatial) in Maori thought. In the Pacific the indigenous people define themselves tribally, through who they are related to, rather than spatially, the region they happen to be born in. Maori, it would seem, are constantly aware of history, living deeply in time, so that everything in the physical world provokes remembering, rather than focusing on the immediate spatial world and its possibilities. The implication is that, in contrast, Pakeha live more out of time, removed from history, easily forgetting, putting it behind them, living in a purely physical and spatial world.

The meeting house contains many carvings or illustrations depicting ancestors, and it is also often metaphorically a body, the personification of an ancestor. The house is often directly acknowledged by Maori in the same way one would address a person: it is not simply a building, a container for human activity. This emphasis on the front face, facade and interior, has often been interpreted by Western culture as a crudity of form, but it should be understood in the same way we greet a fellow human being: we address the face rather than the body or rear. This emphasis would seem to collapse Western notions of architecture (as the three dimensional object in space) into a skin between inside and outside, the two profound poles of human existence.

Maori Architecture

The meeting house has a mnemonic function, it aids remembering, it acknowledges and iterates a connection with the past in contrast to the timelessness and eternal youth desired in modern architecture of the West. It is clear that the house does what Pallasmaa¹⁵ finds modern architecture does not: it provides us with both our domicile in space and it mediates our relation with time. To take this further, it can be argued that Maori architecture may not conform to the formal Western model of the object in space and could better be understood as existing in time rather than space. A visit to a marae involves a series of events such as challenge and welcome, all of which is primarily experienced in time rather than space. Through protocol, one's progression is linear, towards the face or facade of the house. But even after the welcome, one does not walk around the house and look at the sides and rear: it is not intended to be seen as an object in the round, in space. Even contemporary meeting house designers have constructed houses whose rears disappear into the ground. This has previously been interpreted as a desire for ultimate spatial enclosure or a closer relationship with the earth or land, but it can be suggested that it is because the external rear of the building doesn't matter: it can disappear. This is not a two dimensional approach to architecture, rather it is a temporal understanding of architecture: we experience it in the same way as we experience the land or fellow people, through a series of steps in time. Our engagement with people and buildings exists more in time than in space.

Mutability

Western society prefers its buildings to be permanent, durable and lasting. Much of the architecture of the South Pacific shows a transience of form and materials that has been commented on by many writers. The Samoan *fale* (house) for instance is designed to allow a cyclone to strip its thatch, then it is repaired. This has generally been considered as a crudity of construction, a failing, in contrast to modern cyclone-resistant concrete construction. but it could also be seen as a desirable mutability, responsiveness or flexibility. Sarah Treadwell, writing on digital film architecture found a parallel between a time-based approach to design and Pacific architecture:

Architecture of the Pacific is premised on mobility, lightly fabricated and impermanent. Foundational security, traditionally at the heart of architecture's enterprises and already doubtful in New Zealand, is offset by tendencies to movement and lightness. The permeability of architecture in the Pacific, its flexibility and responsiveness to weather, can be seen as a foregrounding of the virtual nature of space as a dimension of the real.¹⁶

Westerners privilege the solid and permanent, and see architecture as primarily a physical object in space. Abhorrence of time and its effects is part of a Western architectural bias as Pallasmaa has argued.¹⁷ Other cultures of the South Pacific accept time and the processes of time as a part of building; they accept mortality as part of architecture. Mostafavi and Leatherbarrow,¹⁸ in their discussion of the effects of time (weathering, erosion, decay), show that these are not usually considered as positive elements in Western design: time and the elements are the enemies of building, the architectural artifact wishes to remain youthful, to exist in a timeless space, an artificial condition separated from time. This durability and timelessness can be seen as the antithesis of some enormously important

Maori cultural values such as a respect for age, the importance of a connection with the past, and the importance of connection with the land and the physical world.

Meeting houses are often allowed to age and decay, as human beings do, then are adapted or rebuilt by a new generation, in a different form, reflecting the needs and concerns of that generation. For example this surprising fluidity of form can be seen in meeting houses such as Rongopai and Te Tokanganui a Noho, and buildings of the Ratana movement such as the Manuao, the branch churches and Omeka Marae. These buildings have been rebuilt a number of times and seem to constantly change and transform: they are a series of incarnations rather than one building, and it has proved difficult for Western scholarship to pin their facts down in time. This can be contrasted with the Western preservation of historic buildings, where the inhabitants are removed and the building frozen at a certain moment in time. There are numerous examples world wide of this mummification of architecture. In Maori architecture buildings are recycled, changing the original, but ensuring it will live on as both spiritually and functionally useful to the inhabitants. A culture going through a time of change and coming to grips with its place in a new world cannot have imposed on its architecture the same rules as others. The Western style approach to building conservation and preservation can become a political constraint.

The timber and organic materials that Maori buildings were traditionally constructed from compelled a constant process of reconstruction to avoid decay. In fact this need for constant renovation and rebuilding had the effect of galvanizing support from local communities and cementing relationships as Maori worked together on building projects. This process also provided the continuing opportunity to practice and pass on construction skills to the next generation. What has not been fully explored is the effect of recycling materials on the architectural logic of a building: a recycled ridge beam for instance may contain old notches irrelevant to its new use and this weakens a functional reading of the structure, building up layers of contradiction that as Pallasmaa has written “wipes away the layers of utility, rational logic and detail articulation.”¹⁹ To Westerners this is often read as a lack of skill or craft, and the structures become characterised as mere buildings rather than architecture.

Conclusion

Western study of indigenous architecture is frequently focused on customary practice, which is considered to be traditional and more authentic than the hybrid structures of the contact, colonial and contemporary periods. This can lead to a stereotyping and homogenisation of an indigenous culture’s architecture, rather than exploring diversity and development. Architectural history also tends to focus on architectural form and decoration rather than context and the motivating ideas and beliefs of the builders.

We must look at the wider intent and architectural purpose of Maori and South Pacific concepts of architectural space and form. Western architectural theorists such as Pallasmaa, Levin, Harries,²⁰ Mostafavi and Leatherbarrow are questioning Western architectural values from an experiential and humanist point of view, for instance, but it is not sufficient to bring Western notions or

Maori Architecture

theoretical frames to indigenous architecture. This architecture has something to teach the West and particularly those of us who live in the region. We need to discern underlying architectural conceptions related to culture which may suggest possibilities for the development of an understanding of architectural form more appropriate to a South Pacific milieu than a European background. An examination of Maori architecture and the buildings of the South Pacific should not aim to take and incorporate Maori architecture and art into the body of Western knowledge or conventional notions of architecture. Rather this architecture can influence and transform Western ideas of architecture, time, space and methodology, open up the possibilities of new architectural form and enrich our understanding of how one can live in the world of the South Pacific.

Notes

- ¹ Samuel Hurst Seager, 'Architectural Art in NZ', *RIBA Journal*, 7 (1899-1900): 481.
- ² Paul Pascoe and Humphrey Hall, 'The Modern House', *Landfall*, 1, 2 (June 1947): 124.
- ³ Priscilla Pitts, 'The Unquiet Earth', in M Barr (ed), *Headlands: Thinking Through NZ Art*, Sydney: Museum of Contemporary Art, 1992, p 87.
- ⁴ See for example: Leonard Bell, *Colonial Constructs: European Images of Maori 1840-1914*, Auckland: Auckland University Press, 1992.
- ⁵ See for example: Alan Taylor, *Maori Folk Art*, Auckland: Century Hutchinson, 1988.
- ⁶ Interview with John Scott, 'Of Woolsheds, Houses and People', *Islands* 5, 2, 3 (Spring 1973): 290.
- ⁷ See for example: Deidre Brown, *Moorehu Architecture*, PhD Thesis, University of Auckland, 1997.
- ⁸ Illustration caption in Jill Malcolm, 'Northern Worship', *Pacific Way*, 58 (February 1993): 54-55.
- ⁹ D M Levin, *Modernity and the Hegemony of Vision*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.
- ¹⁰ Donna Awatere, *Maori Sovereignty*, Auckland: Broadsheet, 1984, p 60.
- ¹¹ Awatere, *Maori Sovereignty*, p 61.
- ¹² Awatere, *Maori Sovereignty*, pp 61-62.
- ¹³ Awatere, *Maori Sovereignty*, p 63.
- ¹⁴ Ranginui Walker, 'A Lot To Learn About Time', *New Zealand Listener* (1982): 59-60
- ¹⁵ Juhani Pallasmaa, 'Hapticity and Time: Notes on a Fragile Architecture', *Architectural Review*, 207, 1239 (May 2000), pp 78-84.
- ¹⁶ Sarah Treadwell, 'Digital Weather: Pacific Space', in Eu Jin Chua and Miriam Bellard (eds), *Quickenings-Digital Film Architecture*, Auckland: The NZ Film Archive, 2002.
- ¹⁷ Pallasmaa, 'Hapticity and Time'.
- ¹⁸ M Mostafavi and D Leatherbarrow, *On Weathering*, Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1993.
- ¹⁹ Pallasmaa, 'Hapticity and Time', p 82.
- ²⁰ K Harries, 'Building and the Terror of Time', *Perspectia: The Yale Architectural Journal*, 19, 1982.