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Abstract

This paper explores spatial dynamics of contestation in the ongoing production of textures of urban place in the postcolonial context of Christchurch, New Zealand. It first examines practices of visual inscription that generate landscapes and mediascapes that struggle to naturalize particular social imaginaries, relations and place-identities. It then considers modes of transgression that rework and expand urban spatiality into new visual terrains of contestation such as those associated with digital media. Emergent communities have thus made use of media spaces such as YouTube to reverse the urban gaze, reframe themselves and the city, and re-imagine place-making landscapes and identities.
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Visual Imaginaries and Place-Identities

This article explores spatial dynamics of contestation and transgression around the visual establishment and disruption of urban landscapes, mediascapes and place-
identities in the postcolonial context of Christchurch, New Zealand. Christchurch was established as an English colonial settlement in the 1850s and to this day is widely seen as the most decidedly ‘English’ of all New Zealand’s cities. Edward Gibbon Wakefield, a key English promoter of the colonization of New Zealand and driving force behind the establishment of the province of Canterbury and its major city, Christchurch, had propounded a ‘theory of systematic colonization’ that argued for the transplantation of ‘whole sections of English society’. Obligingly, the Canterbury ‘gentry idealized and feverishly reconstructed the customs and rituals, the institutions of status and power and the snobbery of home’, Mother England (Cupples and Harrison 2001: 191-2).

More than 150 years later, travellers approaching Christchurch on commercial flights are primed for their experience of the place by screen images that frequently evoke a quaintly genteel and somewhat pastoral colonial yesteryear: sight-seers ‘punt’ on the Avon River, wanderers stroll through lush and florid English gardens, spectators survey the Gothically rich columns, arches and gargoyles of the Oxbridge-style public Arts Centre, passengers sip champagne aboard a restored antique tram car, the Wizard of Christchurch (a kind of polemical town crier garbed in flowing black robes and a pointed conjurer’s hat) holds forth for an onlooking crowd. These visual aphorisms are highly characteristic of the image repertoire that stocks Christchurch’s spatial imaginary and aptly expressive of the city’s pronounced Anglophilia. Here we find nostalgia in the service of forgetfulness. The nostalgic preservation of colonial landscapes serves to erase indigenous and other marginal elements and helps contemporary populations unlearn lessons about the atrocities of the past (Abbas 1999). This type of nostalgia thus constitutes ‘a site in which inequalities are glossed over; . . . a retreat to a temporal comfort zone; to an apolitical
snuggle blanket in which succour and security are assured’ (Bell 2004: 180-1). It is no surprise that a 2003 survey found that the inhabitants of New Zealand’s self-appointed ‘Garden City’ are ‘among the whitest, oldest, and happiest’ urban residents in the nation (Robson 2003).

Nostalgia might be understood as a longing for a sense of place as bounded stasis (Massey 1994: 167). Although the concept of ‘place’ often carries connotations of a self-contained and relatively enduring constancy, much contemporary cultural and geographical thought has stressed the contested, multiscalar, porous, and fluidly dynamic dimensions of places (Adams, Hoelscher and Till 2001: xxi). As Ek observes, ‘place is a diverse social process rather than bounded pieces of Euclidean diagrams or contiguous zones on maps’ (2006: 51; also see Graham and Marvin 2001: 203). Seen in this regard, the identity of a place is as multiple, constructed and struggled for as any other form of social identity. Places, like identities, are thus never finished or finalized but rather always in process. Furthermore, like identities, places must be both imagined and enacted (see, e.g., Donald 1999). Indeed, because ‘individual and collective identities are bound to place at multiple scales’, analysts have come to understand ‘place and place-identity . . . as significant media through which people’ imagine and enact their identities (Adams, Hoelscher and Till 2001: xxi).

‘Imagination’ and ‘image’ share a common root that links both terms to notions of visuality and visualization. To a significant degree, place-identities rely upon practices of visual communication for their establishment and sense of coherence; landscapes thus play a substantial role in the definition of place-identities through the visual inscription of meanings upon surfaces and the creation of spatial ‘textures’ whereby ‘social relations and human-environment interactions’ are woven
together (Adams, Hoelscher and Till 2001: xxi). In their study of place-making around heritage meanings in the affluent, semi-rural suburban New York town of Bedford, for example, Duncan and Duncan (2001) analyse the value of place-image in the constitution of both place- and individual identities, whose interplays function as rich sources of distinction and thus symbolic capital for Bedford’s denizens. Duncan and Duncan note that ‘Bedford need not be socially homogeneous, but it should look so, if living there is to continue to confer social capital upon the residents’. Consequently, people who live there understand some places within the town to be ‘more “Bedford” than others’ and strive to ignore and erase ‘“less Bedford” sites or views’ from both the town’s physical landscape and from their mental apprehensions of it (pp. 45-6).

In his essay on ‘visualicity’, Shields notes that ‘cities are an example of phenomena too extensive in scale to be empirically visible to the human eye in one glance’ and so depend upon a kind of ‘visual magic’ that ‘establishes an order of foci, relations and visual priorities within a field’. These allow us to engage in a ‘collective fiction of seeing the whole from a part’ (Shields 2004: 23, 28). We might understand the enactment of an idealised social homogeneity within both the physical appearances of a place and the mental landscapes whereby residents and visitors grasp and make sense of it (as in the case of a place such as Bedford) as a mapping of the kind of ‘visual magic’ associated with ‘visualicity’ onto the lived realities of socio-political and socioeconomic hierarchies, exclusions and inequalities. And yet, however powerful such visual magics may be, on some level people always already recognize the partiality of their urban visions and the fragility of the whole that is put in question by dissonant scopic elements that disturb the delicate coherence of a city’s appearances. Visuality therefore both facilitates the construction of the city and its
place-identity as an apparent and coherent whole and opens up this constructed
wholeness to disruption, contestation and fragmentation. Dissonant scopic elements
thus endanger the very coherence that constitutes and makes credible official or
dominant place-identity constructs, rendering them amenable to contestation. For
Olwig, landscape is ‘contested both as an actual place and as the figurative site of an
ongoing socio-political discourse concerning the relations between community, self,
and place’ (2001: 94). Analyses of urban visuality should therefore ‘highlight those
moments where the visual is contested, debated and transformed as a constantly
challenging place of social interaction and definition’ (Mirzoeff 1999: 4).

Cresswell (1996) has shown how visual transgressions of spatial order disrupt
and denaturalize dominant place-meanings and official place-identities, and can
thereby facilitate the interrogation and transformation of normative geographies that
work to secure and maintain established social power relations. ‘The criminality of
graffiti’, for example, ‘lies in its being seen, in its transgression of official
appearances’ (Cresswell 1996: 58). Such official appearances are crucial for the
elevation of some place meanings and identities over others, to the advantage of
dominant social groups. The disruption and denaturalization of widely taken-for-
granted meanings that are inscribed within official appearances, creates opportunities
and possibilities for the inscription of alternative meanings and the imagination and
enactment of different place-identities. Such opportunities and possibilities become
more readily available because of the dislocation of established normative
geographies, regardless of the degree of political self-consciousness or intentionality
that may underlie the practices of disruption and transgression at work. By their
impertinent disregard for normative prescriptions that govern what is officially
considered proper or inappropriate practice in relation to this or that place, spatial
transgressions facilitate the production of transformative geographical imaginaries. As Cresswell writes, ‘the associations between the place and its meanings are powerful and often public and communicable. . . . Once it is known what type of behaviour is appropriate for which place, it is simultaneously obvious which things are inappropriate and unacceptable and thus challenging to the guardians of the established order’ (1996: 47-8).

A central element of Cresswell’s analysis concerns the way in which different social groups are differentially empowered ‘to participate in the construction and dissemination of meanings for places and thus places themselves’ (1996: 60). In this regard, spatially transgressive practices such as graffiti writing are at least as important for their ‘subversion of the authority of urban spaces’ (Cresswell 1996: 58) and assertion of a claim to participate in the struggle for the meanings and identities of a place as for their substantive ‘content’. Dávila has studied struggles over the transformation of the landscape of East Harlem, ‘an historically important stronghold of Puerto Rican and Latino New York’ (2004: 95), where there is an ongoing twin influx of, on the one hand, relatively affluent new residents and businesses attracted by comparatively low property values and government policies that promote commercial development and gentrification and, on the other hand, ever expanding outdoor advertising targeted at Latin Americans by large corporations. East Harlem’s visual surfaces and textures are thus shifting as distinctive Latin American architecture, public murals and graffiti are being crowded out by more generic new (or newly renovated) buildings and a constant proliferation of commercially-oriented simulacra of ‘Latin-ness’. Consequently, East Harlem’s long-established residents, shop owners and street vendors experience a progressive diminution of access to the processes through which the neighbourhood’s meanings and identities are established,
whereby in turn it is constructed as a particular place, and hence its spaces are put to
use in ways that better serve some interests at the expense of others. Urban
landscapes and mediascapes thus become sites of struggle for the right and the power
to visibly and effectively articulate the meanings and identities of a place. For both
Cresswell and Dávila, a key stake concerns who gets to be involved in these processes
and who is excluded.

In the sections that follow, I explore these issues around landscapes, place-
identities, exclusions and transgressions in relation to the visual textures of
Christchurch. First I discuss the establishment of English (post)colonial landscapes in
New Zealand’s ‘Garden City’. Such landscapes utilize spatial and visual practices to
exert control and to naturalize certain (post)colonial imaginaries, identities and social
relations. I then consider two highly visible forms of spatial transgression connected
with the forces of popular culture and globalization: graffiti writing and
skateboarding. An analysis of Christchurch media reveals that these local
manifestations of the global popular have functioned in recent times as irritants and
disruptors that have been discursively articulated with ‘Americanization’, racial
difference, criminality and disorder and have thus spectacularly disturbed the surfaces
and textures of Christchurch’s postcolonial visualicity. We might however
understand them as counterclaims on the processes of place-identity formation and as
spatially performative modes of individual identity negotiation that assert difference
in the face of normative postcolonial geographies. Finally, I explore mediascapes that
expand the city’s urban spaces into new visual terrains of contestation. As the screen
images of Christchurch that I’ve described above should remind us, ‘we never
experience the space of the city unmediated’ (Donald 1999: 17). On the contrary, as
Donald (1999: 2) and others have observed, we’ve learned from novels, films and
other media how to see, make sense of and imaginatively map modern cities. The ‘traffic between urban fabric, representation and imagination fuzzies up the epistemological and ontological distinctions and, in doing so, produces the city between, the imagined city where we actually live’ (Donald 1999: 10). Contemporary mediascapes multiply the textured spatiality of places, endowing it with new dimensionalities that facilitate the extension of practices of visual place-identity contestation. As Jansson and Falkheimer (2006: 9) note in their volume on the emergent subfield of communication geography, ‘communication produces space and . . . space produces communication’ (emphasis in original). In this paper I discuss both Christchurch’s ‘official’, place promotional mediascapes and those more transgressive images circulated through new media sites such as YouTube by graffiti writers, urban skateboarders and others.

Christchurch’s (Post)Colonial Landscape

Christchurch’s official nickname, ‘the Garden City’, can be traced to Ebenezer Howard, ‘an obscure English stenographer’ who would vault to international prominence on the basis of his 1898 book, *To-morrow: A Peaceful Path to Real Reform*, which imagined a modernist reformation of industrial urbanism through comprehensive town planning (Ward 1992: 2). Howard was driven by an evangelical zeal for his utopian vision of ‘an Hegelian marriage of town and country out of which would spring “a new hope, a new life, a new civilization.”’ There was no doubt in Howard’s mind that the garden city was the path to a higher plane of living’ (Aalen 1992: 68). The garden city was to be the very embodiment of modern progress, a transcendent fix for the choked and overcrowded cityscapes of Victorian England, with their ‘slums & gin palaces’, their ‘closing out of nature’, their ‘army of

Aalen notes that, like other reformist campaigns of its time, the garden city movement emerged within a historical and geographical context fraught with anxieties around urbanization and marked by romantic inclinations toward rural life and the countryside. These anxieties and inclinations were racially inflected: leading eugenicists associated cities with ‘racial decay’ and therefore had, like the contemporaneous ‘social hygiene’ movement, ‘a significant anti-urban, pro-rural bias’. Although he didn’t explicitly invoke eugenics as a justification for his garden city designs, the import of Howard’s plans to ameliorate the afflictions of urbanism nevertheless takes shape against the backdrop of the hereditary sciences (Aalen 1992: 38). Indeed, one commentator describes Howard’s garden city scheme as the blueprint for a ‘eugenic utopia’ (Voigt 1989). Hence, it is perhaps no coincidence that, as Cupples and Harrison (2001: 191) observe, not only are ‘utopian notions of Englishness’ more visible in Christchurch (which in 1996 beat more than 600 competitors for the title ‘Garden City of the World’) than elsewhere in New Zealand, but ‘the erasure of pre-colonial and indigenous identities has been more comprehensive’ there as well. For it was in Christchurch that the 19th century English reformative utopian imagination found a home and exploited to their fullest the opportunities presented by what must have looked from its perspective like an almost perfect social laboratory: a geographically remote and indeed ‘otherworldly’ site of extreme isolation and unspoiled ‘naturalness’. Here was a place to start afresh, as if from scratch, far removed from the blighted cityscapes of Victorian England. A tantalizing prospect: one could perhaps import Mother England’s ‘best’ features and leave behind her ‘worst’.
Troubling the colonial dream of a social tabula rasa in the Antipodes was the inconvenient fact that the new lands were of course already populated, and if 19th century European cities were increasingly seen as sites of ‘racial decay’, the untamed wilderness of colonies such as New Zealand also presented a racially marked topography. It is here that the figure of the ‘garden’ in ‘Garden City’ assumes a paramount position. As Eric Pawson demonstrates, the garden was a potent signifier of ‘civilization’ in the face of wilderness. The transformation of indigenous spaces through the importation of European landscaping models such as the English-style garden thus functions to tame, order, rationalize and in a word ‘civilize’ the savage wilderness (Pawson 2000). However, this spatial civilization strategy is fraught with anxieties and persistently vexed by the presence of the very elements it attempts to bar, as ‘nature’s’ exuberant excess (and by metonymic implication that of the land’s native inhabitants) threatens continually to outstrip the ‘civilizing’ order and control imposed through colonial landscaping and other imperializing practices (see Ginn, in this issue).

> [NB: Insert Figure 1 approximately here.]

Christchurch’s contemporary north-western suburbs contain a local attraction called Riccarton Bush that invites allegorical reading as a nostalgic monument to the ritualized containment of indigeneity and reminder of the anxieties around impurity and hybridization that attend such efforts at containment. There, a wooden fence surrounds the largest enclosure of remaining native bush in the province of Canterbury, thus establishing an orderly physical and semiotic or diacritical boundary between the autochthonous flora and the park and suburban lawns that surround it. The signifying chain that runs from the bush/containment area to a nearby colonial manse, Riccarton House, via a transplanted historic settlers’ cabin is tellingly
evocative of the imperializing teleology that imagines (and here spatially enacts) a linear progression extending from the ‘primordial’ through the ‘developing’ to the ‘civilized’. Hence, the austere settlers’ cabin bears a sign announcing its distinction as the first European dwelling in Canterbury. Although the cabin stands guard over the native bush (almost as if to prevent an outbreak from its containment area), it is eclipsed by the stately nearby manse (see Figure 1), whose majesty and grace arrive as if in imaginary fulfilment of all colonial teleologies, for as Fiske (1996: 123) notes, ‘race is often recoded into class’. The destiny that is inscribed upon this suburban landscape is thus achieved anew each day, as local ladies and gentlemen congregate here for Devonshire Teas and formal dinners near the banks of the Avon River.

Colonially inscribed landscapes such as this one exert power by working to naturalize (literally) the teleological, Eurocentric historical imaginaries they materially represent.

>[NB: Insert Figure 2 approximately here.]

Riccarton Bush is overshadowed by its colonially inverse image, the city’s much larger botanical gardens, which are situated near the heart of the downtown area, at one end of a key scopic corridor of traditional Christchurch known as the ‘Cultural Precinct’. The precinct’s core stretches for some four blocks up cobbled Worcester Street past the renowned architecture of the Arts Centre to Cathedral Square; it is the radiant centre of an English colonial visualicity (see Figure 2). As Shields (2004: 30) notes, the urban gaze ‘is embedded within a matrix of visualicity . . . that sutures an object or view to a wider experiential time-space milieu’. Hence, along with its meticulous English gardens, Christchurch’s monuments, statuary and major focal icons of Gothic Revival architecture anchor a persistent urban spatial imaginary that goes ‘beyond the visible to form a context that
includes the past and events that have since disappeared’ (Shields 2004: 29). But such iconic features embody and visualize a colonial heritage that is currently under pressure from a variety of different forces and directions. The city’s colonial visualicity struggles mightily against dissonant postcolonial elements that un hinge and reorder its traditional identity coordinates. The complex connectivities and vectors of globalization, for example, facilitate transnational flows of one form or another and introduce deterritorializing energies that operate at hyperspeed, reworking localities and setting complications and conflicts in motion (Appadurai 1999; Tomlinson 1999). Such processes leave some of their marks on the cityscape in the form of the familiar logos and brand names of transnational consumerism and global popular culture. Consequently, visitors to the Christchurch Cathedral, a monument to Gothic Revivalism’s visualization of the ‘English church/state nexus’ (McNaughton, in this issue) and the centrepiece of the city’s main square, find this scene now unsurprisingly circumscribed by three Starbuck’s stores, KFC, McDonald’s, a nearby shop specializing in ‘authentic New York bagels’, and hip-hop clubs catering especially to Maori and Pacific Island youth.

While the city’s image managers and place promoters often draw upon the strategies of heritage promotion and nostalgia commodification, they equally worry that Christchurch’s iconic English gardens are perceived by tourists as dull and antiquated, and should therefore give way to more cosmopolitan and adventure-oriented imagery that breaks ‘away from the old’ (Schollmann, Perkins & Moore 2000: 72). Meanwhile, not uncontentious efforts to reintroduce indigenous plant species to supplement the European varieties that dominate Christchurch’s public green spaces index from another angle the extent to which the city’s historically cherished Englishness is strained in a postcolonial context of globalization, official
biculturalism and de facto multiculturalism. Within such a context, ‘urban growth, advertising, graffiti, and modern social movements’ give rise to struggles ‘for a new visual culture in the midst of the stubborn persistence of signs of the old order’ (García Canclini 1995: 221). Such struggles typically engender opposition from those with an interest or identity invested in the old order. ‘Purified identities are constructed through the purification of space, through the maintenance of territorial boundaries and frontiers’ (Morley and Robins 1995: 122). Identity is thus a spatial as well as an historical problematic, one whose purification impulses and dynamics help to explain recent public outcries in Christchurch in response to plans for the introduction into the Cultural Precinct of a new art gallery featuring a highly contemporary and spectacular undulating glass façade (see Figure 3) and for the simultaneous visual reinvention of the old gallery via the suspension of a floating whare, or Maori meeting house, above its parapets (Scanlon 2004: 8). Additionally, as we’ll see, there has been something of a public backlash against the encroachment of indigenous plant species upon well established European treescapes.

>NB: Insert Figure 3 approximately here.

In 2003 the new NZ$48 million Christchurch Gallery came into being amidst a din of complaints and public controversy over the building’s apparent indifference to the city’s colonial heritage architecture. An opening day review of the new gallery noted with a rather carnivalesque image the sense of transgressive visual discontinuity it introduced into the Cultural Precinct: ‘planted with assurance among Christchurch’s best known and much loved Gothic Revival buildings, the Gallery sounds a peal of bright laughter at a primly decorous party’. As the reviewer succinctly put it, ‘the opulent baroque swaths of the building’s glass wall’ seemed to represent ‘all that was new, and everything that any parochial-minded Canterbury critic abhorred’. It
therefore generated ‘a public debate that reverberated with ferocious verbal cannonades’ (Press 2003). Letters to the newspaper’s editor complained of the ruination of ‘the classical ambience of the area between the Cathedral’ and the botanical gardens, of a failure to ‘marry the gallery’ into its visual environs, of the ‘appalling apparition’ of a ‘glass monstrosity’ unleashed upon the district (Harvey 2002: 8; Keith 2003: 8) and of a lack of ‘respect for the surrounds and history of the area’ (Williams 2002: 14). Architect Peter Beaven, a key spokesperson for a loosely affiliated set of civic organizations dedicated to the preservation of Christchurch’s Gothic architectural patrimony (dubbed ‘heritage Nazis’ by some detractors) memorably designated the new gallery a ‘great alien’ that has little connection to Christchurch’s historical identity and that undermines the visual coherence of its central city (Crean 2005: D3). In a manner that recalls Duncan and Duncan’s observation that Bedford residents convert history into cultural capital by consuming heritage as ‘good taste’ (2001: 44), Beaven declared Christchurch to be ‘in the grip of people who . . . create kitsch results without understanding our history’ (Crean 2005: D3).

Such complaints notwithstanding, creation of the new gallery involved years of extensive consultation with local iwi (or tribes; see Christchurch City Council 2002), and Te Puna o Waiwhetu (the gallery’s Maori name) was strategically situated at a location considered to have historical significance from indigenous as well as Pakeha (New Zealand European) perspectives. From A.D. 1000 to the late 1500s, this location was the site of a Waitaha settlement (Press 2003), and an ancient urupa (or burial ground) lies immediately to the south of the gallery. The undulations in the glazed sculpture wall are said by gallery staff to be evocative of both the curves of the nearby Avon River and the koru, a spiralling, non-linear figure used in traditional
Maori carving and often associated with connotations of (re)birth and new beginnings (Hutching 2003). There is perhaps something of a visual, transcultural hybridity at work in this gallery that indexes the constantly transforming process whereby cultural meanings and identities are continually reshaped, renegotiated and reformulated anew (Mirzoeff 1999: 26). Recurrent references to the gallery’s putative indifference to the area’s history, however, recapitulate colonialism’s identification of European development with ‘History’ itself and its location of ‘Others’ somewhere anterior to the processes of the latter.

The controversy over the new gallery was recapitulated around the announcement of a plan to erect a ‘floating’ Maori whare over the roof of the city’s former art gallery, another focal architectural icon that anchors the opposite end of the Cultural Precinct from the Cathedral. The whare proposal drew heavy fire from locals who turned out for public resource consent hearings. For example, the grandson of Robert McDougall, the philanthropic Christchurch benefactor whose name the old gallery bore, told city councillors the proposed development would be ‘totally disrespectful to the building and its history’, while others who testified objected that it would ‘disrespect the legacy’ of the building’s designer, revered Gothic Revival architect Benjamin Mountfort, display ‘considerable vulgarity’, and reveal a ‘deliberate lack of sympathy with the existing heritage fabric’ of central Christchurch (Gray 2004: 4). Peter Beaven added the claim that the ‘insane’ whare proposal ‘tamper[s]’ with the ‘critical core’ of a legacy bequeathed by the founding settlers of Christchurch, ‘cutting at the very heart of our soul’ (Crean 2005: D3). The author of one letter to the editor of the Christchurch Press characterized the whare plan as a ‘school boys’ scatological joke’ and complained that the ‘proposal to perch a shed on top of the elegant Robert McDougall Art Gallery . . . would give the impression of a
long-drop toilet’ that ‘would always look like a back country dunny’ (Begg 2004: 10). She thus invoked the powerful abjection associated with excremental imagery in order to extend the discourse of European heritage as good taste and to activate its connotations of ‘civilized’ refinement. In their influential analysis of the cultural symbologies of hierarchical classification, Stallybrass and White (1986) discuss the significance of such tropes of abjection. The symbolics of the lower bodily regions, of the digestive, sexual and excretory organs, of toilets and sewers are persistently invoked as emblems of the abject extremities or ‘low’ ends of social life (associated by our letter writer with Maori culture) that establish by contrast what is designated ‘high’ and therefore worthy of respect and even reverence (the ‘civilizing’ influence of Christchurch’s colonial heritage architecture).

For a final example of reactions against struggles to remake Christchurch’s colonial heritage landscapes in a postcolonial context, consider this recent backlash in the face of what we might regard as the botanical desegregation of the city’s public green spaces. In 2003, a Christchurch city councillor penned a paean to ‘poplar purity’, arguing for the renewed segregation of autochthonous plants now apparently encroaching on a number of ‘stately Lombardy poplars along the Avon in the central city’. The poplars are touted as constituting ‘one of our foremost iconic heritage landscapes, strongly linked to our European past’, but currently ‘under threat’ from several ‘wayward’ indigenous seedlings that have ‘drifted’ into their midst from a formerly contained native garden in the vicinity. It is thus the erosion of clear boundaries between the European and the indigenous and consequent spatial and horticultural impurities and disorder that apparently agitate the city counsellor. She writes that the poplared ‘landscape is invested with inherited cultural and heritage meanings’ whose ‘consequences are strong and positive’. This treescape beside the
Avon River ‘creates a sense of belonging and an attachment to the site—giving a unique identity and a sense of place to a community’ (Crighton 2003: A9). What we must notice here is the implied exclusivity of the sense of ‘belonging’ that has been carefully cultivated through more than a century of applied urban ‘Garden City’ planning strategies and concepts whose apparent erosion now threatens the maintenance of purified spaces and thus identities. For whom, after all, do these ‘iconic heritage landscapes, strongly linked to our European past’ produce a sense of ‘belonging’?

A more scientifically oriented companion piece written by a horticultural specialist and run alongside the plea for ‘poplar purity’ in Christchurch’s daily paper similarly contrasts ‘examples of our [pre-colonial] primitive flora and fauna’ with the introduced ‘so-called English trees and shrubs . . . that have been a dominant element in the parks, gardens, and streets of Christchurch since the middle of the 19th century’. Like its companion, this piece uses this contrast to allegorize and naturalize a colonialist teleology:

significantly, indigenous plant species are now heavily outnumbered by naturalised plants . . . . The rapidity with which some of these introduced plants . . . have colonised huge areas suggests either there are numerous ecological niches for which no indigenous species are available, or that many indigenous plants are poor competitors doomed to disappear.

Here, of course, the invocation of aboriginal botanical inadequacy and primitivism corresponds all too neatly (if only implicitly and perhaps therefore all the more powerfully) with the racial supremacy and presumption of impending indigenous extinction inscribed in traditional colonialist discourses. This correspondence is
effective precisely because, within such discourses, the indigenous ‘is defined by the fixed proximity of such people to Nature’ (Hall 1981: 41). ‘Civilization’ and development, by contrast, require appropriate displays of aesthetic cultivation. By the end of the piece, there can be no doubt with regard to the appropriate strategic plan for the landscape architecture of the Garden City:

It is at best misguided to attempt to convert the whole city into a mirror image of Riccarton Bush . . . . There is no good aesthetic or ecological argument to support such a campaign. The clock cannot be turned back. The little bits of primeval survivalism are very important, scientifically and historically, but I guarantee that springtime tourists leave Christchurch with stronger memories of Hagley Park’s blossoming . . . cherries [Rooney, 2003: A9].

Note the easy slippage from arguments made in the name of science (yet which nevertheless rest upon the culturally constructed notion of ‘primeval’ oddities that have managed to survive amidst modern development) to undocumented assertions about aesthetic value; it is this slippage that gives persuasive force to the writer’s claim that the city must rededicate itself to the vigilant policing and containment of Riccarton Bush. While there is then widespread and growing support for movements to alter the imbalance between ‘English’ plants and native flora in Christchurch, there are also recurrent attacks on, as one letter writer put it, the ‘Natification Mafia’ and the ‘silent creep of . . . the miscegenation mish-mash’ within the city’s public green spaces (Pollard 2003: 10).

These various examples of heritage politics in Christchurch suggest that postcolonialism entails the disruption and persistence of Eurocentric, colonial sensemaking practices within a context of official anti-racism and even inclusivism
(see Kobayashi, in this issue). Within such a conjuncture, recoded and covert forms of racism (Fiske 1996) become particularly important as they are among the most prevalent mechanisms for the maintenance of a Eurocentric common sense. Fiske observes that ‘if racism can be recoded into discourses that are not explicitly concerned with race, it can be spoken silently, its power can be exerted invisibly, and it can guard itself against . . . resistance’ (1996: 37). In our examples, discourses of ‘heritage’, of architectural and visual aesthetic coherence, and of indigenous botanical inadequacy recode submerged anxieties around ‘the threat of civilization being over-run or undermined by the recurrence of savagery’ (Hall 1981: 41), whose potential for imminent eruption is difficult to fully evacuate from postcolonial imaginaries. Such anxieties can therefore make the rigorous policing of place-images and place-identities seem to matter intensely. As Cresswell (1996: 26, 39) argues, such policing targets things that are visibly ‘out of place’ (such as ‘wayward’ native plants amidst English gardens, a Maori whare atop the formerly sacred repository of European art, and other architectural ‘monstrosities’ in the heart of the Cultural Precinct), because the transgressive presence of the latter both disrupts common sense notions of place by making its otherwise invisible norms evident and reveals the vulnerabilities of the established order that it violates.

**Globalization, ‘Americanization’ and Transgressive Media Tactics**

Commercial developers and place promoters, urban planners and other city officials, tribal organizations and business owners are all institutional stakeholders with substantial resources to compete in place-making processes and struggles. Culturally, socially and economically marginalized people who lack resources and an institutional support base have fewer opportunities to participate in or otherwise influence visual practices of place-identity (re)making. Nevertheless, the relatively
socially weak and marginal of course have ways of making their mark on place. Since the second half of the 20th century, youth cultures have been among the most adept at developing spectacular forms of visibility that persistently disrupt the authority, official meanings and normative geographies of place and multiply its textures. Such disruptions and multiplications announce an alternative presence, desires and urban imaginaries that put established place-identities under pressure and create spaces for the emergence and assertion of difference.

In this section I discuss two spectacularly visible forms of place transgression that are commonly associated with global youth culture, urban disorder and, in varying degrees, racial difference: skateboarding and graffiti. The threat of erupting difference is, as we’ve seen, a source of anxiety and a motivation to stepped-up policing in postcolonial contexts. Skating and graf writing in Christchurch have given rise to significant public efforts aimed at their containment or eradication. The demonization of such place-disruptive practices facilitates attempts to re-stabilize normative postcolonial geographies and place-identities through the articulation of racially recoded discourses in the media and the reassertion of core power-bearing place values such as social order, harmony, rationality and respect for private property rights. However, just as the city’s landscapes are sites of disruption, transgression and contestation, so too are its media terrains. While city officials, educational authorities and police officers may attempt to exert control over disruptive youths through demonizing discourses and visual surveillance mechanisms, those same youths have made use of new media sites such as YouTube to reframe themselves and to reverse the urban gaze, thus laying claim to, re-visualizing and re-imagining the city’s landscapes and identities.
Within the context of globalization, postcolonialism, and the consumption of English heritage as ‘good taste’, US popular cultures and the spreading threat of ‘Americanization’ can readily represent another ‘Other’, particularly from the perspectives of middle-class and professional guardians of cultural merit and moral values (see Cupples, in this issue). Ang (1985: 2-3, 93) noted some years ago that ‘in many European countries . . . there is an official aversion to American television series’, which are widely seen as threatening to ‘authentic’ European cultural identities and ‘high-principled cultural values in general’. Morley (1989: 32) observes that British scholars have traced back at least as far as the 1930s, fears ‘that English or European “high culture” is in danger of being swamped by a relentless deluge of “Americana.”’ These fears that have perennially afflicted cultural arbiters of legitimate English taste are perhaps not entirely misplaced: scholars such as Dick Hebdige and Tim Blanchard have found that in England, the taste for US cultural products is especially strong among groups that are socially subordinated by class and race, in part because the ‘vulgarity’ of these products so offends British cultural elites, who consistently associate ‘Americanization’ with ‘crime, disaffected youth, urban crisis, and spiritual drift’ (Morley 1989: 32-3). Socially subordinated groups such as young working class and Black Britons have thus found US cultural products to be particularly useful for challenging and subverting elite cultural authority and official place-identities. It is in relation to such popular tastes and elite cultural judgments that my interest in skateboarding and graffiti meets up with the dynamics of place, power and identity, for both these popular practices are, as Christchurch media have noted, imports from the US, England’s crass Other. Although they have both of course long since gone global along with much other US popular culture, skateboarding originated amidst Southern California’s surfing cultures, while graffiti
appeared and developed in conjunction with the emergence and growth of New York City’s hip-hop communities. Both therefore serve as powerful signifiers of globalization as ‘Americanization’, with the capacity to activate all the anxieties and mechanisms of elite cultural distinction and demonization such signifiers carry with them. Since at least the mid-1990s, the Christchurch Press’s coverage of skateboarding and graffiti has generally constructed both activities as urban problems in need of surveillance, containment and, especially in the case of graffiti, eradication.

Skateboarding was in one article, for instance, associated with MTV and an aggressive American ‘Xtreme’ youth culture that openly attacks such traditional virtues as ‘love and peace’, ‘respect for others’ and ‘compassion’ while embracing an anarchic ‘disregard for convention’ and authority (Mealing 1997: 2). Local media coverage has thus often associated skateboarding with crime, drugs, vandalism, laziness, violence and countercultural values. In the pages of The Press, city officials, judges, police officers, prominent citizens and letter writers have repeatedly characterized skateboarders as menaces to pedestrians, drivers, tourists and shoppers; some have even designated skateboarding an unsightly aesthetic offence that degrades the city’s image. In addition to its connotations of ‘Americanization’, skateboarding has been associated with racial difference in Christchurch media discourses since the 1999 election to the New Zealand Parliament of Nandor Tanczos, a dreadlocked, Rastafarian, bi-racial Green Party member who advocates cannabis law reform and routinely skateboards to work for environmental reasons. Tanczos’s preferred mode of commuter transportation is almost ritually noted in The Press’s coverage of national politics, as in, for example, a 2002 story that mentions his strong voter appeal among ‘dope-smoking young skateboarders’ (Espiner 2002: 9).
Skateboarding is sometimes linked in the Christchurch media with graffiti, its even more disreputable cousin. Like skateboarding, graffiti is often inserted by local commentators, officials and letter writers into discourses that evoke social disruption and disorder. Cresswell (1996) shows that publicly circulated discourses around graffiti often associate it with primitivism, irrationality and animality. Its presence, like that of indigenous plants in English gardens, represents the menacing antithesis of ‘civilization’; it thus threatens to convert ‘the Garden City’ into ‘Graffiti City’, an anarchic and degenerative figure that is frequently invoked in The Press, often with racialized discursive undercurrents. One letter writer asserts, for example, that ‘stepping up the removal of graffiti and tagging as soon as it is evident is essential’, for ‘unless Christchurch moves out of its apathy the city is in real danger of becoming like South Auckland’ (a poor community associated by many Pakeha New Zealanders with crime and with Maori and Polynesian identities), ‘where every flat surface is covered with the unintelligible scrawlings of the intellectually challenged’ (Sintes 2001: 4). Christchurch media discourses often associate graffiti with hip-hop culture, gang activities, urban mayhem, and antisociality. It is an invasive visual pollutant more appropriate to the ghettos of East LA, the Bronx or South Auckland than an English heritage garden paradise.

De Certeau argues that place in the modern world is constituted through the controlling administrative activities of institutional subjects powerful enough to establish boundaries that delimit and distinguish a terrain capable of serving as a base for the rationalization and strategic management of relations with some ‘exteriority’ that is ‘composed of targets or threats’. The establishment of place entails both the designation of a proper order that ensures the continuity of power and the exertion of ‘mastery . . . through sight’, whereby alien entities and pollutants can be treated as
objects of observation, control and assimilation (de Certeau 1984: 35-6). Like other cities, Christchurch has responded strategically to its perceived identity pollutants, skateboarding and graffiti. Through monitoring, surveillance, assimilation and spatial cordonning, the city has established distinctions between legitimate and illegitimate skateboarding and graffiti activities and sites of practice. With regard to skateboarding, for example, bans in some tourist, shopping and garden districts have been accompanied by the creation of legitimate skateboard parks on the edges of the city (which have nevertheless become controversial ‘trouble spots’ often associated in the media with criminality, misbehaviour, drugs and graffiti; see Figure 4). In the case of graffiti, a city initiative known as ‘Project Legit’ has established training programmes designed to educate offenders on the impacts of their visual crimes and develop their abilities toward sanctioned forms of graffiti-derived artistic muralism that can be plied in legally authorized venues. Meanwhile, expensive and expansive citywide campaigns have devoted vast public resources and enlisted large numbers of Christchurch residents in endeavours to eliminate and deter tagging through intensified surveillance (including the establishment of police databases of known tags and offenders), the implementation of prophylactic urban design principles and the rapid elimination of all illegal graffiti upon its appearance.

>[NB: Insert Figure 4 approximately here.]

In contemporary times, strategies for mastering places through sight generally involve electronic media systems of one sort or another. For example, one June 2000 TVNZ One News story on the expansion of police surveillance cameras in downtown Christchurch discusses the substantial impact that electronic spatial monitoring has had on violence and youth crimes such as graffiti in the city and the further gains greater investment in such initiatives will surely produce. The story includes images
of young people out of control, kicking cars, breaking windows and assaulting one another during a busy weekend night in the city. Police officers greatly outnumbered by the throngs of youths explain to a reporter that they nevertheless have an ace up their sleeves in the form of a high tech monitoring station where civic-minded volunteers spend all-night shifts in front of banks of screens and sophisticated remote controls attached to dozens of hidden surveillance cameras scattered throughout the city. Upon any signs of a disturbance or impending offence, the volunteers use the remote controlled cameras to record crucial visual data and dispatch officers to the scene. At work here then is a powerful chain of visual media systems turned toward the reduction of social disturbances and the enhancement of order in the city. In the first instance we have the surveillance camera/citizen volunteer/police brigade apparatus, which greatly multiplies the expanse of cityspace that is directly observable by authorities at any one time. But this apparatus is itself expanded and extended by TV news stories and images that convey visual information to a much larger population that includes both potentially ‘disruptive youths’ and ‘concerned citizens’. TV here thus expands the city’s visual monitoring apparatus in at least three ways: 1) by announcing the ever-growing presence of surveillance cameras and police volunteers to young people, who are thereby encouraged to police their own behaviour more effectively or suffer the consequences; 2) by recruiting new citizen volunteers to the police apparatus, thus enhancing its integration into the cultures of everyday life and extending its power-bearing operations throughout the spaces of the city; and 3) by activating within even non-volunteering ‘ordinary citizens’ a state of heightened alertness to potential disorder and disturbances within their own immediate environments and hence a greater widespread readiness to report such disturbances to appropriate authorities.
TV and other media also exert control over urban space by visualizing and imagining it in particular ways. Such activities invite readers and audiences to share these imaginaries and thus the normative geographies they imply. Place-promotional activities such as the City Council and Chamber of Commerce’s recent ‘Always Different’ and ‘Cultural Precinct’ ad campaigns, launched in 2005 through TV, billboards, bus shelter posters, print media and the Internet, are interesting in this regard. While the Cultural Precinct commercials announce Christchurch’s ‘ever changing arts . . . and heritage architecture’ and clearly emphasize the city’s English gardens and Gothic Revivalist treasures, the 30-second ‘Always Different’ TV ad showcases an array of some 21 rapidly changing video images set to percussive, jazzy, contemporary ambient music. These images emphasize movement across urban Christchurch spaces over the course of a day from morning to nightfall and most emphatically showcase alternating depictions of outdoor activity amidst greenery, small groups or individuals being served while enjoying a variety of consumer pleasures, and capital-C cultural pursuits such as a woman gazing at a painting in the city gallery and two performers on a theatrical stage in front of an audience. This ad thus reiterates, updates and visually reworks the city’s normative geographies around signifiers of European cultural heritage and middle-class consumerist imaginaries. Its closing graphic and voice-over state, ‘Christchurch Central City: Always Different’, an encapsulating caption that confronts difference (a threatening figure in this postcolonial context, as we’ve seen) by domesticating the concept and imaginarily confining its visual articulation within the terms of a (limited) range of available consumer varieties and the changing aspects of middle-class urban activity across different parts of a typical day.
Counterposed against the strategic operations of hegemonic place-making, for de Certeau (1984), are the tactical everyday practices of the socially weak, which opportunistically create partially liberated spaces of popular agency that subvert the power of the dominant at the point of its application. An urban skateboarder, for example, fleetingly transmutes the rationally ordered spaces of the city by exceeding their parameters. Skaters stretch and bend the limits of strategic systems and official place-identities founded upon monuments, exclusive shopping districts, meticulously groomed gardens, historic buildings, revered landmarks, offices and other sites of productivity (capitalist or administrative), which become in their hands the departure points for transverse logics and alternative corporealities. As Borden (2001: 53) notes, ‘skaters . . . redefine both the city and themselves’. Skateboarding can thus be seen as ‘an implicit critique of the limited design and uses to which we put our contemporary cities’ (Chatterton and Hollands 2003: 206). Similarly, graf writers undertake stealthy nocturnal commissions that involve intensive corporeal performativities (see Macdonald 2001) and leave colourful, semi-occulted tracings that inscribe place-rewriting countermeanings throughout the city.

In the mainstream media, while demonizing discourses may predominate around visually spectacular tactical practices such as graf writing and skateboarding, such discourses do not go uncontested. Thus, for example, when Christchurch Chamber of Commerce chief executive Peter Townsend (2007: A9) wrote in The Press in favour of ‘the adoption of comprehensive video surveillance’ to create a ‘well-governed, well-managed’ city where disorder is met with ‘prompt intervention by special multi-disciplinary teams’, one letter writer responded that ‘a graffiti-free, totally surveilled city with support from the whole populace’ would be ‘a totalitarian nightmare’ (McLean 2007: 10). Similarly, graf writers, skateboarders and their
sympathetic supporters occasionally proffer counterdiscourses in print or on camera that revalue their activities by disarticulating them from disparaging meanings and rearticulating them to more affirmative ones.

Internet sites such as YouTube, which facilitates the production of a form of DIY global media that is nevertheless firmly anchored in the localities of place, create new spaces where counterdiscourses, tactical appropriations and visual reinscriptions of specific urban sites contest official place-meanings and identities. We might regard such urban reinscriptions as a kind of media graffiti that is to official place-images what tagging and bombing with paint are to heritage landscapes. For example, near the start of one YouTube video, New Zealander Jordan Pearson, framed by a familiar monument known as the Bridge of Remembrance, strolls toward the camera beneath a cloudy gray sky and intones, ‘Christchurch is often criticized as being one of the most gloomy, depressing, conservative, racist and polluted cities in the Southern Hemisphere. But this is not entirely true; it’s also really, really cold.’ Pearson thus disarticulates the monument from its expressive connections with the city’s utopian English heritage discourses and humorously rearticulates it with injustice, discomfort, environmental degradation and malaise.¹

YouTube videos have begun to proliferate that feature skateboarding and graf
twriting in Christchurch. Some show skateboarders gliding across the railings or flying over the stairways, benches and other fixtures that enframe the city’s architectural treasures and heritage landscapes. One, for instance, opens with images of an angry security guard asserting his authority over place after he is challenged by a young, long-haired, skateboard-toting Maori or Pasifika boy known as ‘Fants’, whom the guard calls a ‘lippy little prick’. We then see Fants turn the city into his own playground as he soars off the roofs of concrete structures, glides across tables in
a school classroom, flies gracefully over the stairs and supposedly skateboard-proof
grooved paving stones of the Cathedral Square, whose central monument looms in the
backdrop, and skates through the greenery that lines the banks of the Avon River, all
while hip-hop and other contemporary popular music plays on the soundtrack. We
also see Fants compete in a skating championship, where his transgressive corporeal
displays are recontextualized as signs of achievement. In this video, skating becomes
a skilfully irreverent response to forms of authority that are visibly inscribed in a
variety of urban Christchurch landscapes and places, and literally embodied in the
figure of the angry security guard.2

Another YouTube video begins with images of a dark, long-haired,
Rastafarian-garbed skater approaching the Gothic Arts Centre, then crouching and
soaring over the stone fence that separates the building from the street, with
Christchurch’s iconic Port Hills visible in the background, while his board spins in the
air before rejoining his feet on the pavement. The next shot is a close-up of the skater
sleeping in bed, though the camera zooms out to reveal that the bed occupies the
quasi-public space of a shopping mall, which the skater also ‘misuses’ as he had the
Arts Centre. We see behind his head a nearby shop’s advertising sign that announces
‘Free! Free! Free!’ before the skater rises, mounts his board and fluidly traverses the
mall, turning its obstacles into props for his tricks and skilful manoeuvres as the
Velvet Underground’s ‘I’ll Be Your Mirror’ plays on the soundtrack. The camera
follows the skater’s gaze as he surveys first the ‘sacred’ heritage space of the Arts
Centre, then the consumerist space of the mall. As the lyrics of the accompanying
music imply, both the skater’s fluent movements and the camera’s images rework in
tandem these city spaces to reflect his imagination and desires, thus recasting the
dynamic interplay between place and identity via the urban agency of the skater,
whose uses of these places adapt and reshape them through a kind of spatial mirroring that is governed by his corporeality and videography (‘I’ll be your mirror, reflect what you are, in case you don’t know’).³

While such videos might then be understood as a kind of media graffiti that contributes to the re-imagination and visual remaking of place, some YouTube material takes actual Christchurch graf writing practices as its subject matter. These videos often feature the elaborate and colourful work of graf ‘kings’ in its finished forms or while it is being made at locations throughout the city on the sides of trains, under overpasses and on other available surfaces. Some videos intercut an occasional shot of local businesses, the tourist tram or the iconic Port Hills backdrop amidst footage of graf writers at work or of elaborate finished pieces placed in difficult to access locations. Such videos reverse the scopic priorities of Christchurch’s established regime of visualicity, alluding to but decentring the city’s official image and emphasizing instead its dark aspects and hidden, repressed or underground spaces, landscapes, and geographies, its alternative mappings or countercartographies.⁴ One video that opens with the title ‘Zes One’ surveys the artist’s work across numerous Christchurch locales, including on suburban fences, bridges, post boxes, building walls, and splashed over a Coke ad. This video seems calculated to shock and offend ‘respectable’, middle-class Christchurch, not least through its soundtrack, which is comprised of a hip-hop song that professes a rejection of work in favour of a life of ‘just chillin’’. Thus over the video’s images of graffiti, we hear lyrics such as the following: ‘I’m just ch-ch-chillin’, sponsored by the taxpayers’ sixpence, shillin’s and such . . . I like layin’ in bed in the daytime. If there’s nothin’ on TV, just as happy to watch the paint dry.’⁵ Another YouTube video simply captures the illicit dangers and eerie quiet of an urban rooftop at night as we
hear the sounds of occasional passing traffic, a shaking can of spray paint and not much else. Yet another of the videos, like the one mentioned earlier that features a confrontation between skater and security guard, similarly both evokes and transgresses the authority of urban space by setting its images of graffiti to hip-hop music about a graf writer who is chased by but successfully eludes the police.

These videos work like Bedford’s heritage landscapes turned upside down: they spread the fame that prolific graf writers seek on a scale that is literally global by using YouTube to activate an underground visual economy of illicit cultural capital. Moreover, like the visual terrain of East Harlem, they depict spectacular contestation over who gets to participate in the circulation of place-meanings and the creation of place-identities. Thus, for instance, Zes’s colourful graf work screams over the top of the familiar commercial image of a Coke logo, while Fants spectacularly (if only momentarily) eclipses the heritage meanings that are somewhat more durably inscribed in the Christchurch Cathedral (although this fleeting moment of spectacle can be endlessly reactivated with the click of a mouse). These media practices invite visual identification with the urban tacticians’ perspectives on place—perspectives that evoke but transgress, rework and re-imagine (and thus begin to transform) the city’s normative geographies, sense of place and dominant identities.

An often overlooked aspect of de Certeau’s work concerns the capacity of tactics to create among their practitioners a sense of solidarity and community. Digital media similarly create communicative spaces for the emergence of new communities around the place-imaginaries they circulate. The YouTube videos I’ve discussed sometimes visualize and invite identification with a spirit of community expressed, for example, in their images of groups of young people practicing together at skateparks (a sense of community that is often enhanced by the supportive shouts of
onlooking fellow skaters on the videos’ soundtracks). Similarly, graffiti videos refer
to painting crews and in one case include a closing graphic that proclaims ‘thanks to
all the Christchurch graf family’. The sense of community and place-belonging that
such videos promote and amplify is suggestive of the power of transgressive visual
tactics to impact and reshape place-identities and thus remake places. Place is not
static but rather an ever-shifting set of social relations and identities that come into
being in part through practices of visual inscription, transgression and contestation.
The emergent potential communities and alternative place-identities of tomorrow’s
city are continually being imagined and inscribed across its land and mediascapes
today, where their visual impact is far from negligible.

Notes

1 Available at http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Se77dmMOPPw, accessed
26 July 2008.

2 Available at http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZdmWF1Bo6D4, accessed
26 July 2008.

3 Available at http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1Da42Q-emaA, accessed 26
July 2008.

4 See, e.g., the video available at

5 Available at http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=U_Kba4qQtDg, accessed 26
July 2008.

6 Available at http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fcWAZHQdvrk, accessed 26
July 2008.

7 Available at http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5Sa0G37qHT0, accessed 26
July 2008.
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