

We have learned an “astonishing” lesson from the virus: we have actually proven that it is possible, in a few weeks, to put an economic system on hold everywhere in the world and at the same time, a system that we were told it was impossible to slow down or redirect.

—“What Protective Measures Can You Think of so We Don’t Go Back to the Pre-crisis Production Model?,” Bruno Latour

Giving voice to what many have been thinking, Bruno Latour penned a short essay on post-COVID futures eighteen days after the WHO declared COVID-19 a global pandemic. He admitted that it might be premature to imagine a post-COVID future in the midst of ongoing suffering and death, but he also argued for the necessity of thinking through how we might recover from the global pandemic “so that the economic recovery, once the crisis has passed, does not bring back the same former climatic regime against which we were battling, until now somewhat in vain” (Latour 2020, 1).

Putting the whole economic system on “pause”—or as Gerda Roelvink (2020) puts it, stopping the unstoppable—generates a moment in which both its form and trajectory can be called into question. Similarly, Arundhati Roy

Grounded! COVID-19 and Recovering Postcapitalist Possibility in Place

*Stephen Healy,
Matthew Scobie,
& Kelly Dombroski*

(2020) uses the term “portal” to describe this experience of rapid change that gives further insight into possible futures. Like Roy, Latour, and others, we take the opportunity here to think about how our societies might imagine, enact, restore, and rebuild other economies as a basis for other worlds. In our view, how long this portal can be kept open is a crucial political question. Many world leaders, channeling what Kaika (2017) calls “resilience talk,” are hoping for a quick “snap back” to normal. Drawing on this same language, our interest is in exploring how we might “bounce forward” through the portal and do so in ways where our considered and careful response to COVID sets in motion a sustained response to climate change.

Holding this portal open is a difficult task that is both material and imaginary in nature. Attempting to force it closed is the wish for things to return to “normal,” a wish that takes on different inflections in different places; here, the United States and New Zealand serve as points of contrast. For New Zealand’s major opposition party, a return to normal means pushing for a return to tourism and other activities that are currently suspended, balanced against the necessary border-control measures needed to contain the virus (Moir 2020). In contrast, for the United States the return to normal is already underway: reopening the economy amounts to

Trumpian-hubris: acting as if the COVID-19 crisis were already over, as if humans rather than the virus set the timeline. For some in the United States the desire for normal is fueled by powerlessness, economic precarity, and fatalism: the uncertainty of the virus weighed against the certainty of unemployment and a lack of health insurance. This desire for normalcy persists even if returning to normal also means returning to ravenous extraction, ongoing exploitation, inequality, overwork, overconsumption, overproduction, mass tourism, and polluting traffic. With a sigh, we might comfort ourselves and say that returning to normal means economic growth and, with growth, a chance for work.

But we can also see in the present moment a great many for whom there is no going back to normal. In the distant past of November 2019, the slogan for antiausterity in Chile and Greece was “We cannot return to normal; normal is the problem.” Normal is (still) the problem. Our capacity to keep normal at bay, to hold the portal open, depends upon articulating a better alternative and developing a politics capable of bringing it into being.

Latour’s essay concludes with a practical exercise revolving around a set of six questions and prompts. In essence, Latour asks us to think through the following: What suspended activities would we *not* like to see return? What do we do with the people and materials enrolled

This desire for normalcy persists even if returning to normal also means returning to ravenous extraction, ongoing exploitation, inequality, overwork, overconsumption, overproduction, mass tourism, and polluting traffic.

in these activities? How do we transition them? And, finally, what activities presently suspended should begin again, and why? What new activities would we like to see emerge (Latour 2020, 3–4)?

These are not new questions for us in our respective and collective work in rethinking economies as members of the Community Economies Research Network (CERN).¹ In recent weeks, Australian and New Zealand members of this group have been exploring the parallels between Latour’s questions and the work of diverse- and

community-economies scholarship, which draws on many theoretical traditions—including Marxian, feminist, and decolonial theories, among others—to reframe economies as sites of ethical deliberation and political possibility beyond capitalism. We do this in part by rethinking

what is necessary for shared survival, how we distribute surplus labor, and how we encounter/exchange with others, care for common property, and invest in a common future (Gibson-Graham, Cameron, and Healy 2013).

Like Latour, we have treated COVID-19 as but one symptom of a larger phenomenon of the Anthropocene. In his book *Down to Earth*, Latour (2018) describes the Anthropocene as the site of a new class conflict pitting “globalists,” who aim to sever all bonds of solidarity and earthly concerns, against “terrestrials,” who affirm their interdependence and avow a relationship with

¹ Members of CERN based in Australia and New Zealand have been meeting virtually to collectively consider our answers to Latour’s questions, and we partly draw on this shared thinking in this piece. We acknowledge the members of CERN-Sydney: particularly, Katherine Gibson, Jenny Cameron, Bronwen Morgan, Inka Santala, Declan Kuch, Dan Musil, Bhavya Chitranshi, Anisah Madden, Miriam Williams, Gradon Diprose, Louise Crabtree, Isaac Lyon, and Nanako Nakamura.

² See also Davis and Todd (2017) on decolonizing the Anthropocene.

their planetary home.² The opening COVID-19 creates a chance for a response that generates a different *model of production* that is grounded in terrestrial commitments. We see Latour's concept of the terrestrial as broadly analogous to ecofeminist Val Plumwood's (2007) "mode of humanity" and Glen Coulthard's (2014; Yellowknives Dene) conception of culture as a mode of life. All three authors argue that the future must be grounded in place.

We explore the extent of this analogy in this essay. We do so as one displaced U.S. scholar living in Sydney, Australia, one disconnected Ngāi Tahu scholar raised and passing as Pākehā,³ and one Pākehā/settler-scholar living in Christchurch—quite a complicated "we." The place in which we are grounding ourselves for this essay is Aotearoa New Zealand, where two of us reside. We do so for three reasons. First, Aotearoa New Zealand has had a singular experience of COVID-19 and its associated pause: it came "down to Earth" faster; business as usual stopped in a way that stood out. Second, as we will elaborate in the next section, concepts from Indigenous scholarship and modes of life *already present* in Indigenous communities and economies can help us make sense of Aotearoa New Zealand's response and what is at stake for responding to climate change, in ways that anticipated earlier what Latour is articulating only now. Third, in this context we can perhaps see more clearly than can be seen elsewhere what a terrestrial politics might be and what a new "model of production" could be that is beyond capitalism and the ecosuicidal machinations of the globalists—a model that is more clearly grounded in place.

³ Pākehā is a term referring to people of non-Māori descent, often those of European descent. It is a term widely used in New Zealand English, including as an ethnic group on official forms alongside "New Zealand European."

In the section that follows, we explore Latour's understanding of COVID-19 as just one front of a twenty-first-century "class" struggle that pits modernizing globalists against terrestrials. While the broad outline of this conflict makes sense, we wonder if it is more complex than it might appear. We then recount the first three months of New Zealand's response to COVID-19, including the particular contributions of Māori tribal authorities and members. We frame parts of this response as an example of grounded normativities (Simpson 2011; Coulthard 2014), a concept emerging from Indigenous scholarship that articulates grounded modes of life emerging from the particularities of place. Particularly, Aotearoa New Zealand is at a jumping-off point; will it "snap back" to business as usual or bounce forward to climate responsiveness and new models of production? In the final section, we elaborate what a terrestrial future might look like by illustrating the ways in which this terrestrial "coming down to earth" has already begun in Aotearoa New Zealand: while some places have only recently come down to earth, others were already there waiting.

COVID-19 and Coming Down to Earth

In his essay that began circulating earlier in the COVID-19 pandemic, Latour (2020) refers to the coronavirus as part of a larger earth-altering ecological mutation and to a set of irrevocable changes. The mutagenic agent in question is a 400-year process in which many have been displaced by "the impacts of 'great discoveries,' of empires, modernization, development, and finally globalization" (Latour 2017, 7; see Davis and Todd 2017; Veracini 2019). In the

twenty-first century, this process has culminated in what Latour (2017, 62, 9) has elsewhere called the “age of the new geo-social question,” defined by a universal “feeling that the ground is in the process of giving way.” And of course not just the ground: climate change, mass species extinction, ocean acidification, the inundation of plastics and toxic pollutants into the hydrosphere and biosphere—all these processes push us away from the familiar dynamics of the global/local, the “two attractors” that structure the familiar story of progress from the parochial to the modern, and displace us into the terrestrial—the same earth but with our perspective altered as we come into orbit around new attractors.

The terrestrial is a “third attractor,” a shared imaginary, something “we” might come to revolve around as “we” figure out how to live differently, potentially serving as a shared imaginary. In this terrestrial context, more-than-human material and biological matter move from passive background objects into the foreground as active forces imposing limits and making demands—Terra, Earth, making herself felt one way in Antarctica, in another way in the Himalayas, and in another in Aotearoa New Zealand. For Latour, the terrestrial is site specific and contextual but is not “local.” The terrestrial is the thin biofilm that covers the earth, supporting life, but it is also not “the global.”

This third attractor, the terrestrial, is set in opposition to a fourth attractor, the “out of this world.”

Elon Musk may be looking for a way to get to Mars, but in our view this is not much different than an equally improbable journey back to “normal.” This desire for normal is powerful.

The tension between these opposed attractors sets the stage for a new class conflict between down-to-earth terrestrials and out-of-this-world globalists. The “out of this world” impetus has been building for more than fifty years to sever all bounds of social solidarity and earthly attachment. Deregulation, economic privatization, rising global inequality, and climate denialism become discernible as a single, interconnected phenomena: an ideological project that masks a mad dash for the exit (Latour 2018).

Latour pays close attention to elites in his description of the globalists. We can certainly see how their interests play out in some responses to the

COVID-19 crisis: for example, in the way that Australia’s government has prioritized export-oriented natural-gas extraction as part of its COVID response (Morton 2020), or in the U.S. rhetoric in which

the loss of life to COVID is transformed into a regrettable blood sacrifice required to restart the economy. But we wonder as well if the problem isn’t more insidious than that. Elon Musk may be looking for a way to get to Mars, but in our view this is not much different than an equally improbable journey back to “normal.” This desire for normal is powerful. One inkling of the strength of this desire is in the cruise-ship industry’s report of rapidly booking up for the year 2021 (Quinn 2021). What if Latour’s new “class struggle” is not just a struggle against a global elite bent on smashing and grabbing what’s left of planetary resources but is, perhaps more so, a struggle against this widespread wish for a

return to normal?

The globalists are busy aiming their rocket ships out of this world. Some of the middle class, dreaming of “normal,” are booking next year’s cruise. For many, faced both with COVID uncertainties and also unforgiving social and economic realities, the return to “normal” feels like a safe haven. This is the context for articulating a political project Latour calls a “new socialism.” Here, the struggle is not simply to redistribute wealth and resources but rather to answer the question of what an economy is “for” in the first instance, to explore the “very manner in which the world is made fruitful” or, for that matter, “safe.” This involves taking it apart “pixel by pixel” and “testing in more detail what is desirable and what has ceased to be so” (Latour 2020, 3).

This may be a shared project—terrestrialism at a planetary scale—but the “pixel by pixel” suggests it is also situated, grounded. What is interesting to us about Latour’s arrival at the party is his clear call for “all of us” (his no-doubt non-Indigenous peers) to return to the knowledges that Indigenous peoples have held all along: the land is the source of life, the mode of life, the “model of production.” What we hope will come from Latour’s engagement with these ideas is a greater engagement from other academics in important scholarly

We can envisage a pre-COVID-19 model of production on one side and a postcapitalist future based on a terrestrial mode of life on the other. The iwi checkpoints were managed by Māori communities to prevent the spread of the pandemic for all, and they provide a gateway to recognizing alternative forms of value, labor, exchange, and land, all based on contemporary, contextualized Indigenous perspectives.

and political work that has been going on for decades, if not centuries. In Aotearoa New Zealand, the journey down to earth means Pākehā settlers recognizing the need to partner with tangata whenua—literally, the “people of the land”—where they have settled.

The COVID Pause in Aotearoa New Zealand

The “go hard, go early” national response to the global pandemic in Aotearoa New Zealand, with a “team of 5 million,” was led by Prime Minister Jacinda Ardern’s coalition government. This was based on four alert levels announced and described on Saturday, 21 March 2020, with different layers of autonomy for individuals, families, and businesses within. Ardern’s contribution to the team as a masterful communicator was crucial in providing clear and reassuring communications in a deeply unsettling time. By Wednesday 25 March, alert level four effectively closed all “nonessential” businesses and required people to stay in their “bubbles”—effectively, households. The effect was visceral as the nation ground to a halt, the roads and skies were quiet, and people stayed within their properties unless exercising or going on a recommended one grocery shop a week. A Colmar-Brunton poll found that 87 percent of people in the country supported the measures

(Coughlan 2020).

For many, the lockdown operated as a period in which both business as usual *and* some of the constitutive elements of a capitalist subjectivity were suspended. In New Zealand's situation, the link between capitalist consumer activity—shopping, home-improvement consumerism, commercialized sports and outdoor activities, and tourism—and identity was severed quite abruptly. Widespread government payments replaced people's incomes, if required, so even wage-worker identities were suspended for many. While some elements of capitalist sub-

jectivity were suspended, the lockdown reinforced the Eurocentric notion of the nuclear family as the unit of governance, as the site of meaning making. In addition, a clear privileging emerged of large supermarket chains over locally owned businesses

and diverse food and essential-supplies enterprises. And while the coalition government has many Māori ministers, these decisions were all made without clear evidence of consultation with Māori iwi and hapū as treaty partners in the governance of Aotearoa New Zealand (Johnsen 2020). Thus, while there is now an opportunity to call business as usual into question, the intertwined question of how to respond to settler-colonial norms needs to be considered as well. While some parts of business as usual were stopped, we cannot deny that the lockdown process also reinforced many of the colonial, individualizing social structures that capitalism is

These contextualized Indigenous perspectives are vital in imagining a bounce forward for Aotearoa New Zealand, a bounce in which the social structures on which capitalism is built are decolonized and grounded in the specificities of place.

seemingly built on. Yet this is not the full story.

While Ardern's alert levels were being communicated (or even preceding this), iwi community checkpoints were established by Māori communities under a "duty to protect" (Ngata 2020).⁴ These checkpoints were established on roads entering more "out-of-the-way" parts of Aotearoa where the virus had not yet spread, by groups with mana whenua over the territory in question.⁵ Māori communities were particularly concerned since Māori health outcomes are often poorer than those of majority Pākehā, and there was every reason to suspect this would

also be the case for COVID-19 (Coster 2020; Espiner 2020). An additional worry was that police would exercise "discretion" in favor of white people, particularly wealthy people with second homes—a worry that was not unfounded, given issues with racism in New Zealand policing (Johnsen 2020). In the end, checkpoints were carried out with police support, and they protected health for all in the community, not just Māori (Coster 2020).

The iwi checkpoints in some ways represent a meeting place of worlds at the physical and metaphorical level. We can envisage a pre-COVID-19 model of production on one side and a postcapitalist future based on a terrestrial mode of life on the other. The iwi checkpoints were managed by Māori communities to prevent the spread of the pandemic for all, and they provide a gateway to recognizing alternative forms of value, labor,

⁴In the Māori language, iwi refers to tribes. It is a term used unitalicized in New Zealand English, and the checkpoints were referred to as "iwi checkpoints" by English speakers.

⁵Mana whenua refers to an authority in the Māori language, where "mana" includes authority, strength, spiritual power, and charisma, and "whenua" refers to land—therefore, authority from the land. It is a term used unitalicized in New Zealand English, including in the media.

exchange, and land, all based on contemporary, contextualized Indigenous perspectives (Reid and Rout 2016). These contextualized Indigenous perspectives are vital in imagining a bounce forward for Aotearoa New Zealand, a bounce in which the social structures on which capitalism is built are decolonized and grounded in the specificities of place. Laenui (2000; and see Mercier 2020) is quoted in a new book on decolonization aimed at a general Aotearoa New Zealand audience: “True decolonization is more than simply replacing Indigenous or previously colonized people into the positions held by colonizers. Decolonization includes the reevaluation of the political, social, economic and judicial structures themselves, and the development, if appropriate, of new structures which can hold and house the values and aspirations of the colonized people.” The checkpoints, like Latour’s questions or Roy’s portal, offer us an insight into a post-COVID bounce forward in which the new structures of economy, society, politics, and justice are grounded in place and the local, where we—as a nation—are unashamedly “globalisation interrupters,” to use Latour’s language. Māori philosopher Krushil Watene (2020; Ngāti Manu, Te Hikutu, Ngāti Whātua o Orākei, Tonga) elaborates on concepts of manaakitanga (caring and supporting others)⁶ and kaitiakitanga (caretaking of the environment and people),⁷ identifying these as key words for understanding what *might* be possible

Māori philosopher Krushil Watene argues that efforts by the current New Zealand government to emphasize an economy of care and well-being over an economy focused on growth are a start but require listening to Māori voices to move toward more collective modes of life.

in a post-COVID-19 New Zealand. She argues that efforts by the current New Zealand government to emphasize an economy of care and well-being over an economy focused on growth are a start but require listening to Māori voices to move toward more collective modes of life.

Watene is alerting us to the fact that much of the material we need to bounce forward has been here all along. Indeed, Lorenzo Veracini (2019,

123) draws on Indigenous scholars Daniel Wildcat (Yuchi member of the Muscogee Nation of Oklahoma) and Vine Deloria Jr. (Standing Rock Sioux) to note that “Indigenous struggles have always focused on ... the ‘personality’ of place, where place is endowed with a specific identity that can be related to and communi-

cated with,” part of an argument that Indigenous place-based occupations are struggles relevant to *all* social movements. Similarly, Soren Larsen and Jay Johnson (2018) argue in their book *Being Together in Place* that developing close attentive relationships with place is what provides the possibility for settler-Indigenous partnerships for radical change. In the section that follows, we read Latour’s call for “all of us” to “come down to earth” through the lens of Coulthard’s (2014) and Simpson’s (2011) ideas of “grounded normativity” and the relational partnership approaches of the Ngāi Tahu iwi of Te Wai Pounamu, the South Island of Aotearoa New Zealand.

⁶ See P. Wehi and T. Roa, “Reciprocal Relationships: Identity, Tradition and Food in the Kīngitanga Poukai He Manaakitanga: O te tuakiri, o te tikanga me te kai ki te Poukai o te Kīngitanga,” *SocArXiv*, 12 December 2019, <https://osf.io/preprints/socarxiv/tz746>.

⁷ See M. Kawharu, “Kaitiakitanga: A Maori Anthropological Perspective of the Maori Socio-environmental Ethic of Resource Management,” *Journal of Polynesian Society*, vol. 109, no. 4, http://www.jpss.auckland.ac.nz/document/Volume_109_2000/Volume_109_No_4/Kaitiakitanga:_A_Maori_anthropological_perspective_of_the_Maori_socio-environmental_ethic_of_resource_management_by_Merata_Kawharu_p_349-370/pi.

Terrestrial Solidarities in Aotearoa New Zealand

As we return to our daily routines in Aotearoa New Zealand, we find ourselves faced with some of the questions Latour has asked in his essay: What suspended activities would we *not* like to see return? And why? What do we do with the people and materials enrolled in these activities? How do we transition them? And what suspended activities should begin again? But we also have an additional question to ask: what new activities emerged in this time that we would like to keep? There is not necessarily a shared “we” in answering Latour’s questions. But Latour asks readers to think “pixel by pixel” about what a new model of production might be, grounded, presumably, in the earth. In the Aotearoa New Zealand context, pixel by pixel is a process of experimentation and transformation taking place in the enduring context of the treaty and the political realities of a bicultural nation trying to work out a new mode of life together, one which opens up to the leadership of tangata whenua on the issues that affect us all. In the lockdown, this was manifested in the iwi checkpoints protecting the health of all. What other manifestations of manaakitanga and kaitiakitanga might be acknowledged moving forward? How might these specific practices be grounded in new normativities that protect the health of people and land?

Indigenous struggle within, against, and beyond colonial capitalism(s) is inspired by and oriented around land (Coulthard 2014, 13). Not just land in a material sense but as a “system of reciprocal relations and obligations [that] can teach us

about living our lives in relation to one another and the natural world in non-dominating and non-exploitative terms.” Coulthard gives the name of “grounded normativity” to this “place-based foundation of Indigenous decolonial thought and practices.” Although specific practices of grounded normativity are particular to Indigenous communities, inspired by and oriented around relationships between people and place, the concept of grounded normativity can be transferable across Indigenous contexts and can inform a basis for imagining and creating other more-than-capitalist economies.

Key to extending the terrestrial politics embedded within Indigenous traditions is to push back against the “liberal politics of recognition” that only recognize one mode of production—capitalism—and one mode of governance—state sovereignty—and that only allow for an Indigenous “culture” that fits within these parameters. Instead, Coulthard (2014) challenges these parameters and draws from Marx to assert Indigenous culture(s) as modes of production/modes of life. In the contemporary context of Aotearoa New Zealand, we can see the capitalist modes of production put under severe strain due to COVID-19 while the Indigenous modes of production/life that have always existed, despite repression, becoming visible to the mainstream through the crisis. Perhaps we have a portal-like moment revealing the preexisting conditions for radical resurgence?

Coulthard (2014) develops a framework for resurgence by drawing on Indigenous feminist movements. He draws from Michi Saagiig Nishnaabeg scholar Leanne Betasamosake Simpson

(2011), who advocates a reorientation of efforts from transforming “the colonial outside” into “a flourishing of the Indigenous inside.” Simpson elaborates that resurgence involves recreating the cultural and political flourishing of the past to enhance the well-being of the present. For Simpson this requires sustainable Indigenous economies that are developed according to Indigenous thought, grounded in an intimate relationship with the land. Coulthard (2014) concludes that exploring these Indigenous alternatives poses three threats to colonial capitalism(s):

1. They connect Indigenous Peoples to land-based practices and knowledge and emphasize radical sustainability through education.
2. They offer a means of subsistence to break dependence on the state and capitalist economy.
3. Applying Indigenous governance principles to nontraditional economic activities can open up new means of engaging in contemporary economies in Indigenous ways.⁸

As we can see, “the terrestrials” evoked by Latour may find themselves coming down to earth only to meet those already grounded in a different model of production or, indeed, mode of life.

In an Aotearoa New Zealand context, a key hinge for such a terrestrial politics is treaty partnership. Treaty partnership sets up two spheres of authority based around the signatories to the 1840 Te Tiriti o Waitangi (Treaty of Waitangi): the Crown, with authority based on kāwana-

tanga (governance), and Māori, with authority based on rangatiratanga (chieftainship). Both of these spheres also have the ability to be radically decentralized on their own terms. The iwi checkpoints discussed previously are an exercise in rangatiratanga, and their support from the Crown is an exercise in partnership.⁹ In addition, the food, health, and other care packages, as well as the COVID-19 testing stations set up by Māori communities for their own people, are all examples of rangatiratanga-based diverse economic practices that have risen to meet the challenge the pandemic presents to the capitalist mode of production. These are part of a genealogy of practices based on grounded normativity and partnership, including: postearthquake care (Carter and Kenney 2018); partnership and cogovernance in urban regeneration (Thompson-Fawcett, Rona, and Rae 2017; Thompson-Fawcett and Riddle 2018); and care, solidarity, and partnership in mourning following the mosque attacks.¹⁰

While these practices are the happy hunting ground of speculative utopian academics such as ourselves, for the Māori communities practicing them every day, they are just common sense from the ancestors, based on a duty to protect (Ngata 2020). These practices are not necessarily unique to Māori or Indigenous communities; they can be understood as *grounded* normativities because they emerge from the obligations between people and place, *in place*. These economies of mana (authority) or economies of aroha (love) shine light through the cracks emerging clearly between the pandemic, capitalism, and the state (Hēnare 2014; Amoamo, Ruwhiu, and Carter 2018; Dell, Staniland, and Nicholson

⁹ This support is illustrated through an article penned by Police Commissioner Andrew Coster and by the practical support police gave iwi checkpoints in multiple locations.

¹⁰ See “Official Call to Prayer Event Announced,” Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu website, accessed 16 June 2020, <https://ngaitahu.iwi.nz/official-call-to-prayer-event-announced/>.

⁸ And see “Māori Tribal Economy: Rethinking the Original Economic Institutions” by Reid and Rout (2016).

2018).

One example of where such a grounded normativity is emerging in Aotearoa is the formal partnership between the Christchurch City Council and Ngāi Tahu, the iwi who hold mana whenua within the South Island. Following the Canterbury earthquake sequences of 2010–11, a formal recovery partnership emerged between the Ngāi Tahu iwi and the Crown (the government of New Zealand). The Earthquake Recovery Act (2011) and the Greater Christchurch Regeneration Act (2016) specifically named Ngāi Tahu as a statutory earthquake recovery partner.¹¹ This meant that, in addition to the requirements for Māori consultation already present in urban planning processes, a number of different Ngāi Tahu bodies were formally represented in recovery governance in Christchurch (Thompson-Fawcett and Riddle 2018). While Treaty partnership has long been discussed and sought in Aotearoa New Zealand, Thompson-Fawcett, Rona, and Rae (2017) note that this level of partnership is a significant shift in local governance, a shift that “has enhanced Indigenous influence as compared to conventional practices in the city up until the earthquakes.”

The results of this partnership are telling: not just in urban design with the newly rebuilt city reflecting Ngāi Tahu values, aspirations,

language, design, and more (Thompson-Fawcett and Riddle 2018), but also in other important areas. The Christchurch mayor and the Ūpoko (head) of the subtribe of Ngāi Tūāhuriri together cochair the Te Hononga-Papatipu Rūnanga Committee, which “binds” the Christchurch City Council with the traditional councils of the subtribes in the area. Recently, the two issued a joint statement with regard to statues and name changes in the area in response to the

Black Lives Matter movement. They thanked organizations with problematic names for changing them and acknowledged the work that has been done to balance European symbols with Māori ones, the example given being the carvings added to either side of the Queen Victoria statue to acknowledge and symbolize the partnership between Māori and the Crown. This example of partnership

emerged in the rethinking and recovery following the destruction wreaked by earthquakes, but what other partnerships, such as those prefiqured by iwi checkpoints, might emerge in the wake of COVID-19?

Conclusion

In *Down to Earth* Latour (2018) describes how the ecological mutations of the twenty-first century have effectively displaced “us” from both of the familiar attractors that once defined the process of modernization—the tension between

Indigenous struggle within, against, and beyond colonial capitalism(s) is inspired by and oriented around land. Not just land in a material sense but as Yellowknives Dene scholar, Glen Sean Coulthard argues, as a “system of reciprocal relations and obligations [that] can teach us about living our lives in relation to one another and the natural world in non-dominating and non-exploitative terms.”

¹¹ See “A Place to Remember,” Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu website, accessed 16 July 2020, https://ngaitahu.iwi.nz/our_stories/a-place-to-remember/.

the local and the global. In coming back down, we land on the earth, but not as it was before. Earth can no longer be imagined as a passive background, as Europeans tend to do, but must be recognized as an active force, something that *demands* human consideration, something for us to negotiate with as we live in place on different terms. The class struggle Latour describes is between people who accept the terms of terrestrial relations—our interdependence—and those who seek to flee it, out of this world.

Our essay has sought to engage not only with Latour's call to awareness but also with a critical wariness to the "us" being invoked in the need to come back down to earth, and in how "we" might do that. Because, as we have argued, concepts such as grounded normativity and *kaitiakitanga* suggest that many currently have, and have always had, the techniques to live well together while grounded in and across places. While some of us (settler-colonists) have only recently "come down to earth," others were already there, trying to explain and reclaim and be heard. Latour concludes *Down to Earth* by introducing himself, locating himself in time and space (as being of French, Catholic, and viticultural heritage). And then he asks us to introduce ourselves. To us this is symbolically promising: these down-to-earth questions ground change in place and work toward real relationships, partnerships of change. But for us this raises additional, crucially important questions: What if the next step in positioning himself might also involve a recognition that some peoples already have knowledge of how to live in a particular place and are already operating in a different mode of humanity, despite colo-

onial repression? What might grounded normativities, in which obligations between people and place are developed by communities, look like as we move forward into post-COVID-19 recoveries? How far can such grounded normativities travel? Recognizing that the concept of grounded normativity emerges from the realm of Indigenous resurgence, how can others learn from it without appropriating it? What if "we" were to pause, regather, and seek to learn as the younger sibling in a "Tuakana-Teina" (older sibling/younger sibling) relationship?

Stephen Healy is a senior research fellow at the Institute for Culture and Society, Western Sydney University. His research focuses on the relationship between social transformation and subjectivation. He is coauthor of Take Back the Economy: An Ethical Guide for Transforming our Communities, with J. K. Gibson-Graham and Jenny Cameron.

Matthew Scobie (Ngāi Tahu) is a lecturer in organizational accountability at Te Whare Wānanga o Waitaha, University of Canterbury. Matthew's research interests center broadly around exploring ways to hold organizations accountable for their social, environmental, cultural, and economic impacts with a specific focus on Indigenous development and decolonization.

Kelly Dombroski is a senior lecturer in human geography at Te Whare Wānanga o Waitaha, University of Canterbury. Kelly is a researcher in feminist geography and diverse economies and recently coedited

the fifty-eight-chapter Handbook of Diverse Economies with J. K. Gibson-Graham.

References

Amoamo, M., D. Ruwhiu, and L. Carter. 2018. "Framing the Māori Economy: The Complex Business of Māori Business." *MAI Journal* 7 (1): 66–78.

Carter, L., and C. Kenney. 2018. "A Tale of Two Communities: B-race-ing Disaster Responses in the Media Following the Canterbury and Kaikōura Earthquakes." *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, no. 28: 731–8.

Coster, A. 2020. "Coronavirus: Iwi Checkpoints Were about Safety and Discretion." *Stuff*, 4 May. <https://www.stuff.co.nz/national/health/coronavirus/121400826/coronavirus-iwi-checkpoints-were-about-safety-and-discretion>.

Coughlan, P. 2020. "Coronavirus: The Government's Covid-19 Lockdown Measures Have Overwhelming Public Support, According to a Poll." *Stuff*, 23 April. <https://www.stuff.co.nz/national/121231591/coronavirus-the-governments-covid19-lockdown-measures-have-overwhelming-public-support-according-to-a-poll>.

Coulthard, G. 2014. *Red Skin, White Masks*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Davis, H., and Z. Todd. 2017. "On the Importance of a Date; or, Decolonizing the Anthropocene." *ACME* 16 (4): 761–80.

Dell, K., N. Staniland, and A. Nicholson. 2018. "Economy of Mana: Where to Next?" *MAI Journal* 7 (1): 51–65.

Espiner, E. 2020. "New Zealand Must Learn Lessons of 1918 Pandemic and Protect Māori from Covid-19." *Guardian*, 25 March. <https://www.theguardian.com/>

[commentisfree/2020/mar/26/new-zealand-must-learn-lessons-of-1918-pandemic-and-protect-maori-from-covid-19](https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2020/mar/26/new-zealand-must-learn-lessons-of-1918-pandemic-and-protect-maori-from-covid-19).

Gibson-Graham, J. K., J. Cameron, and S. Healy. 2013. *Take Back the Economy: An Ethical Guide for Transforming Our Communities*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Hēnare, M. 2014. "The Economy of Mana." In *Beyond the Free Market: Rebuilding a Just Society in New Zealand*, ed. D. Cooke, C. Hill, P. Baskett, and R. Irwin, 65–9. Auckland: Dunmore.

Johnsen, M. 2020. "Response Group Criticises Covid-19 Law Failures to Recognise Māori." *Radio New Zealand*, 3 June. <https://www.rnz.co.nz/news/te-manu-korihi/418178/response-group-criticises-covid-19-law-failures-to-recognise-maori>.

Kaika, M. 2017. "'Don't Call Me Resilient Again!': The New Urban Agenda as Immunology; or, What Happens when Communities Refuse to Be Vaccinated with 'Smart Cities' and Indicators." *Environment and Urbanization* 29 (1): 89–102.

Larsen, S. C., and J. T. Johnson. 2017. *Being Together in Place: Indigenous Coexistence in a More Than Human World*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Latour, B., 2018. *Down to Earth: Politics in the New Climatic Regime*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.

———. 2020. "What Protective Measures Can You Think of So We Don't Go Back to the Pre-crisis Production Model?" Trans. S. Muecke. *BrunoLatour.fr*. Accessed 13 June 2020. <http://www.bruno-latour.fr/sites/default/files/P-202-AOC-ENGLISH.pdf>.

Mercier, O. R. 2020. "What Is Decolonisation?" In *Imagining Decolonisation*, ed. B. Elkington, M. Jackson, R. Kiddle, O. R. Mercier, M. Ross, J. Smeaton, and A. Thomas, 40–82. Wellington: Bridget Williams.

Moir, J. 2020. "Border Reopening Must Be Priority—Business NZ." *Radio New Zealand*, 30 June. <https://www.rnz.co.nz/news/political/420127/border-reopening-must-be-priority-business-nz>.

Morton, A. 2020. "Gas 'Completely Dominated' Discussion about Covid-19 Recovery, Commission Adviser Says." *Guardian*, 13 June. <https://www.theguardian.com/australia-news/2020/jun/13/gas-completely-dominated-discussion-about-covid-19-recovery-commission-adviser-says>.

Ngata, T. 2020. "COVID-19 and the Māori Duty to Protect." *Overland Journal*, 7 May. <https://overland.org.au/2020/05/covid-19-and-the-maori-duty-to-protect>.

Plumwood, V. 2007. "A Review of Deborah Bird Rose's Reports from a Wild Country: Ethics of Decolonisation." *Australian Humanities Review* 42 (August):1–4.

Reid, J., and M. Rout. 2016. "Māori Tribal Economy: Rethinking the Original Economic Institutions." University of Canterbury Research Repository. <http://hdl.handle.net/10092/12391>.

Roelvnik, G. 2020. "The Power of a Pause." *University of Minnesota Press Blog*, 22 May. <https://uminnpress-blog.com/2020/05/22/the-power-of-a-pause>.

Roy, A. 2020. "The Pandemic Is a Portal." *Financial Times*, 3 April. <https://www.ft.com/content/10d8f5e8-74eb-11ea-95fe-fcd274e920ca>.

Simpson, L. B. 2011. *Dancing on Our Turtle's Back: Stories of Nishnaabe Re-creation, Resurgence, and a New Emergence*. Winnipeg: ARP.

Thompson-Fawcett, M., and C. Riddle. 2018. "Being Ourselves and Seeing Ourselves in the City: Enabling the Conceptual Space for Indigenous Urban Planning." *Planning Theory & Practice* 18 (4): 659–64. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14649357.2017.1380961>.

Thompson-Fawcett, M., L. Rona, and H. Rae. 2017.

"Taiao Toitū: Māori and Planning." In *Planning Practice in New Zealand*, ed. C. Miller and L. Beattie, 175–88. Wellington: LexisNexis.

Veracini, L. 2019. "Containment, Elimination, Endogeneity: Settler Colonialism in the Global Present." *Rethinking Marxism* 31 (1): 118–40.

Watene, K. 2020. "Caring for Community to Beat Coronavirus Echoes Indigenous Ideas of a Good Life." *Conversation*, 23 April. <https://theconversation.com/caring-for-community-to-beat-coronavirus-echoes-indigenous-ideas-of-a-good-life-136175>.