

Finding our place at the table: A more-than-human family reunion

Alice McSherry  | Georgia McLellan 

Te Kura Mātai Taiao/School of Environment, Waipapa Taumata Rau/The University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand

Correspondence

Alice McSherry, Te Kura Mātai Taiao/School of Environment, Waipapa Taumata Rau/The University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand.
Email: a.mcsherry@auckland.ac.nz

Abstract

Indigenous worlds are and *always have been* sites of more-than-human (MTH) agency and relationship, despite their largely marginalised status within geographic scholarship to date. The return to cosmologically-informed earth-oriented Indigenous Lifeworlds holds transformative power for mobilising collective action toward life-affirming MTH futures for all. In this commentary, we, as two Indigenous PhD students (Alice, *Naxi* Chinese and Georgia, *Te Whakatōhea* Māori), draw on our respective ancestral instructions of kinship to suggest that engaging in MTH geographies is less a ‘discovery’ of new epistemologies and more akin to a praxis of ‘recovery’, similar to showing up to a family reunion. Thinking-with the metaphor of a reunion, we contend that planetary futurity is contingent on Indigenous futurity, and that epistemic freedom is contingent on epistemic justice.

KEYWORDS

ancestral geographies, decolonisation, indigenous lifeworlds, more-than-human kinship

1 | INTRODUCTION: AN INVITATION TO THE FAMILY REUNION

In this moment when our ecological future hangs tenuously in the balance, we find ourselves, as an earth community, at a significant crossroads. Indeed, as news media outlets overflow with disastrous stories of extreme marine and terrestrial heatwaves, mass species extinction and ‘one-in-one-hundred-year’ flooding events in quick succession, we do not need to look far to see that we are living in ‘both a scientific age and an age of mythic consequence’ (Kimmerer, 2021, p. 111). And yet, western approaches to scholarship have tended to erase myth from the stories that guide us in these times. As a consequence, ‘reason’ is left as the only available frame in which to dream a future of planetary co-existence into being. With this inherited

Eurocentric bias in mind, there is often a tacit (mis) understanding within more-than-human (MTH) geographies that *all* scholars arrive to the field with the same dualistic worldview that assumes nature and culture to be separate. However, we contend that it is time to reorganise our socio-political collectives and develop new forms of scholarship that are oriented towards the inherent liveliness of the world, based on new stories yet simultaneously *very old* ones as well. The continuation of our planet depends on it.

There are, helpfully, many ways of seeing and being in the world. In fact, as this commentary puts forth, there *have always been* other ways. What we are speaking to here is the Indigenous Lifeworld (see Williams, 2012), a world where human and non-human beings all flow within intact and emplaced genealogical webs of kinship relations. While the relational specificities differ across place, the Indigenous

This is an open access article under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/) License, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited and is not used for commercial purposes.

© 2023 The Authors. *New Zealand Geographer* published by John Wiley & Sons Australia, Ltd on behalf of New Zealand Geographical Society.

Lifeworld implies that the MTH *is* us, just as much as we *are* inherently MTH ourselves. Opaskwayak Cree scholar Shawn Wilson (2016, p. 313) affirms this when he writes, ‘relationships are reality and reality is relationships. As Indigenous people, we *are* our relationships to people,’ with only some of these ‘people’ being human. These long-established yet marginalised onto-epistemologies constitute what Haudenosaunee and Anishinaabe scholar Vanessa Watts (2013, p. 21) terms ‘Indigenous Place-Thought’, ‘the non-distinctive space where place and thought were never separated because they never could or can be separated.’ Here, the sacredness of places, as the firstborn in a cosmic genealogy, ‘speak, create and teach,’ implicitly bringing the human researcher ‘into the fold of a ‘MTH geographical self’ (Larsen & Johnson, 2016, p. 152).

To this end, our relationships to place as Indigenous people are and *always have* existed, shaping the way in which we understand the world and in turn guiding our respective relational responsibilities toward MTH kin. Rather than ‘discovering’ new and emergent relations within places as they evolve, doing MTH geographies as Indigenous researchers could therefore be thought of more as a process of ‘recovery’; the coming back into relationship with long-lost family members—a family reunion, if you will. At this reunion, the relationships are sometimes strained, sometimes easy and at other times a bit awkward. Ultimately, however, when you accept the invitation to the reunion, you find yourself feasting at a long table, where the food is abundant and you find yourself engaged in many conversations that beckon you into deeper, storied (or ‘mythic’) intimacy with the MTH world.

Following the lead of Indigenous and decolonial scholars before us, we write this commentary as a playful yet earnest provocation to invite western-enculturated geographers to reflect on the potential ways in which Indigenous kinship dynamics may add to or alter the terms of engagement between themselves, the discipline within which they research from and the MTH relations with whom they deal with. To do so, however, requires care-full attention to the ways in which Indigenous Lifeworlds—that is, the specific Indigenous onto-epistemologies that enable this reunion to transpire—continue to ‘remain marginal [... and] denied academic legitimacy within geography’ (Barker & Pickerill, 2020, p. 640). It is on these grounds that we contend that engaging in the oftentimes confronting work of securing epistemic justice for Indigenous researchers are pre-conditions for epistemic freedom to be realised for *all*. In what follows, Alice (*Naxi*; Indigenous Chinese) reflects on her relations with *Shu*, the embodiment of the

‘natural world’ and ‘half-brother’ within *Dongba* (the *Naxi* cosmology), and Georgia (Māori, *Te Whakatōhea*) thinks-with *whakapapa* (ancestry) and her relations with *kuku* (Green Lipped Mussel, *Perna canaliculus*) in re-framing MTH geographies from an Indigenous perspective. While we pay particular attention to the increasing calls to decolonise Māori/Pākehā relations in Aotearoa New Zealand (e.g., Yates, 2021), we also suggest that there are other avenues of Indigenous possibility and futurity in a changing world when it comes to our relations with ‘immigrant’ MTH beings from an Indigenous perspective too. Alice explores this with her relations to her sacred ‘plantcestor’¹ Cannabis/Hemp (*Cannabis sativa*).

We want to reiterate that this invitation is not intended to discredit the work currently flourishing in MTH geographies; this work *does* contribute to useful and important discussions in terms of highlighting and dismantling long-established nature-culture dualisms that are implicit within the discipline (e.g., Castree, 2003; Panelli, 2010). However, for us as Indigenous researchers, engaging in MTH geographies is more than a mere intellectual exercise. As is the case at any family reunion, the meeting of particular long-lost kin may bring up feelings of grief, regret or angst, leading to questionable behaviours at the dinner table. Nevertheless, building communicative and collaborative cultures within which disagreements may be worked through together allows for our relationships to be witnessed and worked-with *in solidarity* for the project of collective liberation. In this sense, when the MTH family reunion is framed as a praxeologically fluid space that enables what decolonial scholar Walter D. Mignolo (2009) calls ‘epistemological disobedience’, the dinner table of MTH geographies has affective socio-political implications for securing Indigenous futurity and the project of decolonisation at large. A humble heart and an open mind are the only prerequisites for participating in the reunion. This is because kinship is not something to be claimed or possessed; it is a process—a living, embodied praxis of epistemic liberation. As such, to deny MTH geographies as a space for liberatory praxis would be to perpetuate ‘coloniality’, the shorthand for what Peruvian sociologist Aníbal Quijano terms the ‘colonial matrix of power’ (Quijano, 2007).

To this end, we suggest that it is time that we gathered for this MTH family reunion. The time has never been more ripe (see Kimmerer, 2021 for a poetic example of this). However, to accept the invitation is also to reckon, sometimes joyously and sometimes painfully, with the ‘colonial baggage’ that is implicit to western scholarly traditions.

And so, as two Indigenous geographers, we humbly ask: will you join us?

2 | ACCEPTING THE INVITATION: CENTRING INDIGENOUS EPISTEMOLOGIES IN MTH GEOGRAPHIES

As Indigenous PhD students engaged in recovering our respective ancestral orientations in our research, we are inundated with MTH scholarship that overtly praises how ‘new’ MTH configurations provide insight into ways that we might think and perform worlds differently. These discussions assume some realisation that the modern neoliberal world has necessitated an onto-epistemological shift, and that in returning to some sort of worldly balance, we need to free our minds from the constraints of dominant scholarship. But suppose your cosmology never enabled this trapping in the first place. Suppose you come from a tradition that has *always* had the kind of interdependency and epistemological liberation embedded within it. How might that re-orient your approach to MTH geographies?

When engaging in MTH scholarship as Indigenous researchers, we often find ourselves laden with the burdens of constantly having to justify and explain that our MTH relationships *have always* existed. In this sense, sudden ‘realisations’ that the world is a site of animated and interdependent relationships are not new. In fact, they are sacred and as old as time for us. This is highlighted by Métis scholar Zoe Todd (2016) who, after attending a public lecture given by ‘the *Great Latour*’ (p. 4), writes that ‘the Ontological Turn [...] is itself perpetuating the exploitation of Indigenous peoples’ (p. 16). Oftentimes, we are left unmoored, feeling as if, again, our voices have, at best, been lost to the spiral of time or, at worst, deliberately ignored. This has very real affective consequences for Indigenous scholarship. Indeed, in the emotionally-taxing work of having to justify *why* Indigenous epistemologies matter, we often do not get afforded the time and space to actually *live* and *practice* these ontologies into being. Take, for example, Alice’s recent experiences in her doctorate journey. For Alice, a descendant of Naxi, an Indigenous ‘ethnic minority’ in the Sino-Tibetan borderlands of China (although born and raised in Aotearoa and of mixed Pākehā descent too), the journey of doing Indigenous research has been fraught with processes of confronting deep intergenerational grief of severance from place and the shamanic lifeways that were once taken-for-granted within the matrifocal societies of her ancestors. What she once chalked up to being ‘the existential crises of a PhD’ was actually the difficult processes of first, recovering lost ancestral memories, grieving their loss and then having to justify *why* they even matter in the first place before she could actually

share and celebrate them. All of this simply to research something she, as a practising herbalist and Indigenous researcher, has long known and lived: that is, that plants not only have agency and ‘speak’, but *are* our ancestors within their own right (McSherry & Williams, 2023). This pain could have been avoided, or at least lessened, had indigenous epistemologies been afforded the legitimacy they deserve and centred within Alice’s disciplinary home, geography.

Accepting the invitation to the MTH family reunion therefore explicitly requires a centring of Indigenous epistemologies within geography, and taking seriously that the academic playing field for many of us is *still* not balanced. When we set forth on the research journey, we carry with us the remembered and embodied pain and grief of our ancestors who have come before us. To this end, the invitation to the MTH family reunion also asks of non-Indigenous researchers to actively participate in the necessary political work that ensures epistemic justice is treated as a pre-condition to ontological freedom. This is essential if we hope to collectively midwife more equitable, inherently MTH planetary futures into being. In the next section, we highlight *whakapapa* as an epistemology to ground this decolonial project in the context of Indigenous futures in Aotearoa.

3 | FINDING OUR WAY IN A WORLD OF RELATIONS: WHAKAPAPA AS AN INDIGENOUS EPISTEMOLOGY

In Te Ao Māori (the Māori world), all living beings *whakapapa* (ancestrally connect) back to Papatūānuku (earth mother) and Ranginui (sky father). *Whakapapa* is a Māori epistemology that posits everything and everyone that has ever existed and that ever will exist as connected and in relation (Mikaere, 2011). In this sense, Māori have ancestral connections to non-human beings like rivers, mountains and *whenua* (land). As Barlow (1991, in Mikaere, 2011) describes below:

‘Whakapapa is the genealogical descent of all living things from the gods to the present time [...] everything has a whakapapa: birds, fish, animals, trees and every other living thing; soil, rocks and mountains also have a whakapapa’ (p. 173).

From this view, *whakapapa* de-centres the human as the pinnacle of existence by positioning all things as connected and equally in relation. To have *whakapapa* is therefore to be agential, animate and in relation,

necessarily imbricated in a more-than-human world of co-becoming with place (see Bawaka Country et al., 2016). This includes opening the possibility for changing relationships to emerge with the evolution of the worlds within which we stand. As Ngāti Whakaue, Ngāti Rangiwewehi, Te Aitanga a Mahakai and Rongo-whakaata scholar Amanda Monehu Yates (2021) puts it:

‘There is no separation: all is imminently related. Our ontologies are already ‘more-than-human’ and ecologically grounded’ (p. 109).

For Te Whakatōhea (an iwi on the east coast of Te Ika-a-Māui/the North Island of Aotearoa), we *whakapapa* back to the kuku (Green-lipped mussel). We often refer to kuku as one of *Ngā tamāhine a Te Whakatōhea*, one of the daughters of Whakatōhea along with the pipi and *tuangi* (cockle) (Waka Huia, 2014). Our relationship with kuku has changed over time; our tīpuna (ancestors) once gathered wild kuku as an abundant source of *kai* (food) and *rongoā* (medicine) (Lyll, 1997), however our whānau (family) have a different relationship with the kuku today. We do not rely on them as a food source as many of our tīpuna once did and we are able to buy them from local shops (McLellan, 2020). In this sense, there is a commercial element to our modern-day relationships with kuku. This relationship is far from extractive though. The Whakatōhea Māori Trust Board owns aquaculture space off the coast of Ōpōtiki and has shares in Whakatōhea Mussels Ōpōtiki Limited, a company which processes kuku and sells them on the global market (McLellan, 2020). This commercialised relationship with kuku is always centred upon our shared *whakapapa* and *whanaungatanga* (relations). When embarking on any commercial ventures with kuku, we do so in a way that honours them as *whanaunga* with whom we must be in good relation in order to enable that relationship for future generations to come. This is done to honour what our tīpuna did for us. For Whakatōhea, the kuku has therefore always been a *MTH* tāonga with whom we share *whakapapa*, *mauri* (life-force) and *whanaungatanga*.

Meeting our *MTH* ancestors at the reunion also determines who we may engage with in our research. For Georgia, her *whakapapa* to kuku led her to undertake a doctoral project with her iwi on contemporary mussel economies in Aotearoa. For Alice, who is Indigenous but not Indigenous to Aotearoa, it was a little more left-field. Her experiences as a practising herbalist prior to her doctorate meant that she already had a deep relationship with the many plants who grew around her home. When in 2020, Aotearoa was to vote on the legalisation of one of her ‘plantcestors’ Cannabis, Alice was halfway through her doctoral fieldwork. Already engaging in the

‘epistemological disobedience’ of sitting in ceremony and learning directly from plants, Alice originally decided not to engage in the contentious space of illegal ‘drugs’ in her research. However, this changed one night, when she was somewhat rudely awoken by a dream she could not silence. In her dream, Alice had a Cannabis seedling on her kitchen window. She knew she was being naughty; but upon hearing police sirens in that dream state, she quickly threw the plant in the bin. It was then when she heard a thundering voice say ‘Child! You simply cannot throw your *whakapapa* in the bin!’ Upon waking, she knew that this was an instruction from her ancestors. In *Naxi* worlds, Māori understandings of *mauri* and *whakapapa* are conceived of as *Shu*, the embodiment of our older-brother who is the guardian of the natural world (Arcones, 2012). *Shu* makes sure that his ‘younger brothers’ (humans) do not abuse their relationships with our *MTH* kin. However, including dreams and drugs in research gets tricky. After all, dreaming and altered states of consciousness have all too often been co-opted by westernised New Age spiritualities or rendered as ‘primitive’ (and/or illegal) by colonial projects influenced by Christian theologies (e.g., Sepie, 2018). Nevertheless, ‘no data are irrelevant,’ as Sioux scholar Vine Deloria Jr (1999, p. 66) reminds us. Dreams are instructional and, when contextually relevant, have the capacity to relay ancestral memories that remain marginalised within the business of ‘serious scholarship’. For Alice, this meant a reorientation of her research project and engagement with drug law reform in Aotearoa, doing what was within her capacity to liberate her plantcestor and thus share the gifts of her ancestral medicine bag freely in a (not quite yet) post-prohibition world.

All this is to say that our *whakapapa* leads us down some rabbit-holes. However, it is these rabbit-holes and points of connection, made fruitful in the setting of a family reunion, that provide us with the orientations that enable *MTH* worlds to flourish in a way that leaves no one behind. Remember? We are all related. In this sense, Indigenous ways of knowing and doing geographies are relevant to the making of other worlds, but they also require a collective reckoning of geography’s ‘long and problematic relationship with colonial power’ in order to be valued and legitimised in contemporary scholarship (Barker & Pickerill, 2020, p. 640). Perhaps then, by thinking about decolonising *MTH* geographies as akin to attending a family reunion, we begin to see human and *MTH* members of the Earth family as a generative site of collective dreaming, in which we honour each other’s stories and commit to the actions of rekindling long-lost relations. Let us break bread together, see what connections emerge and begin to heal together at the dinner table.

4 | SECURING EPISTEMIC JUSTICE: STAYING AT THE REUNION

The nature-culture divide is rooted in Eurocentric understandings of the world (Todd, 2016). For our Indigenous ancestors, this dichotomy simply did not exist. Through long-established kinship, we have always valued and worked with the inherent agency of our MTH relations. From weather patterns, to molluscs, and to plants—even those ‘scary’ ones the westernised world now refers to as ‘drugs’—the many faces of our ancestors surround us. Every being belonging within an unbroken circle of relationality, an embodiment of *mauri* and *Shu*; a sentient life-force unto itself, conspiring alongside us to keep the sacred web of life alive.

At times, because, well, we are human, we forget our manners and break our sacred agreements with the ancestors. This is why our ecological lore is littered with so many cautionary tales (or ‘myths’), warning us to take heed of our place and responsibility as ‘last-born’ within a long lineage of kinship (Larsen & Johnson, 2016). Indeed, the law of the land and our protocols centre around reciprocity with a pantheon of elemental deities, continuing to remind us that kinship is not something to be assumed and claimed. After all, you do not just wander up to a long lost relative the street and assume that you know will automatically get along with them. Rather, we must take the necessary time to get to know them again—to re-learn their languages and laws. Getting to know our kinfolk is a process that relies upon respect, reciprocity, redistribution, responsibility and reverence across human and non-human worlds.

The point here is that if we are genuinely looking to re-evaluate and re-weave connections across space, re-animate place and advance scholarly endeavours that hold transformative possibilities for ecological worlds, we ought to pay care-full attention to which pre-existing Indigenous ontologies have been silenced, denied and erased throughout history. In other words, decolonising is a everybody’s business. By decolonising, we mean ‘exposing the ontological violence authorised by Eurocentric epistemologies both in scholarship and everyday life’ in order to participate in the process of ‘learning [to] dialogue between epistemic worlds’ (Sundberg 2014, p. 2). This is what is required for a convivial and happy reunion to take place.

In the context of Aotearoa New Zealand, this means re-centering and securing the longevity of Indigenous scholars whose voices who have tirelessly paved the way for Te Ao Māori to be normalised within scholarship. We, in Aotearoa, have a collective responsibility and obligation to tend a world in which the original agreements

of *Te Tiriti o Waitangi* are actively honoured. We can do this by citing Indigenous scholars (see Ahmed, 2013 on citational politics), amplifying them, and joining them in ‘the struggle that has no end’ (Walker 1990). As allied geographer Turnbull (2007) reminds us, ‘knowledge is performative,’ and ‘in the act of performing knowledge, we create space’ (p. 3). For our MTH kin who may be more recent arrivals to the places they are in today, we can find their original stories and afford them the opportunity to be embedded within their own ancestral cosmologies too. Chances are, be they leafy, feathered or furred, they too come with human relatives who struggle to be recognised within scholarship (on this, see Virens (2023)).


So, what will it be, whānau? Perhaps the time has come to affirm—alongside and in solidarity with Indigenous scholars—the reality that the world we inhabit is and always has been alive, sentient and relational. There is a family reunion waiting to be had. At that dinner table, we can gather and reckon with our collective pasts so that new and simultaneously very old relationships may be made and re-made. After all, we are *all* invited to the family reunion, but make sure that you stay long enough to help clean up after the feast too. If you hear the call to join in, then know that a response is also in order.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Open access publishing facilitated by The University of Auckland, as part of the Wiley - The University of Auckland agreement via the Council of Australian University Librarians.

ORCID

Alice McSherry  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9195-6398>

Georgia McLellan  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7684-3141>

ENDNOTE

¹ The term ‘plantecestor’ is put forth by SWANA (South West Asia North Africa) herbalist Layla K. Ferghali (2015) to frame plants as our ‘ancestor’s ancestors’. ‘Through their intimate daily relationships to humans for many centuries, they have acted as vessels of ancestral, elemental, and cosmic knowledge, folklore, culture, history, and memory, and have been used to support the spiritual and earthly well-being of humans for many generations’ (Ferghali, 2015).

REFERENCES

- Ahmed, S. (2013). Making feminist points. In *Feminist Killjoys blog*. Accessed June 28, 2023 <https://feministkilljoys.com/2013/09/11/making-feminist-points/>
- Arcones, P. (2012). *Sons of heaven, Brothers of Nature: The Naxi of Southwest China*. Papers of the White Dragon.

- Barker, A. J., & Pickerill, J. (2020). Doings with the land and sea: Decolonising geographies, indigeneity, and enacting place-agency. *Progress in Human Geography*, 44(4), 640–662.
- Castree, N. (2003). Environmental issues: Relational ontologies and hybrid politics. *Progress in Human Geography*, 27(2), 203–211.
- Country, B., Wright, S., Suchet-Pearson, S., Lloyd, K., Burarrwanga, L., Ganambarr, R., Ganambarr-Stubbs, M., Ganambarr, B., Maymuru, D., & Sweeney, J. (2016). Co-becoming Bawaka: Towards a relational understanding of place/space. *Progress in Human Geography*, 40(4), 455–475.
- Deloria, V., Jr., Deloria, B., Fohner, K., & Scinta, S. (1999). *Spirit & reason: The vine Deloria Jr Reader*. Fulcrum.
- Ferghali, L. K. (2015). What does ‘Plantcestor’ mean? In *Ancestral hub blog*. Accessed June 28, 2023 <https://www.riverroseremembrance.com/ancestralhub-posts/1467>
- Kimmerer, R. W. (2021). A family reunion near the end of the world. In G. van Horn, R. W. Kimmerer, & J. Hausdoerffer (Eds.), *Kinship: Belonging in a world of relations, Vol 1: Planet*. Centre for Humans and Nature Press.
- Larsen, S. C., & Johnson, J. T. (2016). The agency of place: Toward a more-than-human geographical self. *GeoHumanities*, 2(1), 149–166.
- Lyall, A. (1997). *Whakatōhea of Ōpōtiki*. Reed NZ.
- McLellan, G. J. (2020). *Balancing moni hua and mana motuhake: Iwi commercial food ventures and Māori food sovereignty a Whakatōhea case study*. University of Auckland.
- McSherry, A., & Williams, K. J. (2023). Gathering with the plantcestors: Ancestral healing, kinship and the gift of psychotropic plant medicines. In M. di Paola (Ed.), *History, prospects and applications of the vegetal turn: Plant minds, persons, relations and rights*. Springer. Forthcoming.
- Mignolo, W. D. (2009). Epistemic disobedience, independent thought and decolonial freedom. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 26(7–8), 159–181.
- Mikaere, A. (2011). *Colonising myths—Māori realities he rukuruku whakaaro*. Huia Publishers.
- Panelli, R. (2010). More-than-human social geographies: Posthuman and other possibilities. *Progress in Human Geography*, 34(1), 79–87.
- Quijano, A. (2007). Coloniality and modernity/rationality. *Cultural Studies*, 21(2–3), 168–178.
- Sepie, A. J. (2018). More-than-stories, more-than-myths: Animal/human/nature(s) in traditional ecological worldviews. *Humanities*, 6(78), 1–31.
- Sundberg, J. (2014). Decolonizing posthumanist geographies. *Cultural Geographies*, 21(1), 33–47.
- Todd, Z. (2016). An indigenous feminist’s take on the ontological turn: ‘Ontology’ is just another word for colonialism. *Journal of Historical Sociology*, 29(1), 4–22.
- Turnbull, D. (2007). Maps, narratives and trails: Performativity, hodology and distributed knowledges in complex adaptive systems - An approach to emergent mapping. *Geographical Research*, 45, 140–149.
- Virens, A. (2023). Plants out of place: How appreciation of weeds unsettles nature in New Zealand. *New Zealand Geographer*, 79(2). <https://doi.org/10.1111/nzg.12364>
- Waka Huia. (2014). *Profile of Te Kahautu Maxwell, an academic who grew up in Opotiki*. Youtube. Māori Television/Whakaata Māori. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bz7ALUnfleo>
- Walker, R. (1990). *Ka Whawhai Tonu Matou—struggle without end*. Penguin.
- Watts, V. (2013). Indigenous place-thought and agency amongst humans and non-humans (first woman and sky woman go on a European world tour!). *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, 2(1), 20–34.
- Williams, L. (2012). The human ecologist as alchemist: An inquiry into Ngai Te Rangi cosmology in a time of ecological peril. In L. Williams, R. Roberts, & A. McIntosh (Eds.), *Radical human ecology: Intercultural and indigenous approaches* (pp. 91–120). Ashgate.
- Wilson, S. (2016). Using indigenist research to shape our future. In M. Gray, J. Coates, M. Yellow Bird, & T. Hetherington (Eds.), *Decolonizing social work* (pp. 311–322). Routledge.
- Yates, A. M. (2021). Transforming geographies: Performing indigenous-Māori ontologies and ethics of more-than-human care in an era of ecological emergency. *New Zealand Geographer*, 77(2), 101–113.

How to cite this article: McSherry, A., & McLellan, G. (2023). Finding our place at the table: A more-than-human family reunion. *New Zealand Geographer*, 79(2), 121–126. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nzg.12366>