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Abstract

Protected areas (lands reserved by Government and local bodies for the nation) are places often considered natural, or becoming natural through ecological restoration. Features of cultural heritage associated with these areas, such as buildings, structures or archaeological sites, may be neglected, under-acknowledged, or even removed in order to support or create an image of “naturalness”. This has resulted in tensions and conflicts between stakeholders and managers.

This thesis investigates the issue by using two island case studies in New Zealand’s conservation estate: Rangitoto Island (a Scenic Reserve) and Motutapu Island (a Recreation Reserve undergoing ecological restoration) – both located in Auckland’s Hauraki Gulf. The research is based on a substantial review of New Zealand and international literature, documentary analysis, interviews with heritage managers and stakeholders, and participant observation. The aim is to ascertain the factors influencing these tensions and conflicts; how they have been resolved on the islands; and, ultimately, how cultural heritage and natural heritage conservation can co-exist in “natural” protected areas.

It is shown that three primary factors have contributed to difficulties over the conservation of cultural heritage on Rangitoto and Motutapu: the way the nature/culture dualism is imbedded in Western thinking and heritage management structures, the strength of the nature conservation ethic in New Zealand (and Western society in general), and the conduciveness of islandness to natural heritage conservation. Even so, over the past 15 years there have been increasingly positive outcomes for cultural heritage on the islands, as postmodern cultural landscape approaches have been adopted. However, obstacles still remain, especially attitudes emanating from sectors of society at large and departments administering protected areas, which continue to regard cultural heritage as not worthy of conservation in protected areas. To overcome these obstacles and achieve a co-existence of natural and cultural heritage conservation, the thesis argues that protected areas should be conceptualised along the lines of indigenous and non-modern thinking, as places with a plurality of heritage values which all deserve protection. Cultural heritage in protected areas should – and can – be conserved while also conserving the natural heritage cherished in these areas.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Translation</th>
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</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hapū</td>
<td>Sub-tribe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiki</td>
<td>The ancestral homeland of Māori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iwi</td>
<td>Tribe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaitiakitanga</td>
<td>Guardianship and responsibility for a place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaitiaki</td>
<td>Māori tribal elders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karakia</td>
<td>Māori prayer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koru</td>
<td>Spiral shapes based on the shape of a new unfurling fern, symbolising new life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manaakitanga</td>
<td>Care and hospitality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mana whenua</td>
<td>Power associated with possession and occupation with tribal land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>The indigenous people of New Zealand, arriving from Polynesia in the thirteenth century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marae</td>
<td>A complex of buildings used as a centre for traditional Māori customs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mātauranga</td>
<td>Knowledge of cultural meaning, value, and practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauri</td>
<td>The life force of the natural environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pā</td>
<td>Māori defence fortifications, usually situated on a hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pākehā</td>
<td>Non-Māori people of New Zealand, predominantly of European origin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papatūanuku</td>
<td>Mother earth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pou</td>
<td>Māori gateway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangi</td>
<td>God of the sky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangata whenua</td>
<td>People of the land, with rights of occupation and ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taonga</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treaty of Waitangi</td>
<td>The founding document and agreement between Māori and the British Crown, signed in 1840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wāhi tapu</td>
<td>Sacred place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waka</td>
<td>Canoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whakapapa</td>
<td>Genealogy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whanaungatanga</td>
<td>Interaction with the environment as kin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Preface

Before Chapter 1 begins, I should explain how I came to study the difficulties and conflicts in managing cultural heritage on conservation estate islands in New Zealand. The seeds of this topic developed from my Bachelor of Arts Honours dissertation research at the University of Auckland (UoA) on the imaginings and perceptions of the subantarctic Auckland Islands (Bade, 2007). I became fascinated with the way in which this isolated and desolate group of islands went from once being a British colonial settlement in the nineteenth century to now being a protected World Heritage nature sanctuary. I began to realise that “nature” was not at all as it seemed: places now considered to be “natural” could indeed have interesting histories which were disguised or ignored to fit the natural image of the place. This dissertation also ignited my interest in the study of islands, and particularly islandness (the characteristics of islands). I was intrigued with newly-developing research from island studies and the ways islandness could influence development, attitudes and perceptions.

I followed up my dissertation with a Master of Arts thesis which examined another island – although this time with a more temperate climate – Motuihe, in the Hauraki Gulf, close to Auckland. The thesis investigated the ways particular aspects of Motuihe Island’s past became “heritage” to be conserved and/or restored (Bade, 2008). From documentary research and interviews with heritage managers during the research, I noticed a favouring of natural heritage management of the island to the detriment of its cultural heritage values (such as archaeology and historical trees), even though the Motuihe working plan gave equal weighting to the conservation of both natural and cultural heritage. With further discussions and literature searches I found that this bias appeared to be a common phenomenon in New Zealand heritage management, particularly on islands in the conservation estate, and also in other places around the world. I thought that this bias deserved some critical attention by way of a PhD thesis.

I came into this PhD research with a background in history and geography from undergraduate and postgraduate studies at the University of Auckland. Hence, I have not had any study of the physical sciences (apart from physical geography up to Stage II level). I have always had a strong interest in New Zealand’s history and cultural heritage (such as historical buildings or the remains of settlements). However, although I have a strong concern for the welfare of cultural heritage in New Zealand, I am also sympathetic to the protection and
restoration of New Zealand’s natural environment. Being a European New Zealander (with ancestors on both sides of my family arriving here before the 1840s), I am proud of New Zealand’s natural splendour and “green” identity. Every summer since I can remember I have gone to my family’s bach (basic holiday home, formerly owned by my great-grandparents) at Snake Point in the Marlborough Sounds (northern South Island) to relax and enjoy the green mesh of native and exotic flora and fauna which characterises the surroundings. I have helped plant trees on various islands in the Hauraki Gulf and have attended the (re)introduction of bird and reptile species on Motuihe Island. But at the same time, I am also intrigued at what this desire to protect and restore New Zealand’s nature has meant for the physical evidence of our human history. I have been conscious of the concerns from cultural heritage managers about the detrimental outcomes for cultural heritage that have resulted from this reverence and protective ethos towards New Zealand’s natural heritage. My aim coming into this PhD research was to find out whether it was possible to manage both natural and cultural heritage on the same protected (island) area and what ways this could be achieved.
CHAPTER 1.

Introduction

During the 1970s and 1980s over fifty baches (basic holiday homes) were systematically ripped down and burnt on Rangitoto Island, in the Hauraki Gulf, New Zealand, by the Department of Lands and Survey (DLS). Rangitoto (Figure 1.1; 1.3) was managed as a place of nature, where New Zealand’s largest pohutukawa forest should flourish, native birds should thrive, where exotic weeds and mammalian pests should be exterminated, and where humans could visit, but not live. However, from the 1990s bach owners, historical architects, and cultural heritage managers advocated for the retention of the baches and argued that they were vital aspects of Rangitoto’s – and New Zealand’s – history. To them, the baches represented a tradition of New Zealand culture which was rapidly disappearing: that of families going to a simple (often homemade) bach over holidays with no electricity, no running water, no phone, no heating and no bathroom to relax, fish, swim and tramp. They also saw the baches as architecturally significant as they retained their 1930s appearance due to a lack of improvements by the owners. To lose any more of these baches, they argued, would be to lose a piece of New Zealand’s cultural heritage which could never be replaced. Since the 1990s no more baches have been removed, however attitudes still remain which consider the baches to be out of place on Rangitoto, an island perceived to be natural.

Figure 1.1 The south-western aspect of Rangitoto Island (taken 2012, photos are my own unless otherwise stated).
On the neighbouring island of Motutapu (Figure 1.2; 1.3), connected to Rangitoto by a narrow man-made causeway, plans were made by ecologists in the early 1990s to ecologically restore the island by planting two thirds of its area in native vegetation and eradicating exotic pest species. The plan was to restore a native forested habitat on the island where native bird species could find sanctuary and thrive. However, as pointed out by archaeologists and other cultural heritage advocates during heated debates with ecologists in the 1990s, this planting would damage or destroy the significant archaeological and historical landscape of the island relating to early Māori settlement from the fourteenth century, European farming from the mid-nineteenth century, and its use during World War II for military purposes. Under this ecological restoration plan, these periods of history would be overlooked in order for the island to become “natural.”

Figure 1.2 Motutapu Island, looking north-east (Dodd, 2008a). Rangitoto is connected by a causeway on the left.
Figure 1.3 The location of Rangitoto and Motutapu in the Hauraki Gulf, New Zealand.

These two examples highlight a key issue associated with the conservation of cultural heritage in protected areas: cultural heritage, that is, features associated with human activity, may be ignored, under-acknowledged or even destroyed in order to maintain the perception that the area is “natural” or becoming “natural” (independent or free from human activity). This particular issue has occurred not only around the Hauraki Gulf and New Zealand, but also around the world (Table 1.1). Since the 1980s, a body of literature has developed, particularly from geography, environmental history and heritage studies, that examines and describes the difficulties and conflicts faced with managing cultural heritage in “natural” protected areas. Table 1.1 illustrates that these difficulties and conflicts with managing cultural heritage in protected areas is a global issue, including countries from the Old World (parts of the world which were known by Europe before the colonial period), such as Scotland and Sweden, and the New World (countries colonised by Europeans), such as

1 The term “protected area” is used to refer to areas of land which are reserved by Government and local bodies for the nation. In New Zealand these lands are commonly referred to as the “conservation estate.” These types of areas are often specifically reserved for their natural values.
Australia, Canada, New Zealand, South Africa, and USA. The examples from Table 1.1 include instances of indigenous people being removed from protected areas, historical structures and buildings being destroyed or left to deteriorate, archaeological sites being planted over, historical trees being cut down, significantly more funding given to natural heritage projects in a protected area, cultural heritage staff numbers being reduced in protected area departments, and human histories not being interpreted. All these examples illustrate manifestations of the general attitude from both protected area departments and wider sectors of society that cultural heritage does not belong in “natural” protected areas.

Table 1.1 Examples where there have been difficulties and conflicts faced in managing cultural heritage values in “natural” protected areas. The citations italicised are from the New World and the citations underlined relate to islands.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Carter, 2010; Ford, 2009; Griffiths, 1991; 1996; Head, 2000; Lennon, 2000; Lennon et al., 1999; Russell &amp; Jambrecina, 2002; Sullivan, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Miller, 1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canary Islands (Spain)</td>
<td>Bianchi, 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galapagos Islands (Equador)</td>
<td>Hennessy &amp; McCleary, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>Bade, 2008; 2010; Baird, 2012; Blundell, 2004; Bray, 2007; InSitu Heritage Ltd, 2010; Trotter &amp; McCullock, 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>Grydehoj, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>Corsane, 2006; Deacon, 2004; Haw, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Head &amp; Regnell, 2012; Skoglund &amp; Svensson, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Avery, 2007; Chalana, 2005; Cronon, 2003; Feldman, 2004; 2011; Feldman &amp; MacKreth, 2004; Keller &amp; Keller, 2003; Moriarty, 2007; Reich, 2001; Scarce, 2005; Somers, 2004; Watt, 2002; Wockner, 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgin Islands (USA)</td>
<td>Griffiths, 1991; Olwig, 1980; Fortwangler, 2009; Fortwangler &amp; Stern, 2004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Two important observations can be made in Table 1.1. Firstly, there are a substantial number of studies on protected areas in the New World. This may reflect both the interest from academics and cultural heritage advocates over the detrimental outcomes for cultural heritage in protected areas in the New World, and that these outcomes may be more common in the New World than the Old World. Secondly, a number of studies are on islands (bounded land, usually by water), indicating that an island context may be an important factor in the study of cultural heritage management in “natural” protected areas. Although most of the studies in Table 1.1 are either in the New World or on islands, or both, these two contextual factors have often not specifically been investigated in the examination of the bias towards natural heritage in protected areas. A number of questions arise from these examples: What are the factors influencing this bias towards natural heritage conservation in protected areas? Why does the issue commonly appear in New World and island contexts? What place does cultural heritage have in protected areas? How can the objectives of natural heritage conservation be met without compromising the cultural heritage of the protected area?

In this research, I seek to answer these questions and fill this gap in the literature by examining the management of cultural heritage in “natural” protected areas by using two case studies on conservation estate islands in New Zealand: Rangitoto and Motutapu, introduced at the beginning of the chapter. The research has three main objectives:

- To ascertain the factors contributing to difficulties and conflicts in managing cultural heritage on the islands
- To explore how these difficulties and conflicts have been resolved
- To determine how natural heritage and cultural heritage conservation can co-exist in “natural” protected areas in general

I used a case study approach – as opposed to purely researching the issues surrounding cultural heritage management in protected areas in general – to allow for a more thorough investigation of cultural heritage management in specific “natural” protected area contexts. Case study approaches have often been accorded a lowly status in qualitative approaches, particularly regarding the usefulness of case studies for generalisations. However, Flyvbjerg (2011) has noted that these criticisms of case study approaches are misrepresentations and that case studies have a number of merits. He emphasises the ‘force of example’, that is, the power of just one, well selected, example to add to knowledge with concrete evidence (Flyvbjerg, 2011: 305).
I have employed Stake’s (1995: 3-4) three types of case study approaches (‘intrinsic’, ‘instrumental’ and ‘collective’) in this research. An intrinsic case study approach places the case at the centre of the study. The case is considered of prime importance due to its particularity and distinctiveness. The instrumental approach uses a case to gain an understanding of a more general issue. The collective case study extends the instrumental approach using multiple cases to provide a greater level of generalisation. This tripartite strategy of intrinsic, instrumental and collective case study approaches means that Rangitoto and Motutapu can be studied not only for distinctive features, but also for the ways that the evidence and findings from each island can help generalise issues regarding the management of cultural heritage on conservation estate islands in New Zealand and around the world.

As Flyvbjerg (2011) highlights, selection is key for case studies to be able to be generalised and transferable to extend knowledge. I chose Rangitoto and Motutapu as case studies for specific reasons. Most significantly, based on anecdotal and documentary evidence, the islands provide clear examples of the difficulties and conflicts associated with managing cultural heritage in “natural” protected areas. The islands also provide examples in different contexts: Rangitoto Island (Figures 1.4) – a rugged, volcanic Scenic Reserve, with New Zealand’s largest pohutukawa forest, managed primarily for its significant natural heritage values, being one of Auckland’s most popular tourist attractions; and Motutapu Island (Figures 1.4) – a farmed Recreation Reserve undergoing an ecological restoration to its former natural appearance through the planting of native trees, the removal of exotic pest species, and the (re)introduction of native bird and reptile species, while also being acknowledged as having one of the best preserved Māori archaeological landscapes in the Auckland region. Both islands therefore provide comparative and contrasting insights from which generalisations can be drawn.

In addition, both islands have been subject to Māori (the indigenous people of New Zealand) Treaty of Waitangi\(^2\) settlement negotiations. Both islands have had significant associations

\(^2\) The Treaty of Waitangi is the founding document of New Zealand, signed on 6 February 1840 between the British Crown and about 540 Maori chiefs. However, there continue to be a lot of issues relating to the Treaty of Waitangi due to misinterpretations and discrepancies between the English, Maori and oral versions of the Treaty. In short, the Treaty was viewed by the British Crown as a way to secure control over land and a right to settle, giving Maori the rights of British subjects; while in the Maori version and in oral explanations at the time of the signing, Maori saw it as an agreement which ensured the retention of Maori authority while governance was given to the British Crown (Baird, 2012; Kawharu, 2000; MCH, 2012; Taiapa et al., 1997). Since 1840 British settlement continued to the detriment of Maori authority. Maori protests developed widely from the mid-twentieth century and culminated in the Treaty of Waitangi Act 1975 which established the Waitangi Tribunal to deal with claims by aggrieved Maori over government actions that were contrary to the Treaty. The Treaty
with Māori iwi (tribes) – with Motutapu showing evidence of having been settled in the fourteenth century by Māori, and Rangitoto having been used by Māori for various purposes since its eruption around 550 years ago. However, through British colonisation and settlement and since the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840, Europeans claimed ownership of the islands and Māori became alienated from Rangitoto and Motutapu. Māori iwi have nevertheless retained strong spiritual ties with the islands. With the Treaty of Waitangi Amendment Act 1992 precluding the use of private lands from being allowed to resolve Treaty land claims, the conservation estate has become central to Treaty redress claims (Taiepa et al., 1997). In line with the National government’s aim to settle Treaty disputes by 2014, since July 2009 both islands have been subject to Treaty settlement redress negotiations relating to the volcanic cones in Auckland and other islands in the Hauraki Gulf between Auckland iwi (the Tāmaki Collective) and the Crown (OTS, 2012). These Treaty negotiations provide a further dimension to the examination of the cultural heritage of the islands, relating to governance and Māori involvement in cultural heritage management on the conservation estate in New Zealand.

Figure 1.4 View to the South-west across Motutapu Island (light green) towards Rangitoto Island (2011).

has become recognised in resource management legislation (such as the Environment Act 1986; the State Owned Enterprises Act 1986; the Conservation Act 1987; the Maori Fisheries Act 1989; the Resource Management Act 1991; and the Historic Places Act 1993).

3 The iwi (tribes) and hapū (sub-tribes) that make up the Tāmaki Collective are: Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki, Ngāti Maru, Ngāti Pāoa, Ngāti Tamaoho, Ngāti Tamaterā, Ngāti Te Ata, Ngāti Whanaunga, Ngāti Whātua o Kaipara, Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei, Te Ākitai, Te Kawerau ā Maki, Te Patukirikiri and Te Runanga o Ngāti Whātua. Ngāi Tai ki Tāmaki, Te Ākitai, Ngāti Pāoa and Ngāti Whanaunga (Finlayson, 2012).
In addition, as observed earlier in Table 1.1, choosing two *island* case studies in a *New World* context enables the management of cultural heritage to be examined in settings conducive to conflicts and difficulties with natural heritage. In this way, this research can make a significant contribution to the existing literature by highlighting concerns about detrimental outcomes for cultural heritage in these contexts and advancing knowledge and theory relating to how these outcomes can be dealt with. This research is therefore relevant to those interested in the conceptualisations of nature and culture, and those currently managing heritage in protected areas not only in New Zealand, but also around the world.

1.1. CENTRAL THEMES

This research is framed and informed by four central themes which underlie the chapters of the thesis (Figure 1.5).

**Figure 1.5** The four central themes of the research relating to the difficulties and conflicts with managing cultural heritage on conservation islands in New Zealand considered to be “natural” or becoming “natural.”
1.1.1. Dissonant heritage

In this research, the term “heritage” is considered to be anything from the past which is valued in the present to be passed on to future generations, while heritage management is taken to mean the practices involved in the conservation of heritage values through such processes as protection, restoration, and/or preservation. Because “heritage” is imbued with value and valuation, there is an embedded dissonance to heritage management: heritage simultaneously holds conflicting meanings, opposing interpretations, and varying attitudes relating to a multitude of values (Graham, Ashworth & Tunbridge 2000; Kerr, 2007; Powell, 1999; Smith, 2006; Sullivan, 1993; Tunbridge & Ashworth, 1996). There are, therefore, always different perceptions, understandings and points of view towards what should or should not be conserved as heritage. Some heritage values may be considered as highly significant by some and strongly despised by others (Kearns, Joseph & Moon, 2010; Light & Dumbraveanu-Andone, 1997; Lowenthal 1998).

1.1.2. The conceptualisation of “nature” and “culture”

As I will explain in more depth in Chapter 3, the nature/culture dualism has been entrenched in Western thought for centuries and has influenced heritage management in two main ways: heritage is classified as either “natural” or “cultural” by heritage managers; and areas can be designated as completely “natural” and therefore not a place for human activity (or cultural heritage). “Cultural heritage” is considered by these heritage management agencies to mean any valued aspect of the past (tangible or intangible) which relates to human activity, such as buildings, structures, or above and in-ground archaeology. “Natural heritage” is considered to be any physical aspect which is independent from human activity, such as geological or water features, vegetation and animals. With this dualistic way of thinking, natural heritage and cultural heritage are independent, existing in opposition to each other and heritage managers can simply decide to favour one over the other. Consequently, cultural heritage can be considered as not belonging in natural areas, leading to the removal of physical historic structures, and even people, from natural areas or places undergoing ecological restoration.

This dualistic thinking has greatly influenced protected area management. Often, because protected areas are considered natural, natural heritage specialists manage cultural heritage in

---

4 If the term “heritage” is used on its own in this thesis, it is used in a general sense (natural and cultural).

5 The term “Western” is used in this thesis to refer to societies whose histories have been characterised by industrial capitalism and institutionalised liberal democracy (Milton, 1999).

6 Cultural heritage is also called “historic heritage” by heritage agencies.
protected areas (Carter, 2010; Carter & Bramley, 2002; Lennon, 2000; 2010; Malins, 2011). As a result, agencies charged with managing both natural heritage and cultural heritage in protected areas can have a strong bias towards natural heritage. McIntyre-Tamwoy (2004: 294) notes that there ‘remains in many protected area management agencies today, a school of thought that says all “non-natural” elements should be removed from a wilderness area.’ In New Zealand, the Department of Conservation (DOC) is charged with the conservation of both natural and cultural heritage in the conservation estate. However, as will be explained in later chapters, like other protected area agencies, there is an evident bias towards the natural heritage side of their duties.

As a reaction to these detrimental outcomes for cultural heritage, postmodern thinking developed and became the vogue from the 1980s and 1990s in heritage management in the Western world. A postmodern understanding emphasises the social construction of nature and highlights the artificiality of the nature/culture dualism. This kind of understanding supports the view of those who are displeased at detrimental outcomes for cultural heritage: it means that there is no such concept as pure nature as every landscape is influenced by cultural processes, and accordingly conceptually allows a place for the conservation of cultural heritage values in “natural” protected areas. However, from the 2000s onwards there have been criticisms of these postmodern approaches, particularly from those viewing the detrimental outcomes for cultural heritage as beneficial for natural heritage. These postmodern understandings are seen to take away from the physical reality of nature and the movement to protect and restore the environment.

1.1.3. New Zealand context

The New Zealand context is a significant theme in this research. In New Zealand there is a strong nature conservation ethic – the desire to both protect and restore nature. New Zealand’s natural values, such as its scenery and native wildlife, are revered not only in the country but also around the world. Because New Zealand was one of the last large land masses on earth to be settled by humans (Māori in the thirteenth century, and Europeans in the nineteenth century), its natural heritage is considered special and ancient (Edwards, 1997; Ginn, 2008; Star, 2009). Similarly, because of New Zealand’s relatively small and sparse population (by global standards), much of the landscape appears natural, green, and like a wilderness (without human impact) (Collins & Kearns, 2010; Young, 2004). In this global
context, New Zealand has been conceived of as an untouched island wilderness: an image and idea which is heavily linked to New Zealand’s national identity.

In contrast to New Zealand’s natural heritage – and to an extent because of this nature conservation ethic – there is a prevailing attitude that New Zealand does not have significant cultural heritage or history. New Zealand’s natural heritage allows New Zealand to have a history of millions of years which it cannot have with cultural heritage. New Zealand is often thought of (by New Zealanders and outsiders) as a young country with a history which is insignificant compared to other places, such as Europe, and New Zealand’s own natural heritage. Although in recent decades there has been an upsurge in the acknowledgement of, and interest in, New Zealand’s history, it is still nowhere near the standing of the New Zealand nature conservation ethic (Belich, 2001; Sinclair, 1979).

It is in this context that the conservation estate islands are managed. Since the 1980s or so, there has been a movement – or even fashion – in New Zealand oriented to giving nature a helping hand: the ecological restoration of areas (especially islands). Not only is it significant that there are these projects, but it is also highly noteworthy that most, if not all, of those involved in these ecological restorations are volunteers – New Zealanders motivated enough to give up their personal leisure time to plant native trees or eliminate exotic pest species. For example, there are a number of islands undergoing forms of ecological restoration in the Hauraki Gulf (Figure 1.3), notably (from north to south): Great Barrier Island (two-thirds of the island), Little Barrier (Hauturu) Island, Kaikoura Island, Kawau Island, Motuora Island, Tiritiri Matangi Island, Motutapu Island, Rangitoto Island, Motuihe Island and Rotoroa Island. In addition to these island ecological restorations are various islands which are designated as Nature Reserves, such as the remote subantarctic islands (the Bounty Islands, the Snares Islands, the Antipodes Islands, the Auckland Islands and Campbell Island) and the subtropical Kermadec Islands; and less remote islands, such as the Three Kings Islands, the Poor Knights Islands, Kapiti Island, Secretary Island, Resolution Island, and Codfish Island (Molloy, 2009). Moreover, mainland “islands” (artificially created or managed by utilising geographical features or through the construction of predator-proof fences) have been established to protect and restore native habitats on the mainland (Saunders & Norton, 2001). Clearly, islands (and the idea of an island) are common contexts where nature can be restored or protected.
1.1.4. Islandness

Islands, or specifically the notion of islandness, is another significant theme to this research. The term “islandness” is used in island studies to describe the qualities, condition or characteristics attributed to islands, such as separateness, boundedness, isolation, vulnerability and smallness (Baldacchino, 2004; 2006; Kelman, 2007; McCall, 1994; Royle, 2001). Both physically and psychologically, islands are well suited to nature designation or for ecological restoration programmes which intend to restore the island landscapes back to their pre-human forested state (Bade, 2010). The physical form of an island means that islands can be viewed in a dualistic fashion: as places which can be wholly controlled by humans, or equally, totally submitted to nature (Baldacchino, 2006). In this way, because of their bounded and isolated qualities, islands can often be seen as insulated from the developments on the mainland and therefore more natural (Bade, 2010; Kelman, 2007). In addition, it is also logistically easier to remove mammalian and weed pests from a bounded and separate island landscape and maintain it in this way than on the mainland (Towns, Wright & Stephens, 2009).

Psychologically, the distinct journey to an island over water can elicit and enhance a feeling of “getting away from it all,” “getting closer to nature” or even returning to the past (Ronström, 2008). Islands are often associated with naturalness in popular culture, such as in “Robinsonade” literature (which spawned from Daniel Defoe’s Robinson Crusoe [1719] novel), reality television programmes such as Survivor (2000-present), as well as television dramas such as Lost (2004-2010) and films such as Jurassic Park (1993), Cast Away (2000) and The Beach (2000) (Baldacchino, 2006; Deloughrey, 2001). Island tourism is also especially driven by images of pure nature and naturalness (Baldacchino, 2006; Baum, 1997; Briguglio et al., 1996). Hennessy and McCleary (2011: 142) emphasise that the ‘discourse of pristine island Edens’ has influenced the will to restore island landscapes to a natural appearance.

For these reasons, islands in general are commonly considered to be places where nature should be protected or restored. In New Zealand, islands have become a vital part of a national strategy to save endangered native species and to preserve aspects of New Zealand’s native forests (Towns, Atkinson and Daugherty, 1990; Young, 2004). Although the hundreds of years of Māori and European influence on the land have left their mark in every corner of New Zealand, New Zealand’s conservation estate islands are predominantly valued for their
perceived naturalness. On these conservation estate islands there is occasionally cultural heritage which is considered as relatively significant (such as lighthouses or historical cottages), but, more often than not, New Zealand’s conservation estate islands have remains of past human endeavours – histories of farming, abandoned settlements, sealing, whaling, quarantine stations, and World War II posts, which are often not considered as important enough to be conserved in the face of natural heritage conservation.

1.2. POSITIONALITY

As with all qualitative research, it is vital to know and acknowledge the positionality of the researcher and its influence on the research. All research is positioned (Chiseri-Strater, 1996; England, 1994; Hopkins, 2007; Rose, 1997). Every researcher brings their own perspectives and interpretations which are characteristics (such as age, gender, race, dis/ability, or nationality) and contextual (such as location, institutional affiliation, personal life history and experience, research training, or intellectual predisposition) which influence the way the researcher is positioned to conduct, understand and know the research. There is therefore no such thing as objective or neutral research (Mason, 2002); rather, research is subjective and positioned. Hence, it is important to outline the positionality of myself (as researcher) – as I did in the Preface – and the organisation and justification of the research design (Section 1.3).

I have come into this research with a desire to examine the management of New Zealand’s cultural heritage in “natural” protected areas, which has been informed by subjectivities as a result of my own personal characteristics, experience and education. My positionality as researcher should therefore be taken into account when reading this thesis. One important point about my own positionality is that as a European New Zealander the nature/culture dualism has become entrenched in my own thought. Thus, although an aim of this research is to determine a way to move beyond dualistic understandings, the dualistic terms of “cultural heritage” and “natural heritage” prevail throughout the thesis because such terminology is embedded in my own personal thinking and in the heritage management agencies and documentation under analysis.

1.3. RESEARCH DESIGN

The perspectives and understandings of “nature,” “culture,” “heritage,” and “islands” (and the relationship between them) from heritage managers of protected areas and the general public are fundamental to this research. Hence, the main information sought from the Rangitoto and
Motutapu case studies relates to (1) perspectives and insights into how cultural heritage has been and is managed on the islands; (2) historical and current examples of issues arising from past and current management strategies; (3) how these issues have been or are managed; and (4) the best practices to deal with these issues. In order to gain this information three modes of investigation were employed for each case study – documentary analysis, semi-structured interviews and participant observation – which will now be described, evaluated and justified.

1.3.1. Documentary analysis

Documentary analysis was used in order to identify and gain background information, historical knowledge, and understandings (official, reported and personal) of the tensions between natural heritage and cultural heritage perspectives and management on Rangitoto and Motutapu. Documentary analysis is the examination of current and historical documents (Mogalakwe, 2009). For each case study, documents, such as published books, articles, pamphlets, archaeological reports, heritage reports, architecture reports, photographs, websites, DOC and DLS files, and newspaper articles, were searched through and analysed. These various text sources were created by different groups for different purposes, holding inherent biases which I took note of.

The DOC files at the Auckland Conservancy were a fruitful source of documents. The Conservancy has files dating back to when DOC was first formed and also files from the old DLS, which DOC replaced in 1987. I searched for relevant newspaper articles and documents predominantly through using the Local History Online website (Auckland Council, n.d.), the National Library’s (n.d.) Papers Past website, the Appendices to the Journals of the House of Representatives (1858-1999) and the Transactions and Proceedings of the Royal Society of New Zealand (1868-1961). In addition, the microfilm newspaper archive at the University of Auckland enabled access to articles from the Auckland Star and the New Zealand Herald. I also visited the local history collection at Takapuna Library to find articles from The Devonport Flagstaff and the North Shore Times Advertiser. Additional information on the islands was obtained from the DOC website (DOC, n.d.a; n.d.f) and the websites of the island community trusts: Motutapu Restoration Trust (MRT, n.d.), Rangitoto Island Historic Conservation Trust (RIHCT, n.d.), and Rangitoto Island Bach Community Association (RIBCA, n.d.).

This documentary analysis allowed a thorough understanding of the viewpoints and perceptions of those with both vested interests and those with an active role in the managing
of cultural heritage on the islands, including local councils, local Māori iwi, government organisations, cultural heritage specialists; as well as those advocating for natural heritage. The examination of DOC’s files enabled the identification of specific areas of tension over cultural heritage remnants and the analysis of how the various issues relating to the management of natural heritage and cultural heritage on Rangitoto and Motutapu were dealt with and what was discussed by DOC. Although providing some good insights into the conflict and tensions that occurred between stakeholders over the management of cultural heritage on the islands, often the documents did not provide the full background to the decisions that were made and the raw emotion associated with the issue.

1.3.2. Semi-structured interviews

Interviews with stakeholders helped to reveal who, what emotions, and what points of view were “behind” the documents analysed, and the difficulties and conflicts encountered with the cultural heritage management of the islands. Interviews are an excellent way to gain opinions, insights, points of view and experiences (The Commonwealth of Learning, n.d.; Dunn, 2000; Mason, 2002). This research used an in-depth semi-structured interview technique. A semi-structured interview takes the form of a discussion with some predetermined open-ended questions or themes to be addressed. It is a way of eliciting information from a person in an orderly and partially structured way (Longhurst, 2003). In contrast to a structured interview in which only predetermined questions are asked, or an unstructured interview where the interviewee’s narrative determines the content of the interview, semi-structured interviews allow some flexibility as to what questions are asked and how the discussion is led without the interviewer losing all control of the direction of the interview (Dunn, 2000). By engaging the interviewee in a dialogue with open-ended questions, a wide-ranging and fluid conversation can occur (Valentine, 2005).

Between April and June 2009, before interviews commenced, I sent out more than 30 investigative emails to heritage professionals and academics around the world (but particularly in New Zealand) asking for accounts of any experiences with tensions and conflicts in managing cultural heritage in protected areas, their perspectives on the apparent dominance of natural heritage over cultural heritage in New Zealand, and any case studies (New Zealand or international) they could recommend. These emails generated a number of

---

7 An ethics application was granted by the University of Auckland Human Participants Ethics Committee before the interviewing process commenced. The application was granted on 11 November 2009 (reference number 2009/468).
highly interesting and thoughtful replies, confirming that there were significant issues arising from how cultural heritage on “natural” islands is managed and that this was indeed something which warranted study (Table 1.3).

Table 1.2 Indicative extracts from emails received from heritage professionals and academics illustrating the passionate perspectives regarding managing cultural heritage on the conservation estate islands in New Zealand.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘You ask what are the major issues and then pretty much answer it by saying that it is the dominance of “green” heritage (nature) over “brown” (cultural) heritage. It’s something that I have been complaining about for years…’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Oh a subject close to my heart, but very difficult to answer in one email! You ask complex questions that require some thought and discussion. What I will say at this stage is that there has been very variable success in terms of managing cultural heritage on conservation islands. In general natural heritage values take precedence in both the thought processes and the actions of island managers, regardless of what legislation or government department mission statements may state!’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘From my perspective, yes there is a gross imbalance in the way that natural and cultural landscape heritage is handled in NZ…’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘From what I know of the heritage sector there is as you suggest a definite problem with raising the awareness of historic heritage within the conservation estate.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Your thesis topic sounds very interesting. I have seen this issue come up a couple of times (…) I think that, overall, you’re probably right – more effort on the ground goes into conservation of biological, rather than cultural heritage.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘This sounds like a terrific project. There are hundreds, thousands of places around the world where natural and cultural resources come into tension.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Even where island managers profess to be working with iwi [Māori tribes], natural heritage tends to dominate. Island managers may adopt “cultural” procedures such as karakia [Māori prayer], or avoid particular areas stated to be “wahi tapu” [sacred] by tangata whenua [people of the land], but still fail to recognise or understand the cultural significance of physical places and evidence on islands.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After considering the responses it became clear that a bias towards natural heritage over cultural heritage was very much a live issue in the heritage management of New Zealand’s conservation estate and that an examination of this issue was very much warranted.

Potential interviewees were identified through a combination of: email conversations with heritage managers and academics; prior knowledge of contacts; investigating heritage organisations; field work on the case studies; and snowballing (recommendations from other
interviewees). In the majority of cases, I made contact with potential interviewees by email and occasionally in person or via telephone. A participant information sheet (Appendix 1) was given to the potential interviewees in the form of an attachment as part of an email or physically at the interview. In the participant information sheet the research was introduced and described.

A total of 37 interviews were conducted with a variety of people from Government and local council agencies, stakeholder groups pertaining to Rangitoto and Motutapu, the Ngai Tai iwi – who claim to be the tangata whenua (people of the land) of the islands, private heritage consultancies, and other organisations (Table 1.4). The aim of the interviews was to gain insights from those who had been, and are currently involved in, managing cultural heritage and natural heritage on the islands, or in protected areas more generally. Because it is unrealistic to interview all heritage managers, the interviews were not able to be completely representative, but they should be considered as an illustrative sample. As shown in Table 1.4, past and present professional heritage (natural and cultural) managers were interviewed. These people were chosen for their experience with the islands, and in some instances, purely for their knowledge and experience of general heritage issues. A number of the interviewees had links with two organisations or groups, or with both islands. For example, many were former employees of DOC now working for a private cultural heritage consultancy or a different organisation. For this reason the total at the bottom of the table is more than 37. Once “saturation point” (whereby the same kinds of answers were being given at the interviews) was reached, no more interviews were sought.
Table 1.3 Breakdown of interviewees by organisation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Current member</th>
<th>Former member</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Government Agency/Local Council:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOC – cultural heritage</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOC – natural heritage</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Regional Council – cultural heritage</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Regional Council – natural heritage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand Historic Places Trust</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry for Culture and Heritage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waitakere City Council</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Lands and Survey</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Trusts and Iwi (Māori):</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motutapu Restoration Trust (MRT)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangitoto Island Bach Community Association (RIBCA)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangitoto Island Historic Conservation Trust (RIHCT)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngai Tai</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Private Cultural Heritage Consultancies:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boffa Miskell</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clough Associates</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Lennon and Associates</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin L. Jones Archaeologist Ltd</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Kelly Consultants</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salmond Reed Architects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsurface Ltd</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treadwell Associates</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other organisations:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Museum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming New Zealand</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geoscience Society of New Zealand</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Auckland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>35</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td><strong>57</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I carried out interviews in a location convenient for the interviewee. Normally this was at the workplace or home of the interviewee or at a cafe nearby to their workplace. In two cases I conducted a telephone interview as the interviewees lived outside of Auckland. In these cases, permission to use the interviews for research was granted orally. Normally though, interviewees were asked to read and sign a consent form (Appendix 2) before the interview commenced which asked whether they wished their interview to be recorded and whether they wished to remain anonymous. No-one declined to be recorded, so each interview was audio-recorded with a portable digital audio recorder device. Most interviewees did not mind their name being linked to any quotations in the thesis, while a few asked to remain anonymous for certain quotes. As explained earlier, as the interviewer, my own positionality (personal perspectives, biases and preconceptions) was always present during the interview. I did, however, make an effort to be always “on their side,” allowing the interviewees to express their points of view more clearly.

At each interview I used a set of up to 40 questions relating to five themes to facilitate discussion (Appendix 3). The questions asked at each interview varied according to the interests, experiences and views of the interviewee. As a result, not all questions were asked and the wording was not necessarily the same for all interviewees. However, each interview followed the same general structure. The questions asked initially were easy-to-answer questions about the interviewee’s background, current responsibilities, and associations with the island case studies. These questions allowed the interviewee to become accustomed to the interview, myself, and topics before I asked questions which required deeper reflection on heritage issues and their association with the islands. The questions were centred on three primary themes: examples of difficulties and conflicts in the management of cultural heritage on conservation estate islands in New Zealand; the origins of these issues (for example, the influence of the New Zealand context and identity, the ethos of DOC, and islandness); and any possible solutions to the issues. On average the interviews lasted for 60 minutes, and ranged from 30 minutes to 120 minutes in duration. The flexible nature of the semi-structured interviews meant that I was able to go back over previous questions and ask the same questions in different ways in order to explore particular issues or aspects more thoroughly. I was also able to craft in new questions into the discussion as it progressed. During the interviews I took written notes as a backup in case the audio files were lost or stolen. The notes also assisted in identifying important points made by the interviewee. I transcribed the interviews either the day of, or the day after, the interview while it was fresh in my mind.
The interviews generated a large amount of information for analysis. Once all the interviews were completed I coded the transcript texts (categorising the transcripts into themes) in separate Microsoft Word documents. As I identified themes I established sub-themes. I copied and pasted quotations relating to each sub-theme into the Microsoft Word documents. After each of these quotations, the interviewees’ names were put in brackets in order for the comments to be traceable to the interviewee. As suggested by Cope (2003), I built in and refined themes and sub-themes as the coding process progressed. Once a full draft of the thesis was completed, I sent the quotes used to each individual interviewee for their interest, to see if any meaning of their quotes had been lost, and to request their permission to use the quotes with their names.

1.3.3. Participant observation

The documentary analysis and in-depth semi-structured interviews were complemented with participant observation. This method was used in order to gain additional information which could not be obtained from the other two methods. Participant observation can provide extra descriptive information and contextual understanding before, during and after other data collection (Flick, 2006; Kearns, 2000; Laurier, 2003; Mason, 2002; Weinberg, 2002). I carried out participant observation on various occasions while doing documentary analysis and conducting interviews from March 2009 to September 2012.

To use Gold’s (1956) term, the “participant-as-observer” observation technique was used for this research. In other words, I made observations while participating in the activities being observed. The main activities I observed were tree planting and weeding days on Motutapu, the Motutapu Restoration Trust’s (MRT) “Make a Weekend of It” (now “Big Weekender”) programme, and guided tours and heritage days on both Rangitoto and Motutapu during the Auckland Heritage Festival held in September/October each year. I recorded visual and audio observations in a note book, took photos to illustrate and capture observations, and had some informal conversations with visitors, volunteers and workers participating in the activities. During the Auckland Heritage Festival, the community trusts of the islands organised heritage tours for visitors, with volunteers from the trusts taking visitors to various important historical sites. On Rangitoto there were guided tours of some of the remaining baches, the former labourers’ quarters, and the kidney fern glen close to Rangitoto wharf, and of the baches at Islington Bay (Figure 5.2). On Motutapu there were guided tours of the World War II military sites, Māori archaeological sites, and buildings relating to the farming of the island
from the early twentieth century. On three occasions I took part in MRT’s “Big Weekender” programme. During this programme, a group of up to 35 people is met at Rangitoto wharf by a MRT volunteer on a Saturday morning and then taken on a four-hour guided walk up to the Rangitoto summit, then over Rangitoto and the causeway, along the north-western coast of Motutapu to Administration Bay (a former military camp, now used as an outdoor education camp). There the group has the opportunity to visit the museum displaying the history of the island, explore the outdoor education camp activities, or be taken on a tour of the nearby World War II gun emplacements and structures. The group then stays overnight at the former Officers’ Quarters before helping other volunteers do tree-planting on the island on the Sunday. The programme is offered six times a year by the MRT.

By observing and experiencing the activities and happenings at the islands, I was able to understand more clearly specific issues regarding the management of cultural heritage on the islands. I was able to observe the importance attributed to cultural heritage and natural heritage features as well as interactions between people of different organisations such as DOC, MRT, RIHCT and RIBCA. Participant observation provided a context for the research and allowed me to experience the case studies. In particular, I was able to experience “islandness” – the journey to and from an island from the mainland and being on a bounded, separate landscape – and how this affected activities or opinions. However, one may not always be able to discover what is “behind” a particular issue using solely participant observation means. I therefore used participant observation as a method which complemented other methodological approaches, rather than the sole source of information.

1.4. ORGANISATION OF THE THESIS

The thesis is organised into three main sections. Chapters 2, 3 and 4 provide a critical overview of the literature to engage in discussion over key concepts on which the thesis rests. Chapter 2 (Heritage) examines the concept of “heritage” and heritage management. Chapter 3 (Nature, Culture and Heritage Management) focuses on the conceptualisations of “nature” and “culture” from modern dualistic perspectives through to postmodern perspectives. The chapter reviews literature from around the world and highlights some of the key concerns that have emerged from managing cultural heritage in protected areas. Chapter 4 (New Zealand’s Islands and Heritage) traces the history of heritage management in New Zealand from the settlement of Europeans in the mid-nineteenth century to the present. The chapter highlights
the association of New Zealand’s natural environment with national identity and the importance of islands to the conservation of New Zealand’s natural heritage.

Chapters 5 and 6 present key empirical insights original to this research. Chapter 5 (Rangitoto Island) and 6 (Motutapu Island) examine the island case studies in depth, delving into the history of the heritage management of the islands, highlighting specific tensions and conflicts relating to natural and cultural heritage conservation on each island, and how they have been managed.

Chapters 7, 8, and 9 present analysis and synthesis of the case studies, linking these findings to the concepts and ideas of Chapters 2, 3 and 4. Chapter 7 (Changes and Challenges on Rangitoto and Motutapu) discusses theoretical and practical findings from the case studies; while Chapter 8 (Achieving a Co-existence) suggests ways natural and cultural heritage conservation can co-exist in protected areas more generally. The conclusion, Chapter 9, brings the thesis to a close, summarising findings, outlining limitations, and suggesting further opportunities for research.
CHAPTER 2.
Heritage

In order to investigate the conflicts and difficulties with managing cultural heritage in protected areas, it is vital to examine the concept of “heritage” and what is meant by the management of heritage. As stated in the previous chapter, “heritage” is defined in this research as any aspect of the past which is treated by society in the present as something valuable to be conserved for future generations. From this definition several questions arise: How does an aspect of the past become heritage? What is the relationship between heritage and society? Why should heritage be conserved? What is the ideal way to manage heritage? In this chapter these questions will be explored. First, the features of “heritage” will be outlined and the importance of heritage discussed. Second, the chapter investigates how aspects of the past become heritage. Standard significance criteria and limitations to heritage conservation are discussed. Third, the ideal of heritage management is examined, highlighting the dissonance of heritage and the way heritage management is characterised by hierarchies and compromises.

2.1. HERITAGE

There is no agreed or accepted time for when “heritage,” as it is known today, first emerged. Some scholars write that it was only in the last few decades of the twentieth century that the meaning of heritage became what it is today (e.g. Lowenthal, 1998; McCrone, Morris & Kiery, 1995), while others, such as Harvey (2001: 332), state that the idea of heritage is much more ancient:

We have no evidence that medieval ‘peasants’ got up and demonstrated against the demolishing of a physical relic in the way that people are encouraged to do today… However, this situation does not mean that people had no concern for certain issues that we would associate with heritage today.

The term “heritage” once meant the material heirlooms which parents handed down to their children (Davison, 2008). However, the term has since expanded to mean anything from the past (including both the positive and the undesirable) which is considered to be important enough to be handed on and conserved for future generations.
Because “heritage” has such a wide and encompassing meaning, its constituents are broken down into sub-categories or binaries by heritage agencies and organisations: the most notable being “natural” and “cultural” heritage and “tangible” and “intangible” heritage. “Natural” and “cultural” heritage were defined in Chapter 1 as representing two distinctive aspects of the past resulting from natural (independent) or cultural (human-made) processes. The terms are further discussed in detail in Chapter 3. “Tangible” heritage includes those aspects of the past which are material and can physically be seen or touched, such as a building, artefact, forest, track, or an in-ground archaeological site; while “intangible” types of heritage are aspects of the past which relate to cultural practices and ways of life, such as: legends, beliefs, traditions, religions, languages and music (Marshall et al., 2011; Nuryanti, 1996; Schofield, 2008). These four categories of heritage encompass basically anything from the past. However, as this chapter will highlight, although anything can become heritage, not everything becomes heritage: what is classified as heritage is not as simple as it may appear.

2.1.1. The social construction of heritage

What is considered as “heritage” is a social construction. An aspect of the past does not become heritage inherently or automatically (even if it may seem so), but rather, becomes heritage only through the values, perceptions and attitudes of society (Gale, 1996; Harvey, 2001; Kerr, 2007; Mason, 2006; Pearson & Sullivan, 1995; Riesenweber, 2008; Spennemann, 2006). In other words, “heritage” is only heritage because society values it as important enough to be conserved for the future and then confirms and legitimises this value through particular conservation practices such as protection, preservation and restoration.

Smith’s (2006) infamous work on the ‘authorised heritage discourse’ (AHD) correlates to the notion of heritage as a social construction. She describes the AHD as a set of heritage practices and management regimes which favour tangible heritage and expert knowledge and has been legitimised by the dominant Westernised view of heritage (Smith, 2006; Stottman, 2009). Consequently, as Harvey (2001: 327) writes, heritage is always ‘an instrument of cultural power in whatever period of time one chooses to examine.’ Heritage can therefore be used as an instrument for the hegemony of society, enabling the dominant values of society to control what becomes heritage through action, legislation or heritage organisational structures (Howard, 2003; Shrimali, 1998; Smith, 2006; Tunbridge & Ashworth, 1996). A primary outcome of the AHD therefore is the exclusion of indigenous people and their knowledge from dominant Western heritage practices (Baird, 2012, Smith, 2006).
Although heritage is often associated with the past, recent heritage literature has highlighted that it is in fact a contemporary social construction (Brisbane & Wood, 1996; Graham, Ashworth & Tunbridge, 2000; Harvey, 2001; Palang & Fry, 2003; Pearce, 1998; Prosper, 2007; Spennemann, 2006; Stottman, 2009; Tunbridge & Ashworth, 1996). Heritage is therefore the ‘position of the past in the present’ (McCarthy, 2005: 3), the ‘mobilisation of the past for present circumstances’ (Harvey, 2005: 123), the ‘perceptions of the past framed in the present’ (Stottman, 2009: 1), or a ‘social construct from the present’ (Schröder-Esch, 2007: 191). Heritage can represent the needs, expectations, ideologies, opinions, cultures, agendas, perceptions, arrangements, relationships, priorities, processes and so on of the present day (Hall & McArthur, 1996; Harvey, 2001; Howard, 2003; Jones & Shaw, 2007; Kirby, 1996; Preece, 1991; Prosper, 2007; Waterton, 2005). Thus, because heritage is a manifestation of the values of society, it is dynamic and changing with the times (Harvey, 2001).

It is up to heritage managers to organise, administer and control the conservation of aspects of the past in light of differing and changing perspectives from society. Heritage managers have a variety of different roles which include identifying heritage, assessing significance, consulting stakeholders, advocating heritage values, and co-ordinating heritage conservation practices. They can manage only cultural heritage, only natural heritage, or both, and thus can come from a broad array of backgrounds (such as ecology, archaeology or history) and have a variety of professional training, experience and expertise.

2.1.2. Importance of heritage

The question of why aspects of the past should be retained and conserved as heritage has been bluntly asked by numerous scholars, particularly regarding cultural heritage in natural areas: ‘If conserving heritage is likely to be both expensive and difficult, why should we do it (Aplin, 2002: 4)? Is heritage conservation ‘merely a luxury’ (Spennemann, 2006: 9)? ‘What difference will it make if we save it or let it go?’ (Warren-Findley, 2001: 30). These questions are frequently asked by detractors and opponents of heritage conservation. However, there are equally strong and direct answers to these questions.

One such response is that aspects of heritage can act as touchstones which reveal to society where we have come from, who we have been, and who we are. As such, heritage can ‘nourish us’ (Park, 2003: 65), ‘provide emotional anchors’ (Spennemann, 2006: 9), and be ‘in
a myriad of ways essential to our well-being’ (Lowenthal, 1998: 185). Heritage is also a way society can take solace from the past in an ever-changing world (Trapeznik & McLean, 2000). Heritage can therefore be of symbolic importance for society, producing a sense of emotional attachment to both the past and a particular place or event.

In addition, heritage can generate and be symbols of a wide range of identities (Allen, 1998; Johnson, 1999; Lowenthal, 1998; Lucas, 1992; Ordev, 2008; Spennemann, 2006; Trapeznik & McLean, 2000). Acknowledging, conserving and valuing heritage can impart a shared sense of belonging at a local, regional, national and even global scale. Through using various symbols, icons and stories derived from or linking back to the past, a wide range of groups can fashion collective identities and pride (Aplin, 2002; Hall & McArthur, 1996). Consequently, by creating a sense of identity, heritage can not only unify, but also help differentiate groups and places (Ashley, 2007; Hoskins, 2004; Ordev, 2008).

Heritage is important for what it can demonstrate and remind society about the past. Remnants from past activity or use of a place can tell a story of the relationship between a culture and a place or environment (Beeton et al., 2006). Aspects of heritage can also provide specific information on the geography and age of certain past events, technical achievements and developments or events never to be repeated (Ordev, 2008; Spennemann, 2006). Heritage can help society to recall former high points or “glory days” in its history (Howard 2003; Trapeznik & McLean, 2000). Guruswamy, Roberts and Drywater (1999: 714 & 716) write that aspects of heritage are the ‘libraries of life… [and] repositories and storehouses of knowledge, or archives of human experience.’ For example, in situ heritage, such as archaeology or forest, can provide information and an experience to visitors that no history book, interpretation sign or oral story can tell (McKinnon, 1997). Actually seeing, walking on or in the vicinity of, and experiencing this heritage provides unparalleled connections between the visitor and the heritage feature compared to that of reading about or listening to a presentation on the same feature.

Economic or commercial reasons can also make heritage important. Heritage places and features have the potential to become a prime attraction for tourism and can become a significant money-generating agent (Lowenthal, 1998). For example, many of the World Heritage Sites have generated much money through tourism such as: Acropolis (Greece); Angkor (Cambodia); Great Barrier Reef (Australia); Memphis and its Necropolis – the Pyramid Fields from Giza to Dahshur (Egypt); Robben Island (South Africa); Sagarmatha
National Park (Nepal); Taj Mahal (India); The Great Wall (China); Stonehenge, Avebury and Associated Sites (England); and Yellowstone National Park (USA) (World Heritage Centre, n.d.). Likewise, in New Zealand, natural heritage imagery is widely promoted as a way to attract tourists to the country. Aspects of heritage in such places can therefore be a resource, but one which is scarce, non-renewable and finite, especially for cultural heritage (Pearson & Sullivan, 1995; Spenneman, 2006). Unlike threatened species which may be able to reproduce in captivity, cultural heritage sites are unable to do the same and accordingly have a threat ‘more perilous than the possible destruction facing the biological diversity of the natural heritage’ (Guruswamy, Roberts & Drywater, 1999: 713). Once in situ cultural heritage is lost, it is gone forever.

Heritage is accordingly of vital importance for a variety of reasons spanning identity, well-being, historical learning, economics, and scarcity. Despite different points of view regarding heritage between times, people and places, the attachment and value towards it remains consistent and universal (Harvey, 2001; Lowenthal, 2005). As Stratford (2012: 16) writes, heritage invokes a variety of strong emotions: ‘loss, nostalgia, possession, ownership, displacement, replacement, heroics and deep and abiding care.’ Heritage is able to unite people and link people with places, times and each other like nothing else can. It connects us to the relics and remnants of our reason for existence. In this way, the conservation of aspects of the past demonstrates the caring nature of people to value and respect past histories and traditions (Howard, 2003; Pearson & Sullivan, 1995). Simply put, heritage enriches our lives through having care, respect and humility for previous generations. Hence, we ‘go to great lengths, often at huge expense, to protect and celebrate the heritage we possess, to find and enhance what we feel we need, and to restore and recoup what we have lost’ (Lowenthal, 2005: 81).

2.2. BECOMING HERITAGE

In order for an aspect of the past to be managed as heritage it firstly has to “become” heritage – important enough to be retained by contemporary society in perpetuity for future generations – and then be able to be conserved through activities such as protection, preservation, and/or restoration. As explained earlier, heritage is a social construction: defining something as “heritage” may appear a simple and straight-forward assertion, but not all aspects of the past become significant enough to be conserved (Howard, 2003; Pearce, 1998; Schröder-Esch, 2007; Spennemann, 2006). A fundamental question therefore is what
are the specific values that transform an aspect of the past into heritage for the future? Figure 2.1, adapted from Bade (2008), illustrates that the process of becoming heritage involves the interaction of a number of factors, values and criteria.

Figure 2.1 How aspects of the past can become heritage which is able to be conserved.
Becoming heritage, whether a natural or human-made feature, is fundamentally an argument based on specific contemporary values from heritage managers and society within the AHD framework. What is considered to be heritage by a heritage manager or “expert” (within of course their legal and professional limitations) lies at the heart of the process (Mason, 2006). However, there is a two-way relationship between heritage managers and society: heritage managers can guide what society values through justification of historical research or advocating specific heritage values for instance (Sullivan, 2010), while society can also influence heritage managers through actions such as demonstrating an appreciation for an aspect of the past.

The process illustrated in Figure 2.1 is a representation based on knowledge of heritage management from interviewees, and an analysis of international heritage assessment guidelines and heritage scholarly literature. The eight criteria at the centre of the figure illustrate particular values important to and attributed to heritage by heritage organisations and the public in general. The criteria do not function individually: an aspect of the past does not have to have a high value in all of the criteria to gain high heritage status. The four limiting factors are typical of heritage management in protected areas.

2.2.1. Knowledge of an aspect of the past

The most fundamental criterion for something (whether furry, featured, scaled or made of bricks, concrete or wood) to become heritage is knowledge (Figure 2.1). Knowledge is the basis on which humans generate understandings and value towards phenomena. A lack of knowledge about a particular aspect of the past represents both a lack of interest or value in the aspect and the potential not to value it in the present. Determining what is significant from the past and what is not ultimately depends on the amount of accurate knowledge and understanding of the particular aspect (Donaghey, 2001; Hague Consulting Ltd & Kelly, 2001; Stephenson, 2005). In turn, knowledge and understanding is determined by the comprehensiveness of research and the extent of expertise used.

The amount and comprehensiveness of research, particularly field research, by experts strongly determines whether or not an aspect of the past becomes known. As ICOMOS NZ (2010: 3) suggest, with regard to the built environment, the values of a place should be understood and assessed through ‘all available forms of knowledge and evidence.’ Heritage managers strive to have comprehensive knowledge and understanding of the heritage of landscapes (ICOMOS NZ, 2010; Mason, 2006). However, as Lowenthal (1998: 186) points
out, ‘the fact that the past is no longer present clouds knowledge of it with uncertainty.’ Heritage managers and heritage agencies therefore employ a series of methods to gain as much knowledge and understanding as possible through sound research (Hague Consulting Ltd & Kelly, 2001; McLean, 2007). For example, systematic surveys or physical investigations of a landscape or feature; stakeholder interviews; species counts; and archival research, can reveal aspects or artifacts previously unknown (Donaghey, 2001; ICOMOS NZ, 2010; Pearson & Sullivan, 1995).

Because there can be so many different values and aspects to every place, a wide range of expertise is needed to gain a thorough knowledge of a place (Mason, 2006; Pearson & Sullivan, 1995). Current best practice for heritage managers is to seek the help of a wide range of stakeholders with an association with or responsibility for a place, including professional experts and laypeople (ICOMOS NZ, 2010; Mason, 2006, Powell, 1999; 2000; Sullivan, 1993). Stakeholders include people who have a connection to the particular aspect such as indigenous people or local residents; those with traditional links to or knowledge about the site; those who visit the site; and those with a legislative, political, or economic interest in the site (Sullivan, 2010). McIntyre-Tamwoy (2004) emphasises that heritage managers should not only educate the public, but also learn from them, particularly regarding the emotional attachment to a landscape by people. The more people consulted the more knowledge there is (Mason, 2006). Without knowledge important aspects of the past can be inadvertently modified or destroyed. With knowledge these aspects have the potential to be valued as heritage.

2.2.2. Assessing and valuing significance

Once an aspect of the past is known (that is, identified as having likely significance), further criteria become important in assessing and valuing the significance of it for present-day society and heritage managers. The criteria listed for assessing and valuing significance in Figure 2.1 are typical and recognised ways heritage value is determined from not only heritage guidelines and experts, but society in general. To a great extent, the popularity or interest in, for example, a place, object, forest or animal is dependent on how well it is interpreted or portrayed to the public: if there is a strong enough following from the public, it can become heritage warranting conservation (Carter & Bramley, 2002). In fact, the process of becoming heritage is very much about making a case or argument (Kelly, 2000). If a case can be built on one or more of the central assessment criteria of becoming heritage from
Figure 2.1, then an aspect of the past can become heritage. The eight criteria are explained here:

- **Ecological/historical importance**
  If something can be associated with or can illustrate a (famous, important or unusual) historical person, event, habitat, species or pattern then it is highly likely to be regarded as heritage (Carter & Bramley, 2002; ICOMOS NZ, 2010; McClean, 2008; McLean, 2007; NZHPT, 2007).

- **Age**
  Age or perceived antiquity is commonly seen as the most obvious criterion to become heritage (Lowenthal, 1998; Pearson & Sullivan, 1995). Generally the older something is the more worthy it is of heritage status (Kelly, 2000) as it may be considered rare, or may be a reminder of a past era or utilisation no longer happening in the present day.

- **Rarity, uniqueness and vulnerability**
  A natural or cultural feature can gain significance due to the extent it is locally, regionally, or globally uncommon, unusual or unique (Carter & Bramley, 2002; Hague Consulting Ltd & Kelly, 2001; NZHPT, 2007; Pearson & Sullivan, 1995). By being rare and unique, an aspect of the past can also be considered as fragile, vulnerable and threatened, adding more reason to be conserved (Lowenthal, 1998).

- **Information revealed and interest generated**
  Aspects of the past with the potential to raise awareness of and generate interest in the history of a place or nation through public education are likely to become heritage (ICOMOS NZ, 2010; NZHPT, 2007). Likewise, due to its potential for tourism, the potential public appeal towards an aspect of heritage can be an important measure of significance (Garrod & Fyall 2000; Hague Consulting Ltd & Kelly, 2001).

- **Representativeness**
  How representative a place, feature, animal or forest is of a historical event or period or a type of habitat is also a significant factor in becoming heritage (NZHPT, 2007; Pearson & Sullivan, 1995). As a remnant, an aspect of the past can act as an icon of
remembrance. For example, a building may be significant for representing a certain architectural style; or an area of remnant vegetation could be important due to it representing the features of an ancient forest (Boswijk, 2010).

- **Authenticity**
  The authenticity, that is, the originality or historical integrity, of heritage, be it a building or a remnant forest, can make it significant (Howard, 2003; ICOMOS NZ, 2010; McClean, 2008; McClean & Greig, 2007). Although most built structures or forests are often not original (due to past modifications, restorations, or the spread of exotic vegetation), if it looks original or is made out of components or species of the original, or is located in its original location, it can be perceived to be authentic and considered as heritage.

- **Visibility, accessibility, condition and aesthetic appearance**
  To a great extent in order for a tangible remnant of the past, whether a built structure or a forest, to gain heritage status it needs to be visible, accessible, in a relatively good condition and aesthetically pleasing (Carter & Bramley, 2002; Clark, 2005; ICOMOS NZ, 2010; McClean, 2008). The judgement as to whether an aspect of the past is aesthetically pleasing is based on ‘ugliness’, ‘locaional inappropriateness’ or ‘discordant juxtaposition’ and is deeply rooted in the psyche of society and is often unquestioned by most of society (Duncan & Duncan, 2001; Tunbridge and Ashworth, 1996: 266).

- **Social and cultural proximity**
  The social and cultural proximity to an aspect of the past considers to what extent people can relate to that aspect and to what extent it is considered to be of important heritage significance (Carter & Bramley, 2002; Marshall et al., 2011; McClean, 2008; McIntyre-Tamwoy, 2004; McLean, 2007). This criterion strongly relates to how well the value of an aspect of the past has been conveyed to the public. The connection or attachment someone, a group, or a country may feel with a house or a forest for instance, provides motivation to cherish it as heritage to be passed on to future generations (ICOMOS NZ, 2010; McLean, 2007; NZHPT, 2007; Sullivan, 2010).
2.2.3. Heritage warranting conservation

Through an evaluation of these central criteria by both heritage professionals and by society in general, aspects of the past can become heritage warranting conservation (including such activities as maintenance, preservation, restoration, reconstruction, adaptation and interpretation). However, despite warranting conservation, a number of factors can limit the extent to which an aspect of heritage can be conserved (Figure 2.1).

- **Location and land designation**

Often the final call on whether an aspect of the past is protected, preserved, or restored comes down to the land designation (or primary significance) of the area in which it is in – whether on public or private land or classified as a Natural or Historic Reserve. Similarly, physical location is another factor potentially limiting conservation (Pearson & Sullivan, 1995). For example, an archaeological site could be on a popular beach – or alternatively in extreme isolation – limiting the extent to which conservation work can be carried out.

- **Legislation**

Legislation can have a fundamental influence on what is considered as heritage. Successful heritage management needs the support and protection from overarching national and regional heritage laws, policies and regulations (Sullivan, 2010).

- **Management ethos**

Embedded biases within a heritage department can impact on not only the activities of the agency but also the motivation and teamwork of heritage management staff. What is ultimately managed as heritage strongly hinges on the priorities, expertise and make-up of the governing organisation (Beeton, et al., 2006; Hague Consulting Ltd & Kelly, 2001; McIntyre-Tamwoy, 2004).

- **Resourcing and funding**

One of the most evident limitations to conserving heritage is resourcing and funding (Hague Consulting Ltd & Kelly, 2001). Often there is never enough money to conserve heritage in the way that management and staff feel that it should be run (Pearson & Sullivan, 1995; Sullivan, 2010). As a result, whether or not an aspect of heritage is conserved is often reliant on the extent to which it can act as an economic resource (Carter & Bramley, 2002; Hall &
McArthur, 1996). Equally, the availability of other resources, such as technology and expertise available to carry out conservation activities, is also an important factor.

2.2.4. Heritage to be conserved

To sum up the process of becoming heritage to be conserved: if there is sufficient knowledge of an aspect of the past, if it has a high standing regarding at least one of the central criteria of Figure 2.1, and if it is situated in a suitable legislative, physical, managerial and financial context, then it can become heritage to be conserved for the future. It must also be highlighted that the values towards aspects of the past are dynamic and can change over time (McClean, 2008). They can ‘get reinterpreted, and indeed should be expected to change’ (Mason, 2006: 33). Consequently, heritage evaluated as insignificant in the present may be regarded as significant in the future, or vice versa (Spennemann, 2006).

A common conception about heritage is that all heritage is, and can be, of equal importance. However, as shown above, not all heritage can have the same significance. Some heritage may have a higher standing in the central criteria, or may have a better ability or capability be conserved than another aspect of heritage due to limiting factors. As a result, aspects of heritage can be placed in a hierarchy of significance. Although perhaps not ethically appropriate, heritage managers find it advantageous to have this hierarchy as it enables heritage to be compared and prioritised easily (Carter & Bramley, 2002; Hague Consulting Ltd & Kelly, 2001; Kelly, 2000; Marshall et al., 2011; Mason, 2006; McClean, 2008; Pearson & Sullivan, 1995). In fact, Hague Consulting Ltd and Kelly (2001: 49) write that the aim of an identification and assessment process should be to identify a ‘hierarchy of significant places under a variety of relevant themes.’ Having heritage with different values of significance makes it easier for heritage managers to make judgement calls as to what heritage features should be saved in the face of competing land uses, the plethora of heritage aspects and budgetary considerations.

2.3. IDEALS AND REALITIES OF HERITAGE MANAGEMENT

The ultimate ideal of heritage management is for all heritage features and their values to be conserved, safeguarded and maintained in the present for future generations (Carter & Bramley, 2002; Garrod & Fyall 2000; Hague Consulting Ltd & Kelly, 2001; McKercher & de Cros, 2002; Pearson & Sullivan, 1995). The ideals can be clearly seen in the ICOMOS New Zealand Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Heritage Value which acts as a
guide of best practice for cultural heritage managers in New Zealand (ICOMOS NZ, 2010). The document states that the ‘conservation of a place should be based on an understanding and appreciation of all aspects of its cultural heritage value, both tangible and intangible…without unwarranted emphasis on any one value at the expense of others’ (ICOMOS NZ, 2010: 3, emphasis added). It continues by stating that conservation plans should ‘be prepared by objective professionals in appropriate disciplines’ (ICOMOS NZ, 2010: 5, emphasis added). However, as illustrated in this chapter, these ideals can never fully be met. Not all aspects of heritage can be saved and conserved for the future. Even if an aspect of the past may be considered as heritage, it still may not be conserved. Furthermore, no heritage manager can be objective as everyone is influenced by their own positionality. There is therefore a disconnection between the ideal of heritage management and the reality of heritage management. This disconnection relates to the heritage characteristic of dissonance.

As briefly outlined in Chapter 1, heritage has intrinsic dissonance due to discrepancies, incongruities and contradictions in the values and attitudes attributed to different types of heritage (Tunbridge & Ashworth, 1996). Smith (2006: 82) even goes as far as saying ‘heritage is dissonance.’ Heritage, such as a building or a bird species, is therefore not valued the same by all people. As a result, not all views of heritage can be compatible, and consequently, not every heritage feature is able to be conserved (Kirby, 1996; Pearson & Sullivan, 1995). Because there are many different voices and perspectives, not everyone is as understanding and sympathetic to each other’s views as managers may like. Sullivan (2010: 21) points out that successful heritage management ‘involves dealing effectively with all of these people, including difficult as well as helpful sections of the community.’ Heritage is always in dispute: ‘any form of conservation or presentation will be political; someone will be advantaged by it [conservation] and someone else will be disadvantaged’ (Howard, 2003: 17). Accordingly, heritage management is a matter of continuous negotiation (Mondale, 1994). Not all values may be able to be accounted for: a particular value may have to be favoured over another, and compromises may have to be made. It is the job of heritage managers to manage these compromises in order to avoid as much conflict as possible (Howard, 2003), whilst also acknowledging that their own ideal solutions often will not be realised, as Sullivan (2010: 21) explains:

Effective community involvement does not mean a manager relinquishes control, but it can lead to solutions that are less-perfect than ones the manager may have been able to design in isolation. On the other hand, solving 80% of a problem, or moving in slow steps that the community can accept to overcome key issues, is much better than
coming up with a “perfect” solution that cannot be implemented because of community opposition.

Moreover, like simultaneously having many different values (horizontal dissonance), each individual landscape also has many different layers of history or ecology overlapping each other (vertical dissonance). In this way, a landscape can be viewed as a palimpsest (a writing block on which an inscription would be imperfectly erased and another written over it, leaving a combination of erasures and writings). It is consequently impossible to fully conserve all layers as one specific site may relate to various histories.

It is clear that the ideals of heritage management can never be met. Instead the realities of dissonance within the way heritage is valued and the limiting factors outlined in Figure 2.1, means that heritage managers have considerable challenges in conserving heritage. As a result, heritage management requires a cautious approach of ‘doing as much work as necessary but as little as possible’ (ICOMOS NZ, 2010: 9). Heritage managers practice ‘the art of the possible’ (Sullivan, 2010: 15). That is, making conservative, feasible and practical decisions in heritage management as not all ideal solutions are possible. This idea of dissonance and the disconnection between the ideal and reality of heritage management is a major theme in this research. The management of cultural heritage in protected areas is very much about taking into consideration different, and often conflicting, perspectives.

2.4. CONCLUSION

This chapter has highlighted five main points which underpin the rest of the thesis. First, heritage is of vital importance for the wellbeing and identity of society. At the core of any group or society is its heritage. Saving heritage is about respect for what has brought us to this point in time as well as having respect for future generations. Second, the chapter brought to attention the primary values or features which give aspects of the past its meaning as heritage. Becoming heritage has been shown to be a complex and dynamic contemporary process with aspects of the past being socially constructed as heritage through the legitimising actions of both heritage managers and the public. In fact, becoming heritage is more about the attitudes in society than the physical attributes of the aspect itself. Imparting knowledge and understandings about a particular aspect of heritage is therefore of considerable importance. Third, the way of valuing and conserving heritage (the AHD) naturalises Western approaches at the expense of indigenous knowledge and methods of heritage conservation. Fourth, the chapter brought to attention the complexities involved in
going from “heritage warranting conservation” to “heritage to be conserved.” In any landscape there are many levels of heritage significance from minor to great. The challenge for heritage managers is to assess this significance, and judge how its management is feasible and compatible with other objectives or factors. It is a balancing act, and one that has to be based on a clear understanding of the different levels of significance, which stakeholders value them, and what the management imperatives are that might allow or prevent heritage conservation. Fifth, the chapter explained that heritage management can never be ideal: not all points of view can be fully accounted for and not all aspects of heritage can be preserved and protected. There are always different perceptions and limiting factors. Heritage managers must, as Sullivan (1993: 25) writes, acknowledge that heritage conservation ‘never takes place in the ideal situation… the key is to operate within this environment to find the most realistic and authentic solution to a complex and exciting problem.’
CHAPTER 3.

Nature, Culture and Heritage Management

3.1. INTRODUCTION

Now that the concept of heritage has been defined and the ideals and practicalities of heritage management have been discussed, this chapter will examine the conceptualisations of “nature” and “culture,” and how they have influenced the standing of cultural heritage in “natural” protected areas around the world. Is “nature” distinct from “culture”? Is “nature” “culture”? What is the relationship between “nature” and “culture”? These questions have been central to significant theoretical work within geography and other disciplines since the nineteenth century (Braun, 2004). This chapter reviews the changes to conceptualisations of nature and culture from the period of Enlightenment onwards and relates these to developments in heritage management from the colonial period to the present. The review is based on a combination of academic books, chapters, articles, and heritage assessments. Two broad perspectives theorising nature and culture have developed since the Enlightenment: modern dualistic perspectives (nature as separate from culture) and postmodernist constructivist perspectives (nature as culture).

3.2. MODERN DUALISTIC PERSPECTIVE

The modern dualistic perspective of separating nature and culture is a product of Western thought emanating at least since the period of Enlightenment in eighteenth century Europe (Baldwin, 2006; McIntyre-Tamwoy, 2004; Stephenson, 2005; Titchen, 1996; Wockner, 1997). The nature/culture dualism has become a long-standing and well-entrenched view of the relationship between people and the environment in Western society; nature and culture are mutually exclusive realms of reality, implying that nature is something opposite to, and therefore free from, culture (Anderson, 1995; Dingler, 2005; Olwig, 1984, Wilson, 1992). In other words, something is either nature or culture, and never both. According to this view, nature is self-perpetuating and independent from culture (Lennon, 2000); if cultural processes act at all upon something natural, such as the domestication of an animal or plant, then it becomes cultural and no longer natural (Hytten, 2009).
Common aspects of “nature” include the features, flora and fauna of forests, lakes, rivers, mountains, deserts, polar regions, and oceans. The epitome of nature, and a term which has been predominant in theoretical discussions, is “wilderness”, a place perceived to be entirely separate from human influence. As Cronon (1995: 69) evocatively describes, wilderness is a ‘pristine sanctuary where the last remnant of an untouched, endangered, but still transcendent nature can for at least a while longer be encountered without the contaminating taint of civilization.’ Hence, nature is something other than and opposed to society or culture: a place to be admired from a distance (Park, 2003); a ‘beautiful alternative to urban industrial civilisation’ (Bell, 1996: 40); and a place to escape to to avoid the ills of civilization (Castree, 2005). Being separate from culture, nature (or wilderness) is seen to be vulnerable to human activity, any human use of nature is considered ‘ab-use’ (Cronon, 1995: 85).

“Culture”, on the other hand, according to modern perspectives, refers to all human activities and their manifestations (Dailoo & Pannekoek, 2008; Winchester, Kong & Dunn, 2003). Culture is an assemblage of shared values, beliefs, behaviours, and practices of people (Dailoo & Pannekoek, 2008; Mee, 2009). This assemblage can have tangible outcomes, such as an artefact, a building, art, or technology. Simply put, “culture” or “cultural” is used as a synonym for human, human-created, or human-influenced features (Plumwood, 2006). Humans (culture) are seen to be distinctive to non-humans in that they can deny their instincts as opposed to non-humans (nature) (Biro, 2005).

The development of science, industry and technology from the eighteenth century in Europe increasingly distanced “modern” civilisation (culture) from “primitive” nature (Papayannis & Howard, 2007; Skoglund & Svensson, 2010). These developments, including industrialisation and advances in the agricultural system, led to three fundamental changes in the relationship between humans and the environment, and attitudes towards nature. First, nature became viewed as a resource to be exploited for human benefit: humans were seen to be able to control and reap benefit from nature through the development of cities and structures and the exploitation of natural resources. Nature was ‘positioned as an inferiorized, feminized otherness – a background to the unfolding drama of human mastery’ (Fullagar, 2009: 299). Second, advances in science and scientific study methods meant that nature was able to be studied separately from humans. “Nature” was available for ‘interrogation, measurement and analysis’ by “objective” scientists who were “outsiders” and “separate” from nature (Sundberg & Dempsey, 2009: 459). Early naturalists from the eighteenth and nineteenth century argued that nature reached a natural climax which would be left stable
unless disturbed (Cronon, 1995). Consequently, as disturbance was often a result of human activity, the ‘human presence muddied the clear waters that researchers wished to plumb’ (Griffiths, 1991: 89). Third, a romanticised view of nature developed. People in urban areas, experiencing worsening living and working conditions, ‘came to see nature as an appealing “other”, a place of peace and beauty, a space for recreation and refreshment for body and soul’ (Warren, 2009: 254).

These three ideas were transported from Europe and projected around the world during the colonisation period of the eighteenth and nineteenth century. Through European colonial encounters, Europeans distinguished themselves as “modern” and “civilised” (above nature), while the new lands, and often the indigenous peoples of these areas, which were untouched by (modern) European influence, were seen as nature or natural. Smith (2006: 89) explains that post-Enlightenment Western Europe saw themselves as ‘having reached a pinnacle of cultural evolutionary achievement’ – civilisation. The indigenous inhabitants of these new lands were deemed to be living in nature, and therefore not (cultur(e)d) and outside of modernity and civilisation (Ginn, 2008; Goodall, 2008; Hennessy & McCleary, 2011; McIntyre-Tamwoy, 2004; Stephenson, 2005; Sundberg & Dempsey, 2009). The ideas of civilisation provided justification for European colonial rule over ‘more “primitive” peoples and their “unspoiled” or empty lands’ (Ginn, 2008: 340). As a result, indigenous people were often forced off their land, alienated from their resources and spiritual home, and almost treated like animals, as in Tasmania, Australia, where the treatment of Aborigines has been labelled as genocidal (Madley, 2008). Some indigenous people of these new lands, such as Polynesians, were also considered as “noble savages” living in balance with nature, thus dehumanised as not having any impact on the environment (Goodall, 2008; Griffiths, 1996; Lowenthal, 1997; 2010; West & Brockington, 2006). Civilisation went hand in hand with the control and subjugation of nature (Warren, 2009). Being ‘the opposite of the wild and uncontrolled sides of nature’, culture became ‘a sign of progress and evolution – a way to take control’ (von Unge, 2008: 11). Consequently, many early colonists often saw nothing wrong with their conquest of nature. For example, the destruction of forests or wetlands was seen as an improvement to the land (Lowenthal, 1997).

During this time, the conquest and protection of nature overlapped. Strongly associated with these ideas of civilisation, conquest over nature, the study of nature and the Romanticism of nature was the need to protect nature from the deleterious impacts of human activity. From the mid-nineteenth century scientists increasingly highlighted the detrimental impacts
humans were having on nature as a consequence of land transformation and resource exploitation. In particular, American scholar George Perkins Marsh in his book *Man and Nature* (1864) called for ecological awareness and proposed remedial actions to halt deforestation and soil erosion (Marsh, 1864). Marsh focussed on the relationship between humans and the environment and on the often destructive impact of human activity on nature, using examples from ancient Mediterranean civilisations. He highlighted the need for careful management of natural resources. This knowledge that humans were damaging nature turned the perception of human activity on its head: ‘Man the improver became man the destroyer’ (Lowenthal, 2005: 83). Nature needed protection.

This need to protect nature spawned the National Parks movement of the late nineteenth century. National Parks are protected areas reserved for the nation. In 1872, Yellowstone National Park, in Wyoming, USA, became the first National Park in the world and a model for National Parks (and protected areas) internationally (Kalamandeen & Gillson, 2007; Stephenson, 2005). Many other National Parks and other protected areas were established on colonised lands by early conservationists following the establishment of Yellowstone National Park (Phillips, 1998; Wockner, 1997). Such protected areas perpetuated the dualistic idea that boundaries did exist between nature and culture (Cooper, 2000; Haila, 2000). National Parks preserved landscapes as Europeans “found” them: “pristine”, “unspoiled” and “untouched” (Griffiths, 1991; Lowenthal, 1997). This perception and understanding of nature denied ‘the meaning of links with the past through evidence of earlier occupation and settlement’ (Taylor, 1992: 57). To a great extent, National Parks and protected areas were a reaction to the blighted landscapes of Europe caused by industrialisation (Ford, 2009) as well as the enormous changes wrought by settler societies on the environment of New World countries. These areas not only fixed the fluid and blurry boundaries of nature and culture, but also created places of nature where human use was not recognised, welcomed or allowed. In fact, in many cases indigenous peoples were removed to create wilderness areas despite the areas having been inhabited and modified by these people for centuries (Haila, 1997; Harrison, 2004; 2008; Hohmann, 2008; Wockner, 1997).

This appeal for untouched and pristine nature, embodied in National Parks, and the reaction to changes in the natural environment of New World countries, which developed in the late nineteenth into the twentieth century, contributed to the growth of the environmental movement within Western society from the 1960s. The desire to protect and care for nature
became a strong environmental political movement (Skoglund & Svensson, 2010). With these movements came understandings that humans were ‘an inconvenient nuisance, a spanner in the finely tuned workings of sublime nature’ (Warren, 2009: 256), ‘something which changes or spoils a nature that exists separate from people’ (Cravens, 2008: 2), or an agent which actively strives to grow and exceed the limits set by nature (Haila, 2000). For example, philosophies such as “deep ecology,” an approach in ecological theory which views the human species as a “cancer” to the planet, gained some momentum. Deep ecologists wish to protect nature against the influence of humans and also remove the past influence of humans from the landscape (Griffiths, 1996; Harrison, 2004; McIntyre-Tamwoy, 2004; Powell, 2000). Although deep ecology was a radical fringe movement, it became a grounding philosophy of environmentalism and has directly influenced attitudes towards cultural heritage in “natural” protected areas (Harrison, 2004). As will be explained later in the chapter, there is an environmentalist\(^8\) undertone to modern dualistic perspectives.

3.2.1. Nature/Culture dualism in heritage management

The nature/culture dualism of the modern perspective, and the ideas it has helped to create, has had a major influence on heritage management in Western countries (Malins, 2011). The ‘problematic wedge,’ to quote Prosper (2007: 118), divides all heritage in two: “Cultural heritage”, is classified as aspects of the past relating to “culture”, while “Natural heritage”, is considered to include everything which is “nature.” As seen with the National Parks movement discussed above, the nature/culture dualism also induces landscapes to be designated and considered as “natural” and free from past human activity.

Scholars, mainly in the fields of geography, heritage and environmental history, have observed that the dualism can lead to detrimental results for cultural heritage in protected areas. Heritage differentials are emphasised at the expense of commonalities, thereby entrenching and polarising natural and cultural heritage and supporting the idea that culture and nature cannot co-exist in one landscape (Allen, 1998; Harmon, 2007; Head & Regnell, 2012; Kendle & Rose, 2000; Melnick, 2000). As a result, protected areas – as they are considered to be natural – emphasise natural heritage values and conservation over cultural heritage. Carter (2010: 398) has termed this emphasis on natural heritage in protected areas as a ‘naturalistic gaze’ that ‘reproduces the nature–culture dichotomy that is thoroughly

---

\(^8\) This term refers to a way of thinking which seeks to protect and conserve the environment (nature) by changing environmentally-destructive human activities.
criticised in geographical discourse.’ This section will survey four main outcomes of the nature/culture dualism in heritage management: cultural heritage values not belonging in natural areas, “either/or” heritage management, protected area departments with a bias towards natural heritage, and the nature conservation ethic.

3.2.1.1. Cultural heritage values not belonging in natural protected areas

The most ubiquitous result of the dualism in heritage management is the attitude that cultural heritage does not belong in natural protected areas and therefore needs to be removed, or at least ignored (Carter & Grimwade, 1997; Chalana, 2005; Griffiths, 1996; Grydehoj, 2011; McIntyre-Tamwoy, 2004; Skoglund & Svensson, 2010; Stepenoff, 2008; Taylor, 1992; West & Brockington, 2006). The dualism can promote ideas in which places can be “natural” or become “natural”. Classifying areas as natural (and free from culture) is ‘both intuitively appealing and deceptively simple’ (Hubbard et al., 2007: 95). Consequently, protected areas are often managed in order to ‘protect nature and biodiversity by abstracting them from their complex social contexts’ (West & Brockington, 2006: 610). Accordingly, as Somers (2004: 85) writes, the sentiment that cultural heritage does not belong in natural areas and somehow threatens natural values results in natural and cultural heritage managers becoming ‘more combative, instead of cooperative.’ There are three main ways cultural heritage values have been removed or ignored to create or maintain “natural” or “wilderness” values which will now be discussed.

**Removal of people from protected areas**

Perhaps the most drastic outcome of the idea of culture not belonging in natural areas is the banishment of indigenous and local people from an area due to their activities and occupancy being in opposition to the natural ideals of the area. As alluded to in the discussion about National Parks earlier, past human presence and the interaction between people and the environment may either be selectively acknowledged or not acknowledged at all in a protected area (Pannell, 2006; West & Brockington, 2006). In some cases, the contribution of people to the form of a “natural” landscape has been refuted even in spite of compelling evidence that shows otherwise (Meadows & Ramutsindela, 2004, Purdie, 1996). At Kosciuszko National Park in southeast New South Wales (Australia) for instance, Sullivan (2010: 11) explains that the National Parks and Wildlife Service (NPWS) in the past tended to downplay the associations of Aborigine people and other local descendants ‘in order to
stress its pristine natural values and because some of the cultural heritage values were considered to be in conflict with these natural values.’

In another example, Carter (2010) writes that on Fraser Island in southeast Queensland, Australia, the naturalistic gaze of management agencies and designations has meant the marginalisation and removal of Aboriginal people from the island. In 1992 Fraser Island was inscribed as a World Heritage site due to its natural values. The island has many unusual natural features such as the largest number of independent coastal dune systems in Australia. However, there has been a long Aboriginal presence on the island. Carter (2010: 402) writes that this designation has led to a ‘tendency to exclude or downplay Indigenous perspectives’ and understandings, as if there were no interactions between people and the environment on the island.

A further example is given by Miller (1988) with regard to Bonaventure Island, off the tip of Quebec’s Gaspe Peninsula in Canada, which became a Provincial Park in 1971. The island has many natural values, especially that of being a breeding and roosting ground for thousands of seabirds. There was also a long history of seasonal occupation by fishermen. However, as Miller (1988) explains, the designation of the island as a Provincial Park, while protecting the seabirds and their habitats, banished people from the island, some of whom had used the island for generations. The fishermen felt they had been able to co-exist with the seabirds, but Canada’s Ministry of Recreation, Hunting and Fishing thought otherwise.

There are also similar examples regarding the type of activities people can carry out in protected areas. It is a selective process: biodiversity management and tourism activities can happen, but not activities which are considered to harm wilderness values. Protected area management often restricts traditional uses such as hunting or grazing as they are considered to conflict with natural heritage conservation (Griffiths, 1996; Lennon, 2005), even though, as Beeton et al. (2006) highlight, these traditional uses may be of important cultural heritage significance. One example is the case of the high country tenure review in the South Island of New Zealand (Blundell, 2004; Bray, 2007). New Zealand’s Commissioner of Crown Land, through Land Information New Zealand (LINZ) and DOC, are administering the phasing out of pastoral lease tenure in the high country. The lessees are given more productive land at lower altitude in exchange for giving up their sub-alpine (“high country”) land to the conservation estate. In essence, DOC is dividing the South Island high country into productive (cultural) and conservation (natural) areas. Bray (2007: 5) writes that it appears
that ‘DOC’s guidelines on significant inherent values afford highest priority to natural (pre-human) landscapes, with lower priority afforded to historic (working) landscapes.’ As a result, the tenure review process is not adequately addressing the cultural heritage of the high country. It may be easy to perceive the farmland of the high country as a purely natural landscape: it is uninhabited and appears unchanging, but this appearance fails to convey the long human history of the area. Bray (2007) explains that little effort has been devoted to the importance of the Ngai Tahu iwi’s cultural heritage in the tenure review process. Likewise, pastoral farming is not considered as significant or important heritage to be preserved despite the activity producing the current landscape and being an important economic industry in New Zealand’s history. Blundell (2004) explains that an outcome of this process may be that many historical sites are in danger of being overlooked as they become part of the conservation estate. For example, early European heritage such as old stockyards, sheep dips, archaeological remains of woolsheds, musterers’ huts, old fence lines, rabbit fences; as well as Māori heritage such as ovens, hunting camps, rock art, moa hunting and burial sites, may be lost.

**Removal of physical built cultural heritage**

The removal of physical *in situ* built cultural heritage may be the most common outcome of projects to maintain or develop a natural landscape. Often historic relics in protected areas have no detrimental ecological impacts, but are removed simply to emphasise the “naturalness” of the place. Often its removal is seen as a tidy-up rather than any aversion to history (Ford, 2009; Griffiths, 1991). Six clear examples of this process from the USA and Australia will now be outlined.

The Apostle Islands, off Wisconsin’s peninsula in Lake Superior, USA, highlights the issue of managing cultural heritage on islands in protected areas well (Cronon, 2003; Feldman, 2004; 2010; Feldman & MacKreth, 2004). Since 1970 the Apostle Islands have been a National Lakeshore and constructed into a wilderness separate from human influence and activity. With this designation and the consequent management it has fashioned, Cronon (2003), Feldman (2004; 2010) and Feldman and MacKreth (2004) argue that the cultural heritage of the islands is being lost. On the surface, it appears that the Apostle Islands are a wilderness: permanent human fixtures are few and far between or are so subtle that they become unnoticed, which means that ‘wild nature is everywhere’ (Cronon, 2003: 36). This perception is a result of a process removing or disguising aspects of cultural heritage in order
to create an artificial wilderness environment. As a result of this process it is argued that the long and complex human history of the islands has been silenced, whilst activities relating to recreational and ecological values are promoted, in order for the area to conform to being a place of nature (Feldman, 2010). This kind of management creates a ‘place without history’ (Feldman, 2004: 372), despite the fact that ‘[t]oday’s Apostle Islands, seemingly so wild, are the product of intricately connected processes of human and natural history’ (Feldman & MacKreth, 2004: 271). The islands have been inhabited by the indigenous Ojibwe people for centuries, have been important trading posts between French and indigenous traders in the seventeenth century, have been places of commercial fishing, logging, quarrying, farming, tourism and have the largest surviving collection of nineteenth-century lighthouses anywhere in the USA (Cronon, 2003; Feldman, 2004). If visitors believe that they are experiencing a wilderness at the Apostle Islands, they will be led to completely ignore this human history as well as the ways the natural environment has been shaped by human activity:

   In a very deep sense, what they will experience is not the natural and human reality of these islands, but a cultural myth that obscures much of what they most need to understand about a wilderness that has long been a place of human dwelling (Cronon, 2003: 83).

Through its management the National Park Service (NPS) have in effect (from the viewpoint of cultural heritage advocates) become the ‘principal vandals’ of cultural heritage through the removal of such historical remnants as farms, fishing camps, and cottages at the islands (Cronon, 2003: 39). Equally, however, from the natural heritage advocate point of view, they may be viewed as “heroes” for nature conservation.

The removal of physical built heritage in a protected area is also evident with the creation of the Point Reyes National Seashore, a peninsular fifty kilometers north-northwest of San Francisco, USA (Watt, 2002). The area had prominent and extensive human use by the indigenous coastal Miwok tribes and by ranchers and loggers. Watt (2002: 69) argues that the human history of the area has been ‘strategically downplayed’ and overlooked as a consequence of the designation of the islands as a wilderness, as to recognise the human history of the area erodes a sense of wilderness. Remnants of history are ‘wiped out in favor of an empty natural landscape’ (Watt, 2002: 55). Since its designation as a wilderness area in 1976, Watt (2002) explains that historic structures have been intentionally demolished and natural resources were promoted at the expense of cultural ones: deteriorated ranch buildings were removed, a failed subdivision was burnt to the ground, pavement from primary roads were removed and converted into more natural-looking trails, while secondary roads were
abandoned and left to be overgrown by vegetation. Watt (2002) observed that official interpretation of the Point Reyes area guides visitors away from understanding the extent to which Point Reyes has been affected by human action in the past and the present.

There has also been criticism leveled at the United States’ NPS management of cultural heritage at the Caribbean Virgin Islands National Park (Griffiths, 1991; Olwig, 1980; Fortwangler, 2009; Fortwangler & Stern, 2004). When the park was established in the 1950s, the NPS and conservationists sought to expunge all traces of seventeenth and eighteenth century cultivation in order to restore the island to a “pristine” pre-Columbian condition. The NPS promoted ‘nature preservation in a rather purist fashion’ (Olwig, 1980: 24). Fortwangler (2009: 205) explains that the islanders see re-creating ecosystems ‘as erasing them[elves] from the history of the island and its landscape.’ Consequently, the NPS has found itself having to find a balance between ‘the native and non-native species and the cultural and historic landscapes in which they are situated’ (Fortwangler & Stern, 2004: 156).

Like the USA examples above, history (or cultural heritage) has been undesirable for “natural” places in Australia as well. Griffiths (1991; 1996) gives an example of the Langwarrin Military Reserve in Victoria, Australia, which was renamed the Langwarrin Flora and Fauna Reserve in 1985. Griffiths (1996: 255) writes that there was a ‘very conscious policy not to acknowledge his[tory] in the management of the reserve. As a result of the ‘apparent conflict between the movements to preserve natural and cultural heritage,’ some of the signs of its early military occupation, such as trees, were removed (Griffiths, 1991: 87).

Similarly, on Summerland Peninsula, Phillip Island (close to Melbourne), Head (2000) writes that in order to conform to the wilderness ideal, visitors (as opposed to permanent settlers) are encouraged, pre-historic Aboriginal settlement is celebrated and protected as part of nature, while the archaeology of Euro-Australian activity is physically removed and contemporary attachment of Aboriginal people is not acknowledged. Head (2000: 50) explains that the dilapidated Cat Bay jetty is left in state, but not actively managed, while dozens of holiday shacks on the Peninsula are seen as ‘blights on the landscape’ and have been actively demolished.

In another example from Australia, Russell and Jambrecina (2002) analysed the heritage management of the Tasmanian World Heritage Area. They noted that in the past, natural area managers worked to restore wilderness qualities of the Tasmanian World Heritage Area through the closure of roads, tracks, and huts; the removal or mismanagement of cultural
artefacts; and the renaming of natural features to better reflect natural values (for example, the Lees Paddocks river flats were renamed Lees Plains to downplay the environmentally-damaging history of grazing in the area).

**Ecological restorations and cultural heritage**

Dualistic understandings and environmentalist ideas have generated desires to restore nature in protected areas. A number of studies have highlighted how cultural heritage values can be ignored or dismissed in ecological restoration projects which re-vegetate areas, remove exotic species and reintroduce native species (Avery, 2007; Bade, 2008; 2010; Griffiths, 1991; InSitu Heritage Ltd, 2010; Trotter & McCulloch, 1999). For example, in New Zealand, Trotter and McCulloch (1999: 8) examined the impact of a planting programme on historic and archaeological sites on Quail Island in Lyttelton Harbour, termed ‘vegetation versus cultural heritage’. They (1999: 8) call for a balance between the ‘perceived value of planting native species’ and ‘the loss of the cultural heritage value of irreplaceable and unique historic and archaeological sites (and the information they may yield) of both Māori and European origin.’

Similarly – and also in New Zealand – the revegetation of Motuihe Island (in Auckland’s Hauraki Gulf) is being undertaken to create an island sanctuary for native flora and fauna. Tension has developed between those advocating for the ideal of a “pre-human” natural landscape and those wishing to preserve the extensive traces of human occupation and use on the island relating to Māori settlement, early European farming, a late nineteenth century quarantine station, and a World War II Naval base (Bade, 2008; 2010). Three main points of conflict between the management of natural and cultural heritage were identified by Bade (2008; 2010): the impact of ecological restoration activity (such as tree-planting or track-making) in the vicinity of archaeological sites, the consideration of historical trees as exotic weeds, and the impact of tree-planting and the release of threatened fauna on historic seaside recreation (such as walking dogs or seeing views of the harbour).

Another example in the New Zealand context is given by InSitu Heritage Ltd (2010) for Moutohora (Whale Island). The island has a history of Māori (Ngati Awa) occupation spanning hundreds of years – including physical remnants of Pā (fortifications), terraces, shell midden, and gardening activity – and a European history from the mid-1800s, including whaling, a sulphur mine, farming, and rock quarrying. In 1965 the island was gazetted as a wildlife refuge and since the 1980s has been undergoing ecological restoration. However,
because of a lack of education and knowledge of protocols from visitors and DOC staff regarding this history and its physical remnants, a number of archaeological or historic sites were disturbed or destroyed. For example, InSitu Heritage Ltd (2010) noted that items taken from historic sites were being used as garden ornaments at the accommodation hut on the island. Similarly, an item originating from the quarry site at Te Ratahi (McEwan’s Bay) was taken from its historical context and used as a weight on top of a bait station (used to catch mammalian pests). In addition, in 2009 tree planting was carried out without an archaeological authority (that is, permission from the New Zealand Historic Places Trust [NZHPT]) in an area where there are numerous recorded (and unrecorded) archaeological sites. Visitors have also used oven stones and cobbles from the floor of a historic structure in the dunes at Oneroa to spell out words and to create path edges. InSitu Heritage Ltd (2010) also noted that a valley behind Oneroa was “cleaned” out by DOC staff as they believed the artefacts were recent in origin and therefore of no historic significance. However, the artefacts were not assessed by cultural heritage specialists and are likely to in fact related to a structure from the early twentieth century.

A further example of issues regarding cultural heritage in an ecological restoration context is in the San Juan Island National Historical Park, on the west coast of USA, close to the Canada-USA border. Avery (2007: 3) explains that the current perception of the island as a ‘peaceful, rural hideaway, a refuge from urban life situated among spectacular scenery’ is very much a ‘cultural invention’ as a result of the ecological restoration of the island. Avery (2007) calls for a rethink into the history of San Juan Island to give a more accurate account the interactions between humans and the natural environment of the island.

A somewhat extreme example was when a review committee in USA recommended in 1963 to re-establish a population of predatory animals (wolves, bears and mountain lions) in National Parks (Griffiths, 1991). These animals had earlier been eliminated in favour of game species such as deer. The re-introduction of the wild animals, however, was at the peril of human visitors: ‘[i]f the occasional backpacker was killed and eaten, it was the way of the wilderness’ (Griffiths, 1991: 89). The underlying motivation to reintroduce these predatory animals was to redress “wrongs” of the past. Cultural heritage was not their focus.

3.2.1.2. “Either/or” heritage management

As seen with the examples above, the dualism has caused a “philosophical chasm” between managers of natural heritage and cultural heritage (Carter, 2010; Conrad, 2001: 9; Cronon,
Many scholars have observed that the nature/culture dualism in heritage management has resulted in silos being created: heritage organisations or staff compartmentalising themselves or being placed as *either* natural heritage *or* cultural heritage. As a result, there can be fundamental clashes of values, a lack of understanding or acknowledgement of different points of view and an absence of will to make compromises, especially when ‘cultural resource and wilderness perspectives come together armed with what they perceive to be mutually exclusive mandates’ (Somers, 2004: 85). These specialised positions mean there can be issues with staff failing to understand or acknowledge cultural heritage values and vice versa (Taylor, 1992). Conrad (2001) writes that in the USA the two silos have meant competition over resources and decision-making authority. Somers (2004: 83) comments that ‘when the two come together they seem to generate more conflict than cooperation, more strife than common sense, and more strongly held opinions than legally supported positions.’ Consequently, the dualism can force managers to make either/or decisions about nature and culture as both are perceived to undermine the other: ‘Wilderness and history [nature and culture], it seems, cannot share the same landscape, we must choose between the two’ (Feldman, 2004: 14). There is a “winners take all” or “pick your side” mentality in protected areas heritage management (Lennon et al. 1999; Somers, 2004). As a result, often only one value – natural or cultural heritage – is recognised and emphasised, as to preserve one value we must disregard the other. Toothman (1987: 69-70) writes that ‘wilderness status has been interpreted by some natural area managers as a mandate to destroy the shelters, cabins, and other artifacts found in such areas, without regard to their potential significance as historic or recreational resource.’ Instead of having cooperative resolutions based on common understanding, conflicts are resolved on a win-loss basis in which winners do not want to concede anything to the losers. As Lennon et al. (1999: 2) explain, ‘[a]ny concessions which might accommodate other less powerful interests are understandably seen as threatening the entire basis of the “winning” outcome.’ With this way of thinking, Cronon (2003: 40) writes that the notion that ‘one might actually wish to protect and interpret a cultural resource in the very heart of wilderness so as to help visitors better understand the history of that wilderness’ is a ‘heretical notion’ and ‘pretty much unthinkable under current regulations.’ Accordingly, Dailoo & Pannekoek (2008) argue that because every landscape is a mixture of natural and cultural heritage, with either/or management only partial heritage conservation occurs.
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Literature has also highlighted that the nature/culture dualism extends deeply into high level heritage organisations and legislation (Brown, 2008b; Skoglund & Svensson, 2010). A clear and significant example is the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation’s (UNESCO) classification of world heritage sites. UNESCO World Heritage was established in 1972 to protect all heritage for humankind as a whole (UNESCO, 2005). However, within this organisation, a split is made between cultural heritage, which includes monuments, groups of buildings, and archaeological sites; and natural heritage, which includes natural features, geological formations, and habitats of threatened species (UNESCO, 2005). This split stems from the nature/culture dualism and is common in heritage management around the world:

Too often, conservation efforts within the spheres of natural and cultural heritage have been perceived as divided, or even competing enterprises. Laws, statutes, and international conventions typically emphasize an apparent dichotomy, and specialists in each area seldom work as truly integrated teams (HGF & WMF, 1998).

Thus, diametrically opposed management objectives and strategies exist side by side (Davis, 2004). The literature argues that as long as there are these silos and divisions in protected area management, cultural heritage will continue to be lost, mismanaged or ignored.

3.2.1.3. Protected area departments with a bias towards natural values

Another major point made in the literature is that because protected areas are considered to be natural, the responsibility for cultural heritage in these areas is often vested in departments or agencies whose primary focus is on natural heritage conservation. Indeed much literature has highlighted how this natural heritage ethos in protected area management has led to cultural heritage, such as buildings, structures and archaeological sites, being considered as irrelevant, tangential, inconvenient, merely a luxury or hobby, inferior to natural sciences, or in opposition to natural heritage conservation (Ashley, Gojak & Liston, 1991; Carter, 2010; Davidson, 1990; Ford, 2009; Griffiths, 1996; Hague Consulting Ltd & Kelly, 2001; Hall & McArthur, 1996; Hubbard et al., 2007; Lennon, 2000; Lennon et al., 1999; Lowenthal, 2005; Malins, 2011; Stepenoff, 2008; Toothman, 1987; West & Brockington, 2006). This ‘naturalistic gaze’ (Carter, 2010: 399) has often underpinned protected area management around the world, and because management of protected areas is heavily influenced by the expertise and interest of the resident staff, agency cultures are more likely to become embedded than change (Hubbard et al., 2007). Carter and Bramley (2002: 193) write that departments, or sub-departments, can have a ‘narrow and specific range of expertise that may
be well suited to management of the resource of highest value and significance [natural heritage], but not useful for protecting and realising values of significance to other sectors [cultural heritage].’ Lowenthal (2010: 25) argues that many natural heritage managers ‘still elevate nature over culture, deploring humanity’s imprint as retrogression from the untouched fundament.’ Not only is social science or history rarely acknowledged in these contexts, but there is also often more resourcing for natural heritage conservation than cultural heritage conservation in protected areas (Beeton et al., 2006; Lennon et al., 1999).

This issue does not rest only with legislation, but also the personal values and selective interpretation of legalisation by protected area department staff. For example, Somers (2003: 85) points out, when writing about National Parks in the USA, that there is ‘no basis in law and policy for this conflict [between natural and cultural heritage conservation].’ He writes that under the Wilderness Act 1964, National Park managers are directed to provide stewardship of cultural resources of historic value. In other words, it is the legislation which is the problem but rather the ‘personal values and selective interpretation of parts of the Wilderness Act, the National Historic Preservation Act, and National Park Service policies’ from National Park management (Somers, 2003: 88). Although Somers (2003) just writes about the American context, there are many other examples of protected area management departments and agencies focussing on the natural heritage side of their mandates, and ignoring the cultural heritage side of their mandate (Malins, 2011; Tranel & Hall, 2003).

Staff in these circumstances are likely to have a background in natural sciences, have strongly held views regarding natural conservation, or have little or no professional training in cultural heritage management. Consequently, there is often ignorance from staff about the requirements for protecting cultural heritage in protected areas (Ford, 2009; Hubbard et al., 2007; Lennon et al., 1999; Toothman, 1987). Decisions and actions which are detrimental to cultural heritage in natural areas, are often made because staff members are either unaware of the cultural heritage values, have not been given clear instructions, or perhaps do not care.

In 2009 the Department of Environment and Climate Change in New South Wales (NSW) conducted a study into the NSW NPWS management of historic heritage assets between 1967 and 2000 (Ford, 2009). The NPWS was formed in 1967 with a mandate to both conserve nature reserves and wildlife and preserve and protect historic sites. However, the service focussed resources on natural heritage conservation. Ford (2009: 8) explains that over the
years staff of the NPWS fervently supported nature conservation, meaning that cultural heritage practitioners often ‘felt anxiety or frustration as they tried to protect heritage places and attempted to convince their park management colleagues – charged with managing the entire landscape of specific parks – of the need to do so.’ Often staff would have a lack of cultural heritage training and a drive to direct (limited) funding and resources towards natural heritage conservation projects. An employee of NPWS, Ross McDonnell, explains that in the 1970s and 1980s ‘historic heritage was seen as a liability’ by field staff and that there were ‘examples of buildings being bulldozed and burnt down and got rid of’ because such features were seen to be a problem in the park land (Ford, 2009: 33). Writing in more general terms about Australia’s National Parks, Lennon (2000: 187) states that the main issues associated with the management of cultural heritage were:

found overwhelmingly to stem from the organisational culture. Generally staff were trained in the natural sciences and, with a penchant for ‘green worship’, were openly hostile to conservation of cultural values, except an acknowledgement of Indigenous values. There was a widespread belief that it is somebody else’s business.

Similarly, Hubbard et al. (2007: 97) write that in the 1980s the NPS in the USA developed an “agency culture” whereby the organisation was ‘dominated by natural resource experts’ and ‘cultural resources [were] often lumped in with interpretation or resource protection.’ Feldman and MacKreth (2004: 273) write that the history of the NPS is full of examples of ‘rash, and later regretted, removal of features thought by one era to be without significance.’ These situations and occurrences are evident in the New Zealand setting, and will be discussed in detail in Chapters 4 and 8.

3.2.1.4. The nature conservation ethic

Another prominent offshoot of the nature/culture dualism in heritage management – and associated with the environmental movement discussed previously – is the emotional appeal of nature and the associated nature conservation ethic in society. Presently, many people feel much more spirited and enthusiastic about nature, and the conservation of nature. Lennon (2000: 184) even describes the movement as ‘the current preoccupation with biodiversity’ which ‘largely ignores the fact that a major agent of change in creating a diverse biota has often been human!’ Nature is something which has an aesthetic value and which people can immediately feel pleasure from seeing (Duncan & Duncan, 2001). In New World contexts, this may spring from regret about the destruction of the environment by early settlers (Lowenthal, 1997). As a result, there is a strong motivation in society to restore areas to their
original appearance. As Griffiths (1996: 261) explains: ‘Colonists wanted to see homesteads, enclosures, cultivation; they divined ruined castles in craggy outcrops. Now we grub out the real ruins and “restore” the wilderness.’

These ingrained dualistic perspectives towards nature and culture combined with the associated emotional appeal of nature have produced a powerful movement within society, a movement which generally considers cultural heritage to be harmful to natural heritage and natural areas to ‘exist outside of history’ (Cravens, 2008: 2). Modernist understandings of nature and culture therefore, to a great extent, support or underlie the nature conservation ethic of society and environmentalist philosophies. Scholars have commented on the way the environmental movement has dominated protected area management (Hall & McArthur, 1996; Stepenoff, 2008). In writing about experiences from Sweden, Skoglund and Svensson (2010: 370) explain that the cultural heritage movement does not have ‘anything like the importance of the environmental movement.’ They explain that nature conservation is ‘the stronger party, possessing many more resources, stronger political influence, and more know-how on how to state and how to achieve goals’ (Skoglund & Svensson, 2010: 372).

3.2.1.5. Conclusion

The four main concerns from scholars raised above are central to the focus of this thesis. The general point to be taken from the literature is that the nature/culture dualism can be harmful for cultural heritage values and its conservation. As Cronon (1995: 79) writes, in ‘virtually all of its manifestations, wilderness represents a flight from history [cultural heritage].’ As can be seen from the examples presented above, to a great extent the idea of a natural or wilderness area depends on how much history or cultural activity is suppressed, obscured or removed. If a place looks natural – such as being green, forested with birdlife, and importantly without obvious human presence – then it is considered to be natural (Collins & Kearns, 2010; Davis, Hayes-Conroy & Jones, 2007; Griffiths, 1991; Preece, 1991; Watt, 2002; Williams, 1980; Wockner, 1997). There needs to be a sense that “nature is in charge” (Warren, 2004). In other words, wilderness does not have to be ancient or pristine; it just needs to seem so (Cronon, 2003; Griffiths, 1996).

There are four themes which come out of the literature. First, it has only been over the past two decades or so that scholars and heritage practitioners have increasingly acknowledged and emphasised that cultural heritage is in – and belong in – protected (natural) areas. With mounting acknowledgement of the ‘longstanding, profound, and pervasive influence of
human societies on the environment’ (Warren, 2009: 258), there has been a strong recognition that so-called natural areas are in fact the product of human-environment interactions (Carter & Grimwade, 1997; Castree & Head, 2008; Grydehoj, 2011; Hall & McArthur, 1996; Kendle & Rose, 2000; Kliskey, Alessa, & Robards, 2004; Lennon, 2006; McLean, 2007; Powell, 1999; 2000). A major point of these studies is that nature alone cannot explain the way landscapes look (Feldman & MacKreth, 2004; Grydehoj, 2011). There is an acknowledgement that natural and cultural heritage values overlap, meaning that they need to be managed together at the same time (Lennon, 2006; Lennon et al., 1999). As a result of this awareness, Carter and Grimwade (1997) write that society is becoming disenchanted with the strict categorisation of natural places. There have consequently been calls for all cultural values to be better taken into account in the management of protected areas and to better acknowledge and understand the ‘interactions and interplays between the natural and cultural environment, between people and place’ (Titchen, 1996: 41). For example, Somers (2004) writes that there have been efforts in the late 1990s in the NPS to have more of an inclusion of cultural heritage resources in wilderness areas. In a NPS Director’s order it was stated that:

There has been extensive prior human use in most areas now designated as wilderness, resulting in archeological sites, historic structures, cultural landscapes and associated features, objects and traditional cultural properties that are contributing elements to wilderness. It is important to recognize that laws ... intended to preserve our cultural heritage, are applicable in wilderness (Somers, 2004: 86).

Feldman and MacKreth (2004: 274-275) call for management policies in the USA which recognise the ‘interconnections between natural and cultural history, rather than placing boundaries between them.’ In Australia, Ford (2009) writes that recently there has been a movement recognising that cultural heritage, particularly Aboriginal heritage, was an integral part of the NSW Park landscape. It has also been highlighted that having both natural and cultural heritage in protected areas can lead to more interest and a broadening of appreciation in history (Lennon et al., 1999). Effectively, by not acknowledging cultural heritage in a natural place, the literature argues that we lose rich sites of historic interest.

Second, a significant number of the examples are from the New World. As highlighted in Chapter 1, this may reflect interest in the management of cultural heritage in “natural” protected areas from those in the New World, and that the issue is predominantly found in former colonies, such as Australia, Canada, the Canary Islands, the Galapagos Islands, New Zealand, South Africa, the USA, and the Virgin Islands (refer to Table 1.1). The idea of these
“new” lands being natural or “Edens” which should be protected and preserved seems to have generated the desire to create natural places. This particular point will be explored in the New Zealand context in Chapter 4. In contrast, as Szabo (2010) writes, the concept of wilderness is hard to imagine in the European (Old World) context, due to the knowledge of the landscape having been heavily modified by humans for thousands of years.

Third, a great number of the examples are islands (e.g. Avery, 2007; Bade, 2008; 2010; Bianchi, 2002; Carter, 2010; Corsane, 2006; Cronon, 2003; Deacon, 2004; Feldman, 2004; 2011; Feldman & MacKreth, 2004; Fortwangler, 2009; Fortwangler & Stern, 2004; Griffiths, 1991; Grydehoj, 2011; Head, 2000; Hennessy & McCleary, 2011; InSitu Heritage Ltd, 2010; Miller, 1988; Moriarty, 2007; Trotter & McCullock, 1999; Wockner, 1997). This finding lends weight to the idea introduced in Chapter 1 that islands are places that are considered suitable for nature conservation, accentuating the emphasis on natural heritage and the divide between nature and culture.

Fourth, the types of cultural heritage found in protected areas in New World contexts are often remnants from histories of displacement, abandonment or failed utilisation. Protected areas are often places where people do not live (or have been displaced from), therefore the cultural heritage of these areas are aspects of the past which are no longer being used. Consequently, this cultural heritage may often not be highly valued (Lennon et al., 1999). Griffiths (1996: 91) explains that ‘[h]istory on public land generally concerns ugly bits [such as old dilapidated buildings and foundations].’ A side-effect of the removal of people or physical remnants from protected areas is that people can be led to believe that cultural heritage in protected areas is of little significance (Skoglund & Svensson, 2010).

As shown in this section, there has been increasing concern about the impact of modern dualistic perspectives in heritage management and a call to alter the conceptualisation of “nature” and “culture” in order for cultural heritage to be better acknowledged in these protected area contexts. These concerns and calls have led to changes in thinking, specifically postmodern constructivist understandings, the focus of the next section.

3.3. POSTMODERNIST CONSTRUCTIVIST PERSPECTIVE

Over the past three decades, there has been a major shift in the way “nature” and “culture” have been understood and studied. Whereas previously nature was understood through modern perspectives as separate from culture, postmodernist constructivist perspectives have
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criticised this dualistic understanding in favour of one which highlights the way nature is socially constructed. The body of work draws attention to the way in which the nature/culture dualism artificially separates people from nature, and comes predominantly from academics and cultural heritage managers who wish to better the management of cultural heritage in natural areas (Kendle & Rose, 2000; Mee, 2009; Sundberg & Dempsey, 2009; Tanskanen, 2009). As Harmon (2007: 381) writes, with postmodern perspectives, the terms of “nature” and “culture” are ‘no longer sacrosanct First Principles, immune from critique.’

Social construction is the primary concept behind postmodern perspectives. Put simply, it highlights the way that all phenomena do not have intrinsic values, but rather are given value through particular understandings, knowledge, and perceptions of humans (Burr, 1995; Greider & Garkovich, 1994). Duncan and Duncan (2001: 398) explain social construction theory through the concept of race:

> It is like the concept of race, which refers to real people who are categorized as belonging to one race or another based usually on skin color. The categorizing really happens, the concept has real, very material effects on peoples’ lives, but it is a humanly created category.

In other words, “nature” only exists because people consciously or unconsciously agree to behave in a particular pattern of conduct as if it exists and these patterns of conduct become accepted as reality (Berger & Luckmann, 2002; Preece, 1991). Thus, a natural or wilderness area is treated and considered as natural by society through its designation as a naturally protected area and the deemphasising of human or cultural elements within that landscape, and not because it is intrinsically natural. These actions create an unquestioned view where the landscape becomes a place of nature even though it may have been, or still may be, strongly impacted on by humans, or may have strong cultural associations.

Postmodernists argue that before the word “nature” was invented there was no “nature”. That is not to suggest that there were not aspects or features that we now attribute to nature, but people were not conscious of there being an entity termed nature which was separate from human influence (Evernden, 1992). In effect, they argue that nature cannot have intrinsic values as human culture assigns all value (Oelschlaeger, 1991).

As postmodernists have attacked modern thinking, so too have they attacked environmentalist and natural science philosophies – to protect or study nature, there needs to be areas of pristine nature which are separate and independent of culture (Krauss, 2005; Wilson, 1992). However, postmodern perspectives dismiss this dualistic thinking. This conflict has been
termed the “two-culture debate” (first used by Snow [1959]) in which the modern side is nature-endorsing and the postmodern side is nature-sceptical (Biro, 2005; Mitchell and Buggey, 2000; Soper, 1995) (Table 3.1).

Table 3.1 The “two-culture debate”: two different perspectives of nature and culture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modern perspective: Nature/Culture</th>
<th>Postmodern perspective: Nature is Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nature-endorsing</td>
<td>nature-sceptical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>natural science</td>
<td>social science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>environmentalist</td>
<td>humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ecocentric</td>
<td>anthropocentric</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nature- endorsers are criticised by postmodernists for separating nature from culture and have been labelled ‘naïve realists’ (Instone, 1998: 452). Postmodern thinking highlights contradictions and paradoxes in natural sciences and environmentalist philosophy. For example, despite ecologists arguing that all phenomena are interrelated (e.g. Lovelock, 1979; Botkin, 1990), nature (or wilderness) is considered as separate from the cultural realm (Jordan, 2000). Likewise, wilderness is seen as being untouched by humans yet it is managed to limit the extent of human impact (Kendle & Rose, 2000; McCullough, 2003). Postmodernists argue that if nature was truly separate from culture, there would be no need for the conservation of nature. Consequently, arguments are postulated that natural scientists and environmentalists are indifferent to, or ignorant of, the social context in which conservation takes place (Harmon, 2007; Griffiths, 1991; Krauss, 2005; Phillips, 1998).

Cronon (1995: 69) argues that these modern dualistic perspectives, ‘get us back to the wrong nature’, as they reproduce categorical binaries between culture and nature and encourage us to ignore the context that defines it. Accordingly, postmodernists argue that a wilderness is a contradiction in terms as it is a social (cultural) construction and so could hardly be contaminated by the very thing (culture) which allows its existence (Cronon, 1995; Dailoo & Pannekoek, 2008; Whatmore & Thorne, 1998).

However, many natural scientists, environmentalists and environmental historians (who support nature as a real agent in history) are unhappy with this criticism and argue that social construction theory degrades and debases natural science identity, research and environmental projects (Castree & MacMillan, 2001; Demeritt, 1994; 2002; Harmon, 2007; Locke & Dearden, 2005; Owen, 2007; Warren, 2009). To question or abandon the autonomy
of nature is to question accepted environmental concerns and to risk hostility from those who proclaim themselves to be guardians and studiers of nature (Warren, 2009; Whatmore, 2002). Likewise, Soule and Lease (1995: xvi), in their book on responses to postmodern deconstruction, claim that the idea that nature is a social construction is as ‘destructive to nature as bull-dozers and chainsaws’ as it can dangerously justify the exploitation of forests and wildlife: if nature is considered as a human creation, we may be less anxious or hesitant to destroy it. Their views are shared by other nature-endorserers. For example, if all landscapes are constructed as being cultural, Waller (1998: 545) asks ‘why should we concern ourselves with conserving nature at all?’ McNeill (2003: 34) writes that the critique of wilderness ‘struck some as treason to the environmental cause, because it could easily be appropriated by supporters of logging, mining, urban sprawl, and so forth as legitimating further human modification of the environment.’ In fact, in 1988, due to worries about mining and logging in Australia’s National Parks, the Australian National Parks Council carried a resolution to ‘provide a united opposition to’ the campaign to promote cultural heritage in Australia’s National Parks (Powell, 2000: 55).

Despite these objections (or perhaps because of these objections) from natural scientists and environmentalists, postmodern constructivist perspectives have been increasingly used in the heritage management of protected areas from the 1990s to better emphasise and acknowledge cultural heritage values. The influence of postmodern thinking in heritage management will now be discussed.

3.3.1. Postmodern constructivism in heritage management

The most notable outcome of the postmodern constructivist movement in heritage management is that of “landscape” approaches. Stephenson (2005: 59) call these approaches part of an emerging ‘post-nature/culture paradigm’ among heritage managers. These landscape approaches attempt to bridge the nature/culture dualism by emphasising that every landscape is a result of the interaction between natural (physical) and cultural (human) processes. There are three main forms of landscape approaches:

- **cultural landscapes** – which is the most widely used (e.g. Brown, 2008a; 2010; Daalo & Pannekoek, 2008; DECC, 2009; Graber, 1995; Keller & Keller, 2003; Mitchell & Buggle, 2001; Phillips, 1998; Roessler, 2000; von Droste, Plachter & Rossler 1995; Titchen, 1996; UNESCO, 2005; Webb, 1987)
• **heritage landscapes** – which has been mainly used in New Zealand (e.g. Bray, 2007; McLean, 2007; Stephenson, 2005; 2006; 2007; Stephenson, Bauchop, & Petchey, 2004)

• **protected landscapes** (e.g. Brown, Mitchell, & Beresford, 2005; Taylor & Lennon, 2011)

All these approaches have the same basic idea of recognising the multiple values of a landscape, with some slight differences: a “heritage landscape” approach views an entire landscape as being of heritage significance (Stephenson, 2003); and a “protected landscape” approach emphasises the contemporary involvement of communities in sustaining natural and cultural values (Brown, Mitchell, & Beresford, 2005).

The cultural landscape approach is the most developed and widely used approach, and has been applied extensively in protected areas management in the Old and New World. There are numerous definitions of the cultural landscape concept but they all highlight viewing a landscape as a social construction and in a holistic inclusive sense. A cultural landscape approach therefore is seen to unify natural and cultural, tangible and intangible heritage (Brown, 2007; 2010; Ford, 2009; Malins, 2011; Rössler, 2006; Webb, 1987). In this way, all landscapes – be it a forested, polar, urban or desert landscape – are considered to have been influenced by direct or indirect human activity. No landscape can be termed as purely natural; meaning, therefore, that even in places considered “natural” there are cultural remnants which can be recognised and conserved (Blair, 1997; Griffiths, 1991; Plumwood, 2006; Titchen, 1996).

Like the general postmodernist perspective, however, there have been criticisms of these landscape approaches – mainly aimed at cultural landscapes – by natural scientists and environmentalists. A cultural landscape approach is considered to be ‘the vehicle by which special interest groups could seek to promote exploitative and destructive land management practices’ (Powell, 2000: 54). By acknowledging the historical significance of activities such as mining, logging or hunting in an area, there is concern that these activities could continue and thus harm natural heritage. For example, Locke and Dearden (2005) take issue with the way the public have to be re-educated about culture in protected areas just when they feel there has been an acknowledgement of the importance of setting aside areas where nature can be protected from human activity. They argue that the philosophical underpinnings these landscape approaches have are ‘human-centred’ and ‘would not allow for even a small
proportion of the planet to be maintained primarily for the benefit of species other than ourselves’ leading to a ‘biologically impoverished planet’ (Locke & Dearden, 2005: 7 & 9). In addition, many natural scientists and environmentalists consider the concept to be too cultural, ignoring the natural features and processes of a landscape which cannot be controlled by humans, such as the features and habitat patterns of flora and fauna which have evolved over millions of years.

3.4. CONCLUSION

As demonstrated in this chapter, there are two main ways in which nature and culture have been conceptualised in heritage management: modern dualistic understandings, which lead to either/or management of protected areas and the idea that cultural heritage does not belong in natural areas; and postmodern constructivist understandings, which view every protected area as a cultural landscape, thus advocating for the conservation of cultural heritage in such areas. Although postmodern cultural landscape approaches have increasingly become used in the heritage management of protected areas, current heritage management structures and practices predominantly tend to follow modern dualistic perspectives. Accordingly, there are views, particularly from natural scientists and environmentalists, which still support modern thinking and find bridging the nature/cultural dualism uncomfortable, as Phillips (1998: 27) explains:

How much easier it was for natural scientists to divide the world into “natural” areas which they could protect, and the rest which they did not have to bother about! And how much simpler it was for policy makers to assign absolute protection to a limited number of empty areas than to have to concern themselves with the much more challenging issue of conserving nature in the inhabited countryside!

However, as shown with the quantity of literature on the topic, there is an urgency to confront the nature/culture dualism in heritage management, particularly from social scientists and cultural heritage advocates.

As alluded to in Chapter 1, the discrepancy between these two conceptualisations of nature and culture is a significant theme of this research. The next chapter will examine how these modern and post-modern perspectives have played out in heritage management in New Zealand, with particular reference to islands. The differences between these theoretical perspectives will be specifically explored in the case study chapters (5 and 6) and then will be examined thoroughly in the discussion chapters (7 and 8).
CHAPTER 4.

New Zealand’s Islands and Heritage

In 1891 New Zealand’s first island nature sanctuary was created on Resolution Island in Fiordland (Southwest of the South Island), primarily for the protection of two endangered native flightless birds: the kakapo and the kiwi. During the same decade three further island sanctuaries were established: Secretary Island, also in Fiordland, in 1893; Little Barrier, in the northern Hauraki Gulf in 1895; and Kapiti Island, west of the lower North Island in 1897 (Figure 4.1). These island reserves are considered to be the first of their kind in the world (Diamond, 1990; Star & Lochhead, 2004; Young, 2004). One hundred years later – in the 1990s – islands were again central for nature conservation purposes in New Zealand. Numerous ecological restoration programmes were actively established on near-shore islands to remove exotic pests and weeds, (re)establish native forest, and (re)introduce threatened native species.

It is clear that islands have played a significant role in natural heritage conservation in New Zealand – their separate, bounded and isolated characteristics have made them appealing as places where native flora and fauna can be protected from the human activity of the mainland – but what has this emphasis on natural heritage conservation for islands meant for the cultural heritage of the islands? How have changes in attitudes towards heritage in New Zealand influenced the ways in which the heritage of islands has been managed? In this chapter the history of the management of natural and cultural heritage in New Zealand will be examined with special attention to New Zealand’s islands. It introduces and explores the social and legislative context in which the case studies, Rangitoto and Motutapu, fit. The chapter argues that in both the current heritage management structures and practices and the theoretical underpinnings of many of New Zealand’s near-shore conservation estate islands, natural heritage, such as forests and native animal species, is privileged at the expense of cultural heritage, such as Māori archaeological sites and early European buildings and structures. This natural heritage bias has developed as a consequence of European attitudes and approaches to the New Zealand landscape and Māori since the mid-nineteenth century.
Figure 4.1 The location of the four New Zealand island reserves established in the 1890s (bolded). Other islands and locations referred to in this chapter are also labelled.
4.1. ENVIRONMENTAL TRANSFORMATIONS AND ATTITUDES IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

Five main interlinking environmental transformations and attitudes towards the environment lie behind the establishment of the first island sanctuaries in New Zealand in the 1890s (Figure 4.1) and inform the positioning of New Zealand’s islands as central to nature conservation activities: the environmental transformation of New Zealand’s forests, wetlands and lowland plains from the second half of the nineteenth century; the tourism potential of natural features; a feeling of nostalgia and sense of regret towards this transformation of the environment; the scientific recognition by ornithologists and naturalists of unique, endemic, and threatened native wildlife and vegetation in New Zealand; and the displacement of Māori as a result of colonisation.

4.1.1. The environmental transformation of New Zealand’s environment

The environmental transformation of New Zealand had been initiated by Polynesian settlement from the late thirteenth century (Wilmshurst et al., 2008). The early burning of the land by pre-European Māori, and the associated arrival of the Pacific rat, resulted in the elimination of 50 per cent of both the pre-settlement forest area and the late Holocene assortment of bird species in New Zealand, including moa (a giant flightless bird) (Anderson, 2002; Haggerty & Campbell, 2009; Wilmshurst et al., 2008). In fact, zoologist Graeme Caughley claims Māori ‘did not just eliminate the moas [sic], they eliminated an ecological and evolutionary process developed over more than 50 million years’ (Anderson, 2002: 32).

With the arrival of Pākehā (non-Māori, predominantly European), the New Zealand environment underwent further transformation: native forest was cleared through logging or burning; five million acres of native bush was cleared between 1886 and 1909 (Star & Lockhead, 2004); wetlands were drained (85 per cent of New Zealand’s original wetlands were drained by World War II [Haggerty & Campbell, 2009]), and fire was used to clear much of the tussock lands of the South Island for pasture (Haggerty & Campbell, 2009). Most of the New Zealand landscape was converted from forests and wetlands into pasture land for farming between the mid-nineteenth century and the mid-twentieth century (Brooking, Hodge & Wood, 2002; Brooking & Pawson, 2011) and exotic flora and fauna from Britain and Europe (of which many are now considered pests) were purposefully or inadvertently introduced (Isern, 2002). Agriculture was undertaken on New Zealand’s islands
ranging from subtropical (and volcanically active) Raoul Island to subantarctic Campbell Island (Bellingham et al., 2010).

In New Zealand, as in other British colonies, in the 1840s, 1850s and 1860s early Pākehā settlers were more concerned with transforming the landscape into something which resembled the European “homeland” than in preserving what was already there (Gentry, 2006; Ginn, 2008; Young, 2004). New Zealand was a “new land” for the settlers, which meant that their own buildings, structures, or works were not considered as heritage, but rather as everyday things of the time. Māori settlements and activities were “pre-modern” which should be modernised. During that period if any thought as given to retaining reminders of remnant places and environments, it was primarily to celebrate a progression from “primitive living” to “civilised living”. “Heritage” therefore was not celebrated as something significant from the past to be conveyed to future generations, but rather as something signifying improvement and development (Gentry, 2009). Through descriptions, such as “Eden of the South”, New Zealand was promoted as a place ideal for agriculture and settlement (Belich, 1996). Accordingly, an ethic of landscape preservation conflicted with a colonial ethos of civilisation (Gentry, 2009). Pākehā settlers wished to tame and subdue what they thought was wild nature, including its indigenous inhabitants, by creating orderly, familiar and productive landscapes; and the result of this environmental transformation was regarded as “civilisation” (Ross, 2008; Star & Lochhead, 2002). For most first-generation Pākehā, the loss of indigenous forests was the necessary cost of European settlement.

However, New Zealand historians and geographers have questioned the idea that all early Pākehā settlers in the middle of the nineteenth century were content with the conversion of forest to pasture. Environmental historians Star and Lochhead (2002) write that there were growing numbers of New Zealand-born Pākehā from the late nineteenth century who began to criticise the rapid transformation of the environment and who considered it imperative to preserve remnants of native forest. Similarly, historian Kirstie Ross (2008) considers that the environmental transformation was never an entirely comfortable process for settlers as they witnessed the destruction of New Zealand’s forests. In the late 1860s and early 1870s concerns were voiced by politicians about the damaging consequences of widespread deforestation in New Zealand. Geographer Graeme Wynn (1979) argues that the ideas in American naturalist George Perkins Marsh’s 1864 book *Man and Nature* greatly influenced their attitudes towards resource management. To a great extent, however, these concerns by New Zealand politicians were for utilitarian reasons, as opposed to intrinsic values, in order
to ensure, for instance, a longer-lasting timber supply. For example, in October 1868 Thomas Potts, a member of the House of Representatives from Christchurch urged the Government to better conserve the forests of the colony as a resource. Similarly, in 1870 William Travers asked at a meeting of the House of Representatives for members not to forget “how much it is our duty to preserve them [these islands] from those destructive processes which even civilised man, in ignorance or wantonness, unhesitatingly applies in his attempts to bring new countries under the dominion of his wants” (Travers, 1870: 329). In 1872, Charles O’Neill, a member of the House of Representatives from Thames, advocated action against forest destruction and suggested the need to conserve the colony’s forests as a resource for future generations. There were also concerns from parliamentarians in the 1870s about the erosion of soils, the drying-up of streams and the desertification of once-forested areas (Wynn, 2002).

As a result of these concerns, Julius Vogel, the New Zealand Premier at the time and who had been one of the most ardent promoters of development when serving as Colonial Treasurer, persuasively argued for the importance of forest preservation in moving the second reading of the New Zealand Forests Bill in July 1874. Wynn (1979) writes that Vogel was heavily influenced by Man and Nature as other parliamentarians had been. During his address, Vogel emphasised the wise and sustainable use of timber: “What would be thought of a man who, cast upon an uninhabited island, and had at command only a limited quantity of food, should recklessly consume it in a few weeks, though he knew that months must probably pass before he could obtain a fresh supply? So to do would be regarded as evidence of madness” (Vogel, 1874: 93). As Vogel spoke, he described New Zealand’s forests as being “something for New Zealand to cling to for generations; to shape its future, to decide its climate, its adaptability for settlement, its commercial value, its beauty, its healthfulness, and its pleasure-bestowing qualities” (Vogel, 1874: 94). According to Wynn (1979: 172), the New Zealand Forests Act 1874 was a ‘striking initiative, as bold and far-sighted an expression of the need for forest conservation as any official action in the new world to that time.’ However, that said, the main aim of the Forests Act was to ensure a future supply of timber as a resource. This growing effort to slow deforestation was, however, surmounted by other economic concerns and opportunities. The development of refrigerated shipping internationally from the 1870s and in New Zealand from 1882 onwards allowed the export of perishable primary products (meat and dairy products) and consequently encouraged more agricultural production and forest clearance (ASHET, 2013; Ross, 2008). New Zealand was to become a farm of Britain
(Brooking & Pawson, 2011) and the desire to preserve New Zealand’s forests became secondary to pastoral development (Brooking, Hodge & Wood, 2002).

4.1.2. The tourism potential of natural features

Even at this early stage, tourism was of great importance to the New Zealand economy (Leach, 1991; Star & Lochhead, 2002). Scenic tourism was seen as an antidote to the extremes of industrial civilisation (Gentry, 2009). Although islands were initially not considered to be tourist destinations for their natural scenery, the potential of natural heritage tourism was a contributing factor in the creation of nature reserves, and consequently the island nature sanctuaries of the 1890s. Early “heritage” legislation from the mid-to-late nineteenth century focussed on the preservation of areas of “pristine” natural beauty. A primary reason for these calls to protect parts of the landscape was because of the ability of these places – in particular forests, thermal regions and waterways – to attract tourists (and revenue). The Land Act 1892 gave the DLS the power to reserve land with natural (scenic) curiosities, which could attract tourists (Gentry, 2009). Reserves – in places unsuitable for farming – were established from the 1880s through the Public Reserves Act 1881, although mainly for forestry purposes. As will be shown in Chapter 5, Rangitoto Island was established as a reserve under this Act in 1890.

4.1.3. A feeling of nostalgia

Also during this time, the National Parks movement, borne out of the United States in the 1870s, was becoming increasingly popular in the New World and was enthusiastically taken-up by New Zealand. The first National Park in New Zealand, located on the central plateau of the North Island (Tongariro), was established in 1887, only 15 years after the world’s first such park in Yellowstone, USA (Baird, 2012; McLean, 2000; Thom, 1987). Tongariro was gifted to the Crown by Te Heuheu Tukino IV, chief of the Ngati Tuwharetoa iwi (tribe), and was given significance due to its scenic beauty and the sacred Māori values of the mountains and forest. Star and Lochhead (2002) write that the Tongariro National Park was generally considered as being useless for farming but was highly valuable as a tourist attraction. Five years later, the establishment of the Land Act 1892, Gentry (2009) argues, was at least in part an attempt to preserve the source of New Zealand’s growing tourism economy from increasing land clearance.
The formation of National Parks and Scenic Reserves in New Zealand was also heavily linked to feelings of nostalgia for, and a sense of regret about, the destruction of New Zealand’s native forests. This was particularly apparent from the late-nineteenth century as Māori and second generation Pākehā remembered a time before areas of land were cleared for farming. Evidence for such sentiments resides in, for example, the formation of numerous scenery preservation societies around the main settlement centres of New Zealand throughout the 1890s. These societies were notable because, as Star and Lochhead (2002) write, their members valued the *intrinsic* worth of nature (that is, the importance of flora and fauna in their own right rather than for purely human benefit). However, because this attitude towards nature was not widespread at the time, the societies also promoted utilitarian benefits, such as tourism, as the best means to protect native forests until others shared their admiration for the intrinsic worth of New Zealand’s remnant “natural” environments. The first such society was the Dunedin and Suburban Reserves Conservation Society, which was established in 1888 to improve and preserve the natural attractions of Dunedin. Between 1891 and 1899 further societies were established in Taranaki, Nelson, Wellington, Christchurch, Auckland, and Birkenhead. Notably, these societies were formed in growing settlements – their advent perhaps underscoring how scenery was seen as an antidote to urbanisation and the excesses of agricultural modernisation.

### 4.1.4. Scientific study of New Zealand wildlife

While the burning and clearance of New Zealand forests continued, by the late nineteenth century, natural scientists were also documenting the various impacts of environmental transformation on New Zealand biota (Treadwell, 2005). Scientists voiced their concern over the diminishing numbers of native flora and fauna, particularly bird species, as a result of fire, land clearance, the collection of bird skins for overseas institutions, and as a result of the presence of mustelids such as stoats, weasels and ferrets, which were introduced to control rabbit populations. Surveyors, who worked long periods in isolated mountainous country and who relied on native birds to supplement their food rations, lamented the disappearance of native birds and were among the first to note the relationship of predator and prey relating to mustelids (Hill & Hill, 1987). Scientists around the world, as well as from New Zealand, became fascinated with the unique – and declining – New Zealand forests and animal species, such as kiwi, kakapo, takahe and the tuatara. Those expressing their concern about the demise of native flora and fauna included prominent ornithologists and biologists, such as Sir Walter Buller (naturalist and ornithologist), William Colenso (a missionary and botanist), Frederick
Hutton (a Professor of Biology at the University of New Zealand), Charles Heaphy (surveyor and explorer), Thomas Potts (a naturalist and politician), and Andreas Reischek (an Austrian ornithologist) (Fulton, 1907; Young, 2004). By 1890, Young (2004: 86) writes, the worst fears of scientists were realised with the discovery of mustelids on the west coast of the South Island: with ‘nocturnal boomers like kakapo and so many other native birds decimated or eliminated, a terrible hush stole over the forest.’ On 21st October 1891, Walter Buller spoke to the Wellington Philosophical Society of the rapidly declining numbers of birds in New Zealand:

We have fresh evidence every day that the native fauna is passing away; and this is particularly true of the birds, several of the species being already extinct, whilst many others are on the border-land, so to speak, from which they must soon disappear. It seems to me that it is one of the most important functions of such a society as this to collect and preserve for all time the fullest possible record of these expiring species (Buller, 1891: 75).

In his talk, Buller spoke of a sense of loss about New Zealand’s fauna, but his talk also drew attention to Darwinian thinking (Galbreath, 2009). New Zealand species were considered by scientists to be less vigorous and competitive than the introduced European species and were therefore considered not “fit” enough to survive. The wish to “collect and preserve” bird species described by Buller (1891) was oriented to shooting and collecting bird skins before the species died out. Rather than protecting species in order to regenerate their numbers, it was common during this time to preserve species by taking physical records of them as museum pieces. Even so, Star and Lochhead (2002) write that the research and interest in New Zealand’s native species helped the Government and the public appreciate, that with such species, New Zealand had something of international significance that was worthy of protection. These reorientations in attitude mark an emergent idea that New Zealand had natural heritage which was unique and ancient, compared to the relatively recent human history.

At the same time, the concept of ecological climax underpinned thinking about ecological systems. According to this concept, every biotic community was expected to reach a state of climax which was stable, and in balance, unless disturbed. The notion of climax perpetuated the modern dualistic idea that humans were separate to nature and had a detrimental impact on it (Cronon, 1995; Griffiths, 1996). To these scientists, humans were the “contaminating” disturbance to nature which altered the “balance” or “stability” of nature. The notion of “reserves” to protect nature from the “dangerous” impact of human activity therefore came to
be advocated among scientists as a means to prevent the loss of further native biota. Isolated and separate from the threats of the mainland, New Zealand’s offshore islands were considered as ideal for this purpose.

4.1.5. Displacement of Māori

In establishing reserves, however, the Government and scientists failed to register – or simply ignored – the occupation and authority of those islands by Māori, to whom islands were not a separate category of land but an extension of land reached via the principal means of transport, the waka (canoe). Davidson (1990) writes that all offshore islands in New Zealand were in some way used or settled by Māori. For example, some offshore islands were used for refuges to avoid attack, such as Poor Knights Islands (off the Northland east coast) and the Hen and Chicken Islands (south of the Poor Knights Islands). Some islands also had special resource qualities. For example, the islands in Foveaux Strait provided habitat for mutton birds, which were popular for food and for feathers; Mayor Island (in the Bay of Plenty) was a major source of obsidian, a black volcanic glass which was used to make small flake tools; and, as will be explained in Chapter 6, Motutapu Island had highly fertile soil ideal for cultivation as a result of ash deposits from the eruption that created Rangitoto. Some islands were also strategically important during times of war for Māori, such as Mana Island and Kapiti Island (off the Kapiti Coast, the western coast of the lower North Island). Despite this Māori history and its palpable cultural heritage, islands were seen by Pākehā society, and members of the science community in particular, as ideal natural refuges for endemic native species which were threatened or not found on the mainland (Bellingham et al., 2010; DOC, n.d.d.; McSaveney, 2009). The idea to reserve islands epitomised the modern dualistic idea of nature as separate from culture; a place where culture should not be.

4.1.6. Island reserves

The genesis of the island nature refuge in New Zealand is clear: at the Australasian Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) conference in early 1891, George M. Thomson (a naturalist) and A.P.W. Thomas (Professor of Natural Science at Auckland University College) moved that ‘in the interests of science, it is most desirable that some steps should be taken to establish one or more reserves, where the native flora and fauna of New Zealand may be preserved from destruction’ (Galbreath, 2002: 84). They requested the Government to reserve both Resolution Island and Little Barrier Island. They had made previous requests through their local societies for preservation with no effect, but when the
Minister of Lands received the resolutions from the AAAS meeting he acted with remarkable speed (Galbreath, 2002). The AAAS meeting’s secretary, Professor A. Liversidge of Sydney University, forwarded the resolution to the Government on 16 March 1891 and the Government reserved Resolution Island on 22 May 1891 (Hill & Hill, 1987), making it what is considered to be the world’s first island sanctuary for native birds (Diamond, 1990; Star & Lochhead, 2004; Young, 2004). Young (2004) writes that the main reasons for the extraordinary speed at which Resolution Island was made a reserve was that the island had no farming appeal and no obvious Māori owners. Gazetted as a reserve in 1891, it was not until three years later however that the island was actively managed as a reserve (Galbreath, 2002).

Resolution Island was considered highly suitable for a bird sanctuary as it provided habitat for flightless birds such as kakapo and kiwi, and protection from mustelids. There were also faint hopes that the island may have some takahe, which were nearly extinct at the time (Hill & Hill, 1987). Richard Henry was appointed curator of the island in 1894 and made some the earliest translocations of birds. With the help of a well-trained (and muzzled) dog, and expert knowledge of bird habits, Henry managed to trap and transport over 700 kakapo and kiwi to the island (McSaveney, 2009; Peat, 2007; Young, 2004). However, in 1900, tourists on a boat to nearby Dusky Sound, reported that they had seen a weka (a flightless native bird) being chased by a stoat on the island (Young, 2004). This observation was later confirmed (McSaveney, 2009). Henry was understandably distraught that mustelids had managed to swim to the island and had started to kill the highly vulnerable native birds which he had trans-located there. This event foreshadowed a major problem which was to hamper island reserves in the future – that of exotic pests getting to islands.

Other islands were also suggested as possible bird sanctuaries. In August 1891 journalist James Richardson presented a paper “On the extinction of Native Birds on the West Coast” to a meeting of the Otago Institute. Discussion after his paper generated suggestions for potential island bird sanctuaries in addition to Resolution Island (Hill & Hill, 1987). Among the suggestions were Little Barrier Island; the larger islands in Lakes Te Anau, Manapouri and Wakatipu which could be stocked with birds; Stewart Island; Codfish and Bench Islands (close to Stewart Island); the Snares (south of Stewart Island); the Solanders in Foveaux Strait; the subantarctic Auckland Islands; and the subtropical Kermadec Islands (Hill & Hill, 1987). Those at the Otago Institute meeting stressed that any island reserve must be at a distance from the mainland sufficient to prevent mustelids swimming there. These suggestions highlight the importance attributed to islands for natural conservation in New...
Zealand at this time. Islands appeared to be ideal for nature sanctuaries due to their remoteness and the way water could insulate an island from unwanted predators to native flightless birds, such as mustelids.

Three more island sanctuaries were established between 1893 and 1897. Secretary Island, New Zealand’s fifth largest offshore island, was designated as an island reserve in 1893 (Nightingale & Dingwall, 2003). The island remained free of any introduced grazing or browsing mammals until the 1960s, when wild deer became established (Edge, 2004). Little Barrier Island had long been considered as suitable for a nature sanctuary. In fact, the island was considered more suitable than Resolution Island as it had a warmer climate and was less accessible to mammalian predators which could swim (Young, 2004). The island had attracted much scientific interest, particularly relating to the flourishing native bird populations. Austrian ornithologist, Andreas Reischek, documented over 40 different species of birds on the island in the 1880s. Although suggesting it as a sanctuary for birds, Reischek nevertheless shot 150 rare Stitchbirds (which had become extinct on the mainland) on the island for his collection (Young, 2004). However, the Māori presence on the island complicated the establishment of a reserve. Little Barrier Island Ngati Wai chiefs, such as Tenetahi and Rahui Te Kiri, were opposed to leaving the island so that a reserve could be established, and Tenetahi was profiting from milling the island’s kauri forest and from running stock on the island (Young, 2004). In December 1892, in order to protect the potential reserve, the Government issued an injunction to prevent the felling of timber on the island (Hill & Hill, 1987). In order to forcibly remove the resident Māori from the island, the Little Barrier Island Purchase Act 1894 was enacted, and the island was purchased from Māori for £3000. As shown in the New Zealand Parliamentary Debates of 1894, the Bill was heavily argued in parliament and Tenetahi believed the Bill to be a breach of the Treaty of Waitangi. Despite objections, in the end Tenetahi and the remaining inhabitants on the island were forcibly moved off the island by a bailiff and soldiers at dawn on 20 January 1896 (Ballara, 2010). The Auckland Institute then managed the island until 1905 when it was managed by the Tourism Department (Young, 2004). Tenetahi continued to demand compensation for the removal of his people from Little Barrier. He refused to remove his stock from the island until 1897, when the Crown decided to remove the stock themselves to recoup some of their expenses. At the same time Tenetahi removed the only habitable cottage on the island to make it difficult for the Auckland Institute to stay on the island during inspections (Ballara, 2010). The island was declared a reserve in 1897 and remains one of
New Zealand’s premier nature sanctuaries. Wild cats, however, were a problem on the island until they were eliminated in 1980 (Young, 2004).

The fourth island reserve established during this period was Kapiti Island in 1897. The island consisted of New Zealand’s largest single area of lowland coastal forest free from introduced predators and herbivores, until possums were introduced in 1893 (Young, 2004). Like Little Barrier, Kapiti Island had many Māori inhabitants (Ngati Toa) who were unwilling to sell their land to the Government, which delayed the establishment of the reserve. The island had been an important base for Te Rauparaha, the chief of Ngati Toa, to wage battles in central New Zealand from the 1830s to the 1860s. The island was also a place of interaction and trading between Māori and whalers, having had up to 2000 people living on the island during whaling times (Hill & Hill, 1987). Once whaling declined in the mid-nineteenth century, farming became an important industry and much of the island’s forest was cleared (Hill & Hill, 1987). In 1897 the Kapiti Island Public Reserve Act was passed, which declared the island to be a reserve for the flora and fauna of New Zealand. The Act compensated European owners, and allowed about 1300 acres of land at Waiorua Bay (on the north eastern side of the island) to be used by Ngati Toa. Cattle, goats and sheep were introduced to the island in 1893 and pests remained a problem for many years: deer and pigs were eradicated between 1902 and 1906, and cattle, sheep, goats and feral cats were eliminated between 1916 and 1934 (Young, 2004). Endangered birds were introduced including: North Island brown kiwi (before 1903 and in 1919); kakapo in 1903; great spotted kiwi in 1915; and saddlebacks in 1925 (Hamilton, 1961). Presently, Kapiti Island is one of New Zealand’s most thriving island nature reserves.

4.2. THE EARLY TWENTIETH CENTURY

Although significant deforestation continued in New Zealand, by the early twentieth century indigenous natural heritage had become an important part of the New Zealand identity, reinforced by the preservation of native bush remnants, including the establishment of island reserves, and scenery preservation societies. To the settlers, native flora and fauna gradually became symbols of national identity. Native birds and mountains began to appear on New Zealand postage stamps as early as 1898 (Star & Lochhead, 2002). The huia and the kiwi also became popular national icons (Ginn, 2008). Likewise, scenic landscape painters found mystery and romance in the New Zealand native forest and represented the native forest as timeless and primeval (Eldrege, 1991). New Zealand’s natural heritage was beginning to be
treated as the equivalent of cultural heritage in the Old World, such as in Europe. New World settler countries often compensated for having recent (and therefore apparently insignificant) local histories by highlighting the wonders of their “prehistoric” natural heritage (Griffiths, 1991; Lowenthal, 1985). New Zealand’s “timeless” forest was considered to have far more heritage significance than more recent buildings or structures.

Nostalgia for “the indigenous remnant” continued to grow in New Zealand society during the late nineteenth and early twentieth century as early settlers reflected on their memories of New Zealand’s forests (Cullum, 1978; Star & Lochhead, 2002). For example, the well-known New Zealand politician and poet, William Pember Reeves, lamented the deforestation of New Zealand’s forests in his poem “The Passing of the Forest,” published in 1898:

The axe bites deep. The rushing fire streams bright;
Swift, beautiful and fierce it speeds for Man,
Nature’s rough-handed foeman, keen to smite
And mar the loveliness of ages. Scan
The blackened forest ruined in a night,
A sylvan Parthenon that God will plan
But builds not twice. Ah, bitter price to pay
For Man’s dominion—beauty swept away!

However, there was also some growing interest in, and concern for, Māori historical landscapes and battle sites. Such concern arose mainly from the common social Darwinian view of the time that the Māori race was going to die out. Belich (2001) writes that by the turn of the twentieth century, most Pākehā, and even some Māori, believed that the Māori people were heading for certain extinction, or at best complete assimilation into Pākehā culture. In the late 1890s Stevenson Percy Smith, an ethnologist, began to speak with regret about the way parts of the Māori historical landscape had been left to ruin and believed that preservation of the sites was the responsibility of Pākehā (Gentry, 2009). In April 1899 at the unveiling of a monument at Kaiapoi Pā in Canterbury, which was commemorating conflict between Ngai Tahu and Ngati Toa in the 1820s, Premier Richard Seddon called for the preservation and remembrance of historical sites. His speech emphasised old Pā and battle sites as worthy of protection (Gentry, 2009). His calls were taken up in an article titled ‘Preservation of Historic Sites’ from The Press (1899):

For such a young colony we are singularly rich in spots around which cluster various associations of human interest… Still we must not forget that our history is now in the making, that what is interesting, to us now will be immeasurably more so to our
descendants. Already there are many, spots which ought to be preserved, and the traditions connected with them, for the benefit of posterity.

The article suggested that New Zealand’s historical places, such as the landing places of Captain James Cook (the first European to circumnavigate New Zealand), sites of battle between Māori and Pākehā, places where the Treaty of Waitangi was signed, and where the first European pioneers arrived, should be made ‘tapu’ (sacred). The article specifically called for Premier Seddon to enact legislation similar to the Ancient Monuments Protection Act 1882 which had been passed in England.

It must be emphasised, however, that the process of preserving Māori historical landscapes was selective. In some places sites or areas were deemed to be historical, but in other places, such as island sanctuaries, people were forcibly removed so the area could be framed as “natural”.

4.2.1. Scenery Preservation Act 1903

As a result of the culmination of the transformations and attitudes detailed in the previous section, and the growing significance of cultural heritage in the late nineteenth century, the Scenery Preservation Act 1903 was passed. The Act can be seen as a breakthrough and a major milestone in the preservation of New Zealand heritage. At a time when most legislation was being passed to clear land for farming, that legislation allowed for systematic protection of areas of aesthetic, scientific, historic, iconic, and natural curiosity values on both public and private land (Nightingale & Dingwall, 2003). The growing interest in conserving historical sites is highlighted by Premier Richard Seddon who emphasised the importance of scenic and historical places in New Zealand in 1903 when introducing the Scenery Preservation Bill to parliament:

We are only in our infancy now. As time rolls on and [the] population increases greater interest will be taken in our history, and unless we preserve these spots we will be wanting in our duty not only to ourselves, but also to future generations... the time has arrived in the history of our colony when our scenery should be preserved, when the historic and beautiful places should be for all time conserved (Seddon, 1903: 704-705).

Here Seddon expressed the importance of heritage conservation for the colony, and that New Zealand’s ‘historic and beautiful places’ should not only be given just economic and utilitarian importance, but also intrinsic and priceless value. Seddon, and others also
addressing parliament, spoke with regret about why this kind of legislation was not put forward sooner (Seddon, 1903).

The Scenery Preservation Commission was appointed in March 1904 with Stephenson Percy Smith as chairman. The enthusiasm of this movement is reflected in the generous Government budget which allocated £100,000 to make land acquisition and subsequent reservations (Leach, 1991). However, many New Zealand historians now argue that although the Act was a milestone, it was, to a great extent, a failure when it came to the preservation of cultural heritage (Allen, 1998; Gentry & Nightingale, 2007; Gentry, 2009; Leach, 1991). Leach (1991) suggests it was a lost opportunity for New Zealand to become a world leader in the protection of cultural heritage. There was a great imbalance in the formation of the reserves. Between its first meeting in 1904 and its disbanding in 1906, Gentry and Nightingale (2007) calculate that the Commission lodged 14 interim reports made up of 414 recommendations for reservation, comprising nearly 365,000 acres of land. Of these recommendations, 317 (76%) were scenic sites; 75 (18%) were Māori historic sites; 12 were European historic sites (3%) and ten (2%) were thermal areas (Gentry, 2009). However, by 1906 only 61 reserves, totalling 15,000 acres, had been gazetted – although another 76,721 acres had been reserved under other legislation as a result of the commission’s work (Appendices to the Journal of the House of Representatives [AJHR] 1907 C6: 3). A huge majority of these were natural scenic sites. Although many sites of historical interest (mainly Māori Pā sites) were recommended to be acquired for reservation, the emphasis of the Scenery Preservation Commission was on large areas of scenic natural heritage with perceived tourism potential. Gentry (2009) writes that the Commission was continually undermined by the DLS who argued that the reserves would be better suited for agriculture. When the Commission was replaced with the Scenic Preservation Board in 1906 the administration for the Act was also passed over to DLS.

Large tracts of scenic land were taken under the Board, but most of this was in areas occupied by Māori. The Act in fact is now widely considered as a legislative mechanism for alienating Māori land (Gentry, 2009; Nathan, 2009). This has had long term consequences for current heritage management in New Zealand’s conservation estate: many reserves contain significant archaeological sites relating to Māori settlement, many are now subject to Treaty of Waitangi negotiations between the Crown and Māori iwi, and generations of New Zealanders have grown up and accepted the conservation estate as being naturally significant,
often unaware of the impact pre-European Māori had on the landscape, and that they only appear natural because Māori were displaced from these areas.

The focus on remnant forest and waterways meant that sites with cultural heritage value were largely ignored (Leach, 1991). While dozens of historical sites (and, again, particularly Pā sites) were suggested for reservation by the Commission, by 1920 less than ten of these sites had been reserved. However, the reservation of sites with scenic importance (but not suitable to be farmed) were growing quickly. By the beginning of the 1920s, more than 430 reserves for scenery had been established by the Board (Gentry, 2009). Although appearing to support both natural heritage (scenery) and cultural heritage (historic sites), the Scenery Preservation Act 1903 in practice privileged natural preservation. Significantly, this privileging was evident 80 years later in the management of heritage by DOC which will be discussed in detail later in this chapter, and in Chapter 7.

Very few islands were reserved, or even recommended to be reserved, under the Scenery Preservation Act 1903. As listed in the AJHR, by 1906 only six islands had been reserved under the Act. Nine other islands (often small river islands) had been recommended to be reserved under the Act in 1906. These were, however, either in ‘negotiation’, ‘held over’, ‘under consideration’, or had ‘no action’ taken, or were simply ‘not reserved.’ One reason why islands did not feature in the reserves of the Scenery Preservation Act 1903 could be that the Board was focusing on larger areas of forested land rather than on smaller pockets of land. Perhaps islands were already considered to be reserved as a consequence of their separation and distance from the mainland. Many of the islands were also under private ownership, such as those used for farming. The Board may have also focused their reservation efforts on (more visible) mainland areas before turning their attention to relatively isolated islands in later decades.

By the 1930s, the situation had changed as islands featured prominently on the list of scenic reserves. By 1934 New Zealand had around 950 scenic reserves, covering a total of 300,000 hectares (Young, 2004). These reserves included many islands such as: the bulk of Stewart Island; three small islands in the Marlborough Sounds; the Poor Knights Islands; Taranga Island off Whangarei; Raoul Island in the Kermadec Island group; the subantarctic Auckland Islands; and Karewa Island in Tauranga harbour. These islands were recognised as significant places with scenic and natural values, but at this time the cultural heritage of the islands was given little prominence.
4.2.2. Growth of interest in New Zealand's cultural heritage

By the late 1930s, natural heritage was vastly privileged over cultural heritage in terms of preservation activity in New Zealand. However, the centennial celebrations of 1940 (100 years since the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi) acted as a catalyst for cultural heritage conservation in New Zealand and brought to attention the importance of both Pākehā settler heritage and Māori heritage for New Zealand’s identity (McLean, 2000). In 1954 Sir Keith Holyoake spoke of the huge impact the 1940 centennial had on the perception of New Zealand as having a history worth preserving:

I think it was only in 1939 and 1940, when we celebrated our national centennial, and the years just prior to and succeeding that, when we celebrated provincial centennials, that many people in New Zealand for the first time became conscious of the fact that we really did have a history of our own, quite separate from the history of the Mother Country. I think all too many of us had become used to saying that New Zealand was just a young country, but the celebration brought home to us that we had at least to some extent achieved maturity… The interest that was awakened led to a greater interest in places, monuments, and sites commemorating our history (Holyoake, 1954: 553).

In addition to the growing importance attributed to cultural heritage, the admiration for the New Zealand forest was also represented in the centennial. The Minister in charge of the centennial, Bill Parry, an advocate for forest preservation, put forward a programme of commemorative tree planting and forest preservation for centennial events and activities. During 1940 thousands of native and exotic memorial trees were planted and numerous forests were reserved as centennial parks, such as the Waitakere Ranges, as Auckland Centennial Memorial Park. The protection of existing forests, the creation of memorial parks and the planting of trees directed a critical gaze on the early settlers and the transformation of New Zealand’s landscape (Ross, 2008). It seems the destruction of forests was viewed as an inevitable – yet regrettable – part of settlement. Trees, as living memorials, acted as a reminder of the past and a symbol of the contemporary attitude towards preserving natural heritage in New Zealand. There was also a practical aspect as tree planting and the protection of forests was seen to reduce soil erosion which had been caused by deforestation.

After the 1940 centennial celebrations there was a groundswell movement towards the preservation and active study of nationally important cultural heritage, such as buildings, historical sites and works. Due to accessibility and visibility reasons, such sites were given higher priorities in cities, than in other areas such as off-shore islands. In addition,
development pressures galvanised and motivated city residents to support and organise cultural heritage conservation, tending to protect and preserve buildings and structures considered grand and significant. Many organisations associated with cultural heritage were founded in the mid-twentieth century. For example, the New Zealand Geographic Board was established in 1946 to preserve historic place names, particularly Māori place names (LINZ, n.d.); the New Zealand Archaeological Association (NZAA) was established in 1955 to foster and promote archaeological research (NZHPT, 2004); the National Archives were established with an Act of Parliament in 1957 as a repository for historical documents; and local historical societies proliferated (with many being set up in restored historic buildings) as one-hundred-year anniversaries created a stimulus for interest in cultural heritage (McLean, 2000). The Town and Country Planning Act 1953 gave local government authority for some cultural heritage preservation, although this was largely reliant on the pressure exerted by local historical societies (McLean, 2000).

The most significant of the organisations established at the time was the New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT) which was created to preserve and protect heritage sites with the enactment of the Historic Places Act 1954. The Act undoubtedly has had the greatest impact on the cultural heritage movement in New Zealand. The Bill was placed before parliament by the National Party Member of Parliament Duncan Rae “to mobilise local and national interest in identifying, retaining … the various sites of buildings, institutions, battlegrounds, Maori pa, and other places of interest to Maori and Pakeha” (Rae, 1953: 722). Rae further stressed the way the New Zealand landscape had both a scenic beauty and an historical beauty: “We have a beautiful country from a physical point of view, but if we do not know the historical associations we see only half the picture. That is what lies behind this Bill” (Rae, 1953: 721). To some extent, therefore, the establishment of the Historic Places Act and the NZHPT was not only in response to the growing interest in New Zealand’s history, but also in response to the emphasis on natural heritage in New Zealand’s landscape.

The Act aimed to preserve heritage sites, specifically buildings and structures of historical importance. The NZHPT was established as an autonomous crown entity, being affiliated with the government but not a government agency. Early on the NZHPT focussed on recording and surveying historical sites, and producing publications as there were insufficient funds to acquire land for protection (McLean, 2000). Private grants were mainly used to acquire buildings or land of historical importance. However, after the restoration of the Waimate Mission House and the acquisition of the Pompallier House in the Bay of Islands in
the mid-1960s, the NZHPT was encouraged to have its own flagship properties and the Trust acquired most of its properties (either by direct purchase or by being gifted) between 1965 and 1975 (McLean, 2000). During the 1970s and 1980s the NZHPT led the research and classification of a large number of buildings predominantly in urban areas deemed to be of historical interest (McClean, 2006).

The study of New Zealand’s archaeology also began to be more organised from the mid-twentieth century, particularly focussed on the pre-European Māori period. Furey (2004) writes that archaeology in New Zealand was not practiced as a modern discipline until the arrival of Jack Golson, a Cambridge archaeology graduate in 1954. Golson was appointed at Auckland University as New Zealand’s first lecturer in archaeology (Prickett, 2004). Until the 1950s most archaeological excavations and research had been carried out by amateurs, particularly on South Island sites; however, Golson sought to rectify this imbalance and gave North Island sites more attention (Furey, 2004). During the 1950s and 1960s archaeology was weakly established with very few professionals (Walton & O’Keefe, 2004), but over the next few decades archaeological research became more established, particularly rescue archaeology (the investigation or survey of areas threatened by developments or activities). From the 1960s, archaeological research shifted from artefacts to a study of the functional relationships between sites (how sites were used together) (Allen, 1998). During the 1960s the NZAA and local archaeological associations began lobbying for the preservation and protection of archaeological sites, especially in the rapidly developing Auckland region. However, despite archaeologists knowing that the destruction of archaeological sites was increasing, early attempts to quantify the loss of sites were hampered by a lack of knowledge of what had existed (Walton & O’Keefe, 2004).

Landscapes free from development were perceived to be highly important by archaeologists because they retained archaeological sites which were being lost in urban areas. Due to rapid urbanisation on the mainland, it was the conservation estate islands which were highly regarded by archaeologists. It was no coincidence that the NZAA’s first major fieldwork (in January 1955) was located on Great Mercury Island (east of the Coromandel Peninsula, see Figure 4.1) which was considered to be undisturbed or less modified than the mainland (Prickett, 2004). The islands of the Hauraki Gulf, particularly Motutapu (as will be discussed in Chapter 7) were widely studied during the mid- to late-twentieth century.
4.3. THE MID-TWENTIETH CENTURY

From the mid-twentieth century there was a change in ecological theory as natural scientists largely abandoned the concept of ecological climax to adopt a new approach which worked with ecosystems and focussed on the complex relationships between organisms (Andrews, 2010; Griffiths, 1996; Kalamandeen & Gillson, 2007). Consequently, rather than being perceived as an obstacle to study, humans were increasingly regarded as a part of nature, along postmodern ways of thinking (Andrews, 2010).

During this time, natural heritage conservation issues became national issues in New Zealand. A strong indication of the support for New Zealand’s environment – and growing environmentalism – from the general public is the enduring and ultimately successful campaign to “Save Manapouri.” In the late 1950s, the Government produced plans to develop a hydro-electric power station at Lake Manapouri in Fiordland National Park. The creation of the power station was to involve merging Lake Manapouri and Lake Te Anau, raising Lake Manapouri by 30 metres and engulfing its forested shoreline. The campaign was a watershed for environmental awareness in New Zealand (Bain, 2008; Belich, 2001; King, 2003; Ross, 2008). The debate generated by the Save Manapouri Campaign led to changes and additions to legislation. There was an overhaul of the Water and Soil Conservation Act with an Amendment Act in 1968, and the introduction of the Marine Reserves Act 1971 and the Clean Air Act 1972.

New Zealand has often been considered a world-leader in the environmental movement of the 1970s, but whether New Zealand followed, or led, these environmentalist trends is debatable (Bührs & Bartlett, 1993). That said, however, New Zealand’s environment has been central to its national identity and tourism image and from the 1970s and 1980s onwards a widespread acknowledgement of the impact of humans on the environment and a determination to preserve what remained, became popular in the New Zealand psyche (Nathan, 2009). Certainly, in 1972, New Zealand had one of the first “green” parties in the world – the Values Party – although, because of the first-past-the-post political election system, they never actually gained a seat in parliament (Belich, 2001; Bührs & Bartlett, 1993; King, 2003). The environmental movement of the 1980s was global, heightened by concern about apparent global warming, the discovery of the ozone hole in 1985, the Chernobyl disaster in 1986, and the Exxon Valdez oil spill in 1989. The environmental group Greenpeace also became popular in the 1980s, especially after the bombing of the Rainbow Warrior in Auckland.
Harbour on 10 July 1985 by the French Secret service (the boat was just about to sail to Moruroa in French Polynesia to protest against nuclear testing of the atoll).

Running parallel to the environmental movement of the 1970s and 1980s was another upsurge in interest in New Zealand history and cultural heritage (Belich, 2001; PCE, 1996). A new generation of New Zealanders were beginning to become aware of, and appreciate, the significance of New Zealand’s historical buildings, places, and archaeology. This change in attitude was also expressed in the appreciation and acknowledgment of New Zealand’s art, ceramics, literature, and popular culture. Television series on aspects of New Zealand’s history and geography became popular, such as: The Governor (1977), a docudrama series on the life of George Grey, who was Governor of New Zealand during the middle of the nineteenth century; Landmarks (1981), a documentary series hosted by Kenneth Cumberland, (Head of Department in Geography at the University of Auckland) which examined New Zealand’s history through the landscape; and Children of Fire Mountain, a 1980s drama about relations between Māori and new settlers set in 1900. Programmes such as these brought to life New Zealand’s history and illustrated the growing interest in New Zealand’s history from the general public. New Zealanders were becoming aware that New Zealand had a significant and interesting history.

4.4. HERITAGE LEGISLATION FROM THE LATE TWENTIETH CENTURY

Since the late-1980s the protection, recognition and management of heritage in New Zealand has been shaped by three major pieces of legislation: the Conservation Act 1987, the Resource Management Act (RMA) 1991 (and its amendment in 2003) and the Historic Places Act (HPA) 1993. These pieces of legislation followed on from the increasing awareness of New Zealand’s history from the 1970s and 1980s. They were enacted by the Government to provide a more organised system of heritage management to preserve and safeguard New Zealand’s heritage. However, these pieces of legislation have largely entrenched the modern dualistic perspective in heritage management: natural heritage and cultural heritage management have been separated in legislation – and consequently practice – and have led to a context whereby natural heritage is easier to conserve than cultural heritage.

4.4.1. The Conservation Act 1987 and the Department of Conservation

The Conservation Act 1987 established the Department of Conservation (DOC) as a central government agency to promote the conservation of both New Zealand’s natural and historic
resources. DOC staff were drawn from various land management agencies: the New Zealand Forest Service, the DLS, the Wildlife Service and the archaeology section of the NZHPT (Napp, 2007). Almost eight million hectares – around 30 per cent of New Zealand’s total area – would be managed by DOC (ICOMOS, 2005). The mission statement of DOC was, and is, to ‘conserve New Zealand’s natural and historic heritage for all to enjoy now and in the future.’

Despite the mission statement and the inclusion of the archaeologists of NZHPT in the Department, DOC was launched with little direction or resources for cultural heritage conservation (Napp, 2007). As a result of this, NZHPT removed its archaeologists from DOC in 1993. Both agencies were to work collaboratively but each developed its own focus. While still responsible to the Minister of Conservation, NZHPT staff then became employees of the NZHPT. In 1998 the portfolio responsibilities for the NZHPT were transferred from the Minister of Conservation to the Minister for Culture and Heritage (Napp, 2007). Since NZHPT left DOC there has not been a strong cultural heritage presence in the Department, resulting in a bias towards natural heritage conservation. DOC has become more known as the department managing New Zealand’s natural heritage, while the NZHPT is known as a manager of New Zealand’s cultural heritage.

Since its establishment in 1987 DOC has undertaken significant amounts of work in the conservation of native species and ecosystems. From the mid-1990s DOC undertook a number of large-scale natural heritage initiatives, including site-based ecological restoration – particularly on islands – with world-leading control of pests, such as cats, rats, stoats, goats and possums (Dorfman, 2005; Napp, 2007). In 1996 funding was secured for the development of “mainland islands” as pest-free areas for endangered species. These mainland islands were based on the success of offshore island ecological restorations. Six mainland island projects were established: Boundary Stream Reserve (Hawkes Bay), Hurunui River (Canterbury), Northern Te Urewera National Park (eastern central North Island), Paengaroa Reserve (southern central North Island), Trounson Kauri Park (Northland), Rotoiti Nature Recovery Project (in Nelson Lakes National Park) (Saunders & Norton, 2001).

---

Notes:
- Currently DOC manages 14 national parks, 26 conservation parks, hundreds of reserves, and many offshore and subantarctic islands. The department operates with 44 area offices which are grouped into 11 conservancies (DOC, 2012). The department’s Head Office is in Wellington and provides national service and support functions.
DOC’s continued emphasis on natural heritage is especially highlighted in the strategic plan for 1998-2002 titled “Restoring the Dawn Chorus,” in light of the conservation of native bird species. With the new millennium, DOC continued to focus on biodiversity management. Substantial funding was given to pest-control (particularly for islands) and management of threatened species. In 2001, a $2.5 million funding boost for work with communities led to hundreds of partnerships with communities across the country (Napp, 2007).

In terms of cultural heritage (defined as “historic heritage” by DOC), DOC’s mandate is to manage and advocate conservation of historic resources. DOC is achieving this through the active management of a number of sites and producing conservation plans for important historic places on the conservation estate. Even so, anecdotal and documentary evidence suggests that DOC has strongly favoured natural heritage. In the mid-1990s there were several harsh reports and commentaries criticising DOC’s management of cultural heritage. The Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment (PCE) (1996: 35) commented that the ‘lobbying of politicians by environmental NGOs [non-government organisations] for DOC work is almost exclusively directed at increased funding for natural heritage’ and that there were ‘serious inconsistencies in the level of attention to historic and cultural heritage between conservancies.’ PCE (1996) also iterated that much higher priority in staffing and strategic planning was given to natural heritage. Allen (1998: 9) wrote that most of the thousands of historic places in the conservation estate ‘have not been identified’ and ‘receive little attention in DOC plans of management.’ It seems DOC has acknowledged its bias towards natural heritage; some DOC documents mention that most of the land administered by DOC was not inherited or acquired primarily to protect or manage its historic values and that there was therefore more of an emphasis on the natural heritage of this land (Clayworth, 2008; DOC, 1996a; 2008).

4.4.2. The Resource Management Act 1991

The second important piece of legislation from this period directing heritage management is the Resource Management Act (RMA) 1991, which was created to ensure sustainable management and use of the environment and resources for current and future generations. The intent of the Act was to produce a more streamlined, integrated and comprehensive environmental management system (MfE, 2006). Under the terms of the Act, resource management was devolved to local authorities and emphasis was placed on the assessment of environmental effects of developments rather than regulation. In the Act, five matters of
national importance were listed which were to be “recognised and provided for” by all those using the Act. Matters of national importance included:

a) The preservation of the natural character of the coastal environment (including the coastal marine area), wetlands, and lakes and rivers and their margins, and the protection of them from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development

b) The protection of outstanding natural features and landscapes from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development

c) The protection of areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna

d) The maintenance and enhancement of public access to and along the coastal marine area, lakes, and rivers

e) The relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, wāhi tapu, and other taonga [treasures]

In the original Act of 1991, natural heritage was greatly accounted for as well as Māori heritage. However, neither the terms “cultural heritage” nor “historic heritage” were included as being of “national importance.” Instead, the protection of New Zealand’s “historic heritage” was placed alongside the protection of trout and salmon habitats in the “other matters” section. Those using the Act would merely have to “give particular regard to” those in “other matters.” Consequently, local authorities had the discretion to do little or nothing in relation to cultural heritage (Allen, 1998, PCE, 1996).

In the wake of this, significant lobbying from heritage agencies pushed for cultural heritage to be included in the Act (such as Allen, 1998; Carrie, 2002; NZBR, 1998; PCE, 1996). These reports were harsh, emphasising the increasing significance attributed to New Zealand’s buildings and archaeological sites and the growing wish to acknowledge these more effectively in the conservation estate and in New Zealand more generally. Woodward (1996) called for cultural heritage to be given the same weighting as natural heritage by decision makers. As a result of this lobbying, the RMA 1991 was amended in 2003. The Resource Management Amendment Act 2003 added the term “historic heritage” under the section of national importance, specifically 6 (f). Local authorities must now, in carrying

---

10 Historic heritage is defined in the RMA as:

(a) those natural and physical resources that contribute to an understanding and appreciation of New Zealand’s history and cultures, deriving from any of the following qualities:

(i) archaeological:
(ii) architectural:
(iii) cultural:
(iv) historic:
(v) scientific:
(vi) technological; and
(b) includes—
out their functions under the RMA, in relation to managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources, recognise and provide for matters of national importance which are: the protection of historic heritage and outstanding natural features and landscapes from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development; and the relationship of Māori to their sites, wāhi tapu and taonga (NZHPT, 2004). The inclusion of historic heritage in the RMA demonstrates the increase in support for cultural heritage in the New Zealand psyche during this time as well as the power of a small group of lobbyists.

4.4.3. The Historic Places Act 1993

The third significant Act introduced in the late twentieth century was the Historic Places Act (HPA) 1993, replacing the Historic Places Act 1954. The HPA 1993 was established to promote the identification, protection, preservation and conservation of the historical and cultural heritage of New Zealand. The NZHPT is charged by the HPA to undertake these aims (MfE, 2006). Under the HPA all archaeological sites are protected whether or not they are officially recorded. Any development that may damage, modify or destroy an archaeological site, must first obtain an authority from the NZHPT.

This move further strengthened the division in how heritage is managed in New Zealand as NZHPT was the central agency charged with cultural heritage management, while DOC was the only government organisation mandated to manage natural heritage (Stephenson, 2005). Consequently, an attitude within DOC was generated which placed more effort on the conservation of New Zealand’s wildlife as there was no other governmental entity with the same biodiversity responsibilities.

Under the terms of the RMA and the HPA, heritage assessments were required to identify values, remedy and mitigate the effects of a development or activity, and to produce conservation management plans. As a result, in the late 1980s the private consultancy heritage industry in New Zealand grew, with a number of new private professional consultancy groups becoming established such as Salmond Architects (now Salmond Reed Architects) in 1988 (SRA, n.d.), and Clough & Associates Ltd in 1995 (Clough & Associates, n.d.). Also, in 1987 the International Council on Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS) New

(i) historic sites, structures, places, and areas; and
(ii) archaeological sites; and
(iii) sites of significance to Māori, including wāhi tapu; and
(iv) surroundings associated with the natural and physical resources.

An archaeological site is defined in the HPA 1993 as a site associated with human activity before 1900 which may be able to provide significant evidence relating to the history of New Zealand.
Zealand was established for the support and advancement of the conservation of places of cultural heritage value in New Zealand (ICOMOS NZ, n.d.). In 1993 the ICOMOS New Zealand Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Heritage Value was published and has been widely used by local and national agencies for conservation plans and heritage studies (ICOMOS NZ, 1993).

4.4.4. Conclusion

It is in this context that the ecological restoration of islands in the Hauraki Gulf is placed. From the 1990s the emphasis in DOC on natural heritage conservation has meant New Zealand is leading the way in natural heritage programmes and activities, such as pest eradication, but has also meant less of an emphasis on cultural heritage management of the conservation estate. In addition, the perceived naturalness of New Zealand has become a central part of New Zealand’s identity and something which is showcased to the world (Kirby, 1996). The “clean and green” and “100% Pure” image heavily relies on the natural appearance of landscapes in New Zealand (Bell, 1996; Peart, 2004).

The modern dualistic perspective of the nineteenth century which guided the establishment of the conservation estate and island reserves persists to the present day. As Park (2003: 71) points out, the ideas of humans outside of nature and the ‘admirer-from-a-distance’ mentality continue to affect the way New Zealanders view the conservation estate. Traces of people in natural areas, the conservation estate in particular, are generally considered as regrettable (Kirby, 1996).

4.5. ISLAND ECOLOGICAL RESTORATIONS AND HERITAGE MANAGEMENT

From the 1980s, at the same time as the legislation discussed above was enacted, ecological restoration of offshore islands in New Zealand proliferated. There are four main reasons for this proliferation: the environmental movement which had become established since the 1970s; the growing number of scientific studies on New Zealand’s native flora and fauna; changes in technology which enabled islands (even large islands) to undergo ecological restoration; and, as detailed earlier, the establishment of DOC and its bias towards natural heritage.

First, from the 1970s the environment movement encouraged concern for the conservation of natural heritage and the improvement of the state of the environment. The idea of nature as
something to be protected from humans was behind the philosophy of this movement. Ecological restoration was a way for humans to actively engage in the conservation of nature (Eden, Tunstall & Tapsell, 1999). Griffiths (1996) writes that, although stemming from earlier environmental movements, the movement of the 1980s distinguished itself by advocating the removal of later layers of history in order to restore an earlier “ideal” time. Human history in natural areas was seen in a negative light.

Second, and related to this view, scientists in the late twentieth century highlighted the significance of offshore islands as containing significant biological wealth and even a ‘direct view of pre-human nature’ (Daugherty et al., 1990: 18). New Zealand’s offshore islands were especially attractive for ecological restoration due to the high endemism of the biota and the suitability of islands as safe refuges for many species (Bellingham et al., 2010). Alongside this, a growing body of literature from the late twentieth century presented environmental histories of New Zealand, highlighting the detrimental impact humans had had on New Zealand’s forests, wetlands and bird life (e.g. Arnold, 1994; Crosby, 1986; Flannery, 1994; McKinnon, 1997; Park & Potton, 1995). The affirmation of these impacts meant there was a growing public demand to preserve and enhance the native ecosystems on islands (Towns & Ballantine, 1993) and a condemnation of colonial actions.

Third, concern about the natural environment coincided with advances in technology which allowed environmental managers to “right the wrongs of the past,” highlighted by the environmental historians and scientists and environmentalists of the last few decades of the twentieth century. Technology, for example, the wide-scale aerial dropping of poison, enabled the removal of pest mammals on large islands (which was previously impossible), such as the eradication of possums and wallabies on Rangitoto and Motutapu in the 1990s. Threatened species could be trans-located to and from islands (Bellingham et al., 2010; DOC, n.d.d). This technological ability has enabled a shift in philosophy from preservation and protection of natural heritage to the active management of flora, and particularly fauna, through the restoration and enhancement of island ecosystems. As Towns, Atkinson and Daugherty (1990) stress, no other area can offer the same opportunities for conservation than islands.

Fourth, the establishment and natural heritage bias of DOC also influenced the proliferation of island ecological restoration projects. As highlighted in the previous section, DOC actively established and managed ecological restorations and the natural conservation of offshore
islands (Bellingham et al., 2010). Indeed, New Zealand is considered to be at the cutting edge of island restoration projects internationally. Bellingham et al. (2010) writes that DOC actively experimented and tested new eradication technology, such as the helicopter bait spread system.

During the 1980s, 1990s and 2000s there were numerous translocations of threatened native bird species, such as saddleback, takahe, and kakapo to island sanctuaries as well as the eradication of exotic mammalian pests from islands, such as cats, goats, rats, mice, and possums (Bellingham et al., 2010). Also during this period there was an increase in research on, and greater recognition of, the qualities of New Zealand’s native flora and fauna (Bellingham et al., 2010; Young, 2004). The ability to understand and monitor endangered species and the decline of mainland species has only been a feature of the last thirty years or so.

As a result of these four factors, efforts to restore the native natural environment, such as by ecologically restoring an island, have become common. Ecological restoration is the process of assisting or accelerating the recovery of an ecosystem which had previously been altered by human interference (Jackson, Lopoukhine & Hillyard, 1995). The notion of ‘ecological purity’ has become central to such actions (Lowenthal, 1997: 238). The ideal of a restoration is to “return” the landscape to its “pure” and “original” (pre-human) conditions (Eden, Tunstall & Tapsell, 1999). However, returning a landscape to its “pure” or “original” state means that remnants and relics from human activity are seen as being “bad”, a “blot”, or a ‘disturbing stain of “progress”’ (Lowenthal, 1997: 236). Consequently, the preservation and protection of cultural heritage are often considered to be in opposition to ecological restorations. As explained in Chapter 3, ecological restorations can be seen as embodying modern dualistic perspectives. These kinds of activities have been emulated around the Western world, particularly in the USA. In this regard, Fraser (2009) writes about how people of the Western world are currently refashioning themselves as restorers who attempt to recover and rectify past wrongs. Without these island conservation projects, Edwards (1997: 39) writes that ‘New Zealand’s conservation future would be looking very bleak.’ New Zealand’s islands are indeed central to the survival and protection of threatened native flora and fauna (Pryde & Cocklin, 1998; Towns, Atkinson & Daugherty, 1990).

The most notable and famous island ecological restoration in New Zealand is that of Tiritiri Matangi Island in the Hauraki Gulf (Rimmer, 2004). By the 1980s, 94% of the 220 hectare
island, located 30 kilometres northeast of central Auckland, had been stripped of its native bush and planted in pasture as a result of 600 years of Māori settlement and a 120-year history of Pākehā farming. In 1981 a draft working plan was prepared by the DLS to revegetate the island to provide habitat for rare and endangered species of New Zealand fauna (DLS, 1981). A final form of the working plan was prepared in 1982 (DLS, 1982). In these plans, archaeological sites relating to Māori settlement were cited and described (based on a survey made in 1981) and it was recommended that an archaeologist be consulted before any planting was carried out. However, no formal conservation plan dealing with the management of archaeological sites on the island was made. Between 1984 and 1994 hundreds of volunteers, particularly from Auckland’s North Shore suburbs, planted between 250,000 and 300,000 native trees on the island. The trees were propagated from the island’s own seedstock and from local surrounding areas. Over half of the island is now planted with native vegetation and the remaining 40% has been retained as grassland, a suitable habitat for pukeko and takahe (STM, n.d.). Many endangered bird species have been (re)introduced to the island including brown teal, red-crowned kakariki parakeet, saddleback, takahe, whitehead, little spotted kiwi, stitchbird, and kakapo (Pryde & Cocklin, 1998).

The planting of trees and the (re)introduction of birds to Tiritiri Matangi was the focus, and archaeological sites were not given the same attention. It was not until 2008 that a heritage assessment was carried out (Dodd, 2008c). In it, Dodd (2008c) explains that a formal heritage conservation plan would have been to the benefit of the management of archaeology as it would have provided an opportunity for input from Ngai Paoa and Kawerau (the local iwi) and the NZHPT. Dodd explains that while many archaeological sites were excluded from planting, because of the proximity of the planting to the sites, they are now subject to encroachment by woody plant species, requiring regular inspections in the present day.

Since the success of the revegetation and (re)introduction of native fauna to Tiritiri Matangi, ecological restorations have gained widespread public support and have enjoyed significant political traction with copy-cat programmes throughout New Zealand. Concerns about the island’s cultural heritage were either ignored or not considered significant. This backing and popularity for ecological restoration has largely brought about the formation of numerous community groups (trusts), in partnership with DOC, which have the primary goal to

---

12 Like in other island ecological restorations, it is often unclear what particular wildlife species were originally on the island. Thus, some species supposedly re introduced to these islands may in fact be introductions (Bade, 2010).
ecologically restore landscapes. There are several examples in the Hauraki Gulf (Bade, 2008), such as: Pohutukawa Trust New Zealand, formed 1992 (for Kawau Island); Motutapu Restoration Trust, formed 1994; Motuora Restoration Society Incorporated, formed 1995; Little Barrier Island (Hauturu) Supporters’ Trust, formed 1997; Motuihe Trust, formed 2000; Motu Kaikoura Trust, formed 2004; Great Barrier Island Charitable Trust, formed 2005; and Rotoroa Island Trust (formed 2012) (refer to Figure 1.1).

These community trusts and the activities undertaken by the volunteers of these trusts illustrate and confirm how the idea of valuing natural heritage as something to be preserved and restored has become entrenched in the New Zealand psyche. Tree-planting has become a recreation activity for New Zealanders. Catching a ferry to an island, spending a morning planting trees or removing exotic weeds (while also keeping a lookout for exotic mammalian pests) followed by a barbeque before returning to the city is becoming an increasingly popular weekend activity. However, on most, if not all, of these islands, there have been issues regarding tree-planting and the retention of archaeological sites or other cultural heritage. Like the examples detailed in Chapter 3, in ecological restoration contexts, archaeological sites or remnant structures can be ignored as those managing or undertaking tree-planting may be unaware or not care about these features, or feel they are insignificant compared to the establishment of native habitats for endangered wildlife.

Currently DOC manages over 70 island ecological restorations in New Zealand (DOC, n.d.). Although there is a long history of appreciation of New Zealand’s indigenous natural heritage, the major change in mentality from the late 1980s has been the idea of converting (restoring) good and valuable pastoral land to its perceived original pre-human state (Bade, 2010). This idea stands in complete contrast to earlier times when only land unable to be used for profitable farming was preserved for its natural heritage values. Likewise, one can only imagine what the early Pākehā settlers would have thought while seeing trees being planted on farmland which they had worked so hard to clear. There has been a transformation in mindset towards nature. Nature, once powerful, despised and something to be controlled is now threatened, treasured, and something to be protected (Duncan & Duncan, 2001; Lowenthal, 1997; 2010).
4.6. CONCLUSION

Five main themes drawn from this chapter permeate through the rest of the thesis. The dominant idea is that aspects of cultural heritage (or human activities which are detrimental to natural heritage) do not belong or are not significant enough to be in a place of nature. This idea stems from the entrenched duality in the management of heritage in New Zealand. Areas of land, particularly islands, have been reserved as, considered as, or even restored to “natural” places, despite these lands having a history of human association and activity.

First, islands – both as physical places and the concept of an island – have been, and are, considered to be central to the safeguarding of New Zealand’s natural heritage. Because of their apparent isolation and separateness, many offshore islands have retained remnants of native forest or animal species which were formerly on, or are threatened on, mainland New Zealand. As a result, many islands have been reserved as nature sanctuaries and are considered as natural and pristine, or at least more natural or pristine than the mainland, despite the historical use of the islands by Māori and Europeans. The isolation and separateness of islands also makes them ideal places for ecological restoration which aim to convert the land back to its “original” state (before the arrival of humans) as pest species can be eradicated from and kept off islands.

Second, natural heritage has become a significant part of New Zealand’s identity and there is a sense of regret about New Zealand’s environmental past: a wish to right the wrongs of the past by creating nature reserves or ecologically restoring islands. The ‘fashion for restoration’ (Griffiths, 1991: 93) demonstrates the connection and feeling of attachment between people and the natural landscapes of New Zealand. By caring for nature, through planting native trees and removing exotic weeds, people can maintain or develop respect and concern for the environment (Clewell & Aronson, 2006; Gardener, 2009). The ethos of environmentalism is widespread both in New Zealand and around the world. Environmental-thinking and the sustainability movement have also become very important in New Zealand business and social development.

Third, New Zealand’s history has often been considered as “young” and insignificant compared to New Zealand’s “ancient” natural heritage and the grand cultural heritage from other parts of the world (Belich, 2001; Sinclair, 1979). Consequently, there is, and has been, a clear dominance of natural heritage over cultural heritage in the conservation estate – and this dominance is even more accentuated on islands considered natural (as sanctuaries) or
becoming natural (through ecological restoration). The cultural heritage found on these islands (such as archaeological sites or old farming houses), such as Tiritiri Matangi Island, have often been considered as not worthy of preservation or protection compared to the negation of the drastic decreases in native species in New Zealand. In these contexts, natural heritage is something to be treasured and cultural heritage is often seen as a blot on the landscape.

Fourth, in the last two decades or so there have been a strong movement to give cultural heritage more prominence in legislation and management, such as the Conservation Act 1987, HPA 1993 and the RMA Amendment 2003. Despite there being strong tendencies to regard islands as significant purely for their natural heritage, over the past two decades efforts have been made to highlight the importance of the cultural heritage of New Zealand’s offshore islands.

Fifth, this chapter has shown that the nature/culture dualism is embedded in New Zealand society, heritage legislation and heritage management organisational structures. The management of heritage is split into natural and cultural heritage. The NZHPT focuses on cultural heritage, while DOC focuses primarily on natural heritage programmes. It is also significant that both the pieces of legislation which attempted to manage both natural heritage and cultural heritage in New Zealand together – the Scenery Preservation Act 1903 and the Conservation Act 1987 – resulted in organisations and actions which were biased towards natural heritage conservation.

These five points collectively illustrate the societal and institutional biases influencing the current state of heritage management in New Zealand. The status of cultural heritage as the “poor cousin” to natural heritage is a major current issue concerning heritage practitioners, especially in the conservation estate (McClean & Greig, 2007; Peart, 2004; Swaffield, 2003). According to the MfE (2004: 175) there is a ‘higher priority given to natural heritage in terms of finance, staffing and strategic planning’ by the government. ICOMOS (2000) point out that much of New Zealand’s Māori and early settler heritage may be found within “natural” areas, but, in these areas, there is an ‘implicit assumption that natural heritage values take precedence over cultural heritage’ which results in a lack of understanding of cultural heritage values, damage or destruction of cultural heritage through the maintenance or enhancement of natural heritage.
This general issue in New Zealand is particularly seen with the heritage management of New Zealand’s islands. As illustrated in this chapter, islands have a long history of being considered “natural”. More recently, islands have also been considered as “becoming natural” through ecological restorations. The two case studies used in this thesis examine this issue in both of these contexts: Rangitoto – an island reserve since 1890 – considered to be “natural”, and Motutapu – an island undergoing ecological restoration since the 1990s – considered as “becoming natural”. These case studies will be examined in turn in the next two chapters.
CHAPTER 5.

Rangitoto Island

Around 550 years ago Rangitoto emerged from the sea in a major volcanic eruption.\(^\text{13}\) The substantial volcanic figure of the island now dominates the skyline of Auckland harbour (Figure 5.1). It is Auckland’s youngest – and largest – volcano. From any angle the island retains its distinct symmetrical appearance. Viewed from above it is roughly circular (five kilometres in diameter with an area of 2311 hectares) (Figure 5.2) with a mesh of dark green vegetation and patches of loose brown-red volcanic rock. Viewed at a distance from Auckland, the volcanic cone rises gently and evenly above the water of the Hauraki Gulf to reach a peak 259 metres above sea level (Figure 5.3). From the summit there are wide and expansive views of the Hauraki Gulf and towards the Auckland isthmus. Despite being only seven kilometres, or 20 minutes by ferry, from downtown Auckland, from the summit the island seems a world away from urban life. The vast surrounding area of greenness elicits a feeling of being amongst nature. From a distance, the welcoming greenness, uniformity and naturalness not only disguise the rugged physical landscape of the island, but also its history of human utilisation and association.

![Image](image_url)

**Figure 5.1 Rangitoto as viewed from Auckland (photo: Natalia Tellechea, 2010).**

\(^{13}\) Needham et al. (2010) claim that following initial volcanic activity around 600 years ago Rangitoto emerged from the sea with a Strombolian magmatic eruption approximately 550 years ago (c. 1460 AD). Between 40 to 60 years after this major eruption a second eruptive phase, which was shorter than the first, built the current summit scoria cone. The times for the two eruptions are given as 553 ± 7 Cal yr BP and 504 ± 5 Cal yr BP respectively.
Figure 5.2 Aerial map of Rangitoto Island (DOC, n.d.b).

Figure 5.3 View of Rangitoto Island from the Auckland Domain (2011).
The perception of the island as a place of nature has dominated Rangitoto’s history since European arrival and the natural values of the island have been held in high regard. The island’s vegetation – growing in what seems like an inhospitable landscape – has greatly interested natural scientists, particularly botanists (Wilcox, 2007). Rangitoto is considered an outstanding example of forest succession and the colonisation of new land by plants for the first time (Auckland Star, 1934; Jamieson, 2004; Julian, 1992). The nineteenth century naturalist, Thomas Kirk, took an interest in the island’s unique ecology: ‘[t]he volcanic island of Rangitoto, which forms so prominent a feature in the scenery of the Hauraki Gulf, possesses greater interest to the botanist than any other island in the group’ (Kirk, 1879, quoted in Wilcox, 2007: 21). As it is such an accessible island, natural scientists from New Zealand and around the world have visited and studied Rangitoto, including, in the first half of the twentieth century, New Zealand botanists Leonard Cockayne and Lucy Cranwell; English botanist Sir Arthur Hill; New Zealand plant morphologist John E. Holloway; and the Dutch botanist Dr Johannes Paulus Lotsy (Wilcox, 2007; Woolnough, 1984). This interest in the natural heritage of Rangitoto is expressed well by George Farrant (1999: 14), who is now the Principal Heritage Advisor for the Auckland Council:

[Rangitoto is] an ecological set-piece of great educational and research value, as young hybrid pohutukawa forest colonises the lava from scratch, with precious humus derived mainly from leaf-litter, supporting tiny green islets of vegetation, which slowly coalesce into forest.

Due to this interest in the native flora and fauna of the island, there has been considerable concern from botanists and members of the public about the impact of human activities on the island, namely the construction of permanent buildings and structures; the introduction of exotic species of plants and animals, such as the spread of self-seeded pines which out-compete native vegetation; and the threat of mammalian pests, such as wallabies, possums, wild deer, wild cats, stoats and weasels, which directly and indirectly decimate native bird species. This concern has been apparent since the late nineteenth century.

In a study on the contingent valuation (an economic technique used for valuing non-market resources) of the environment of Rangitoto, Vadnjal and O’Connor (1994) presented their interviews by integrating transcripts (in italics) into condensed paragraphs conveying the attitudes and feelings of respondents towards Rangitoto. These responses, despite being

---

14 A questionnaire consisting of 246 respondents who were residents in the East Auckland suburb of St Heliers Bay were used in this study (Vadnjal & O’Connor, 1994).
over 15 years old, clearly highlight the dominant perceptions of Rangitoto among the general public in the present day:

Rangitoto is an island in the gulf, green, unspoilt. It is natural, untouched, in its primitive state; and it should stay that way. Visually, it makes the harbour so much nicer, the way the blue of the sea leads on to the green of the bush. Yeah, there is something about it; something beautiful that’s part of nature (Vadnjal & O’Connor, 1994: 373).

When respondents were asked about whether there should be any major residential development on the island they responded that they:

like the clean green look: a little bit of nature and not clouded with houses and buildings and lights and all that sort of thing. It’s really quite beautiful in its unspoiled state. And, we’ve got to have some green sanctuaries to go to, where you can look out on nature, untainted, there for everybody to enjoy. Rangitoto makes a contrast to the urban clutter... Rangitoto is something too precious. It is a part of the gulf, that should be vested forever in people who will come. It’s something to be looked after carefully, handed down... There would be something sacrilegious in putting houses on it, like defacing a monument. Houses on it would absolutely ruin it, clutter it up with busyness and civilisation (Vadnjal & O’Connor, 1994: 374-375).

As these perceptions illustrate, and as stated by others (such as Ell, 1980; Jamieson, 2004; Robinson, 2008), for many, Rangitoto is a place of natural splendour and wilderness. This chapter will introduce and outline the history of the island, examine the natural perception of the island over time and identify how cultural heritage has been and is being managed on the “natural” island.

There are various types of cultural heritage on Rangitoto, such as Māori burial caves, old quarries, tracks, shipwrecks, a small park with exotic plants, and structures from World War II. However, this chapter will primarily focus on the historical baches (basic holiday homes) of Rangitoto. These features have been the source of significant dispute, and offer insights into both tension and resolution in the management of cultural heritage in a “natural” protected area. The baches issue has been described as ‘[a conflict] between the independent heritage riches of ecological versus built environments’ (Farrant, 1999: 14), a ‘conflict of natural versus cultural landscape’ (Treadwell, 1997: 2) and a ‘tension between the conservation of natural heritage and human heritage’ (NZHPT, 1997a, 1997b, 1997c). Farrant (1999: 16) stated that the outcome of the baches issue would be a ‘barometer of the state of balance between the conservation of New Zealand’s natural versus man-made heritage estates.’
5.1. MĀORI ASSOCIATIONS WITH RANGITOTO

The name given to the new volcanic island by local Māori was “Rangitoto” and is often thought to mean the “Island of the Bloody Skies”, representing the active volcano colouring the night sky blood-red (Ell, 1980). The name of the island could have referred to the actual eruption of the volcano, however, the traditional phrase behind the name is “Te Rangi itotonga a Tamatekapua” (the day the blood of Tamatekapua was shed) (Jamieson, 2004). According to Māori folklore, Tamatekapua was chief of the Arawa waka (canoe) which was engaged in (and lost) a major battle with Tainui at Islington Bay on Rangitoto (DOC, n.d.a; Phillips-Gibson, 2006; Yoffe, 2000). According to the legend, Tamatekapua bled so much from his wounds that he stained the rocks of Rangitoto red (Phillips-Gibson, 2006).

The use of Rangitoto by Māori is not entirely clear. According to Murdoch (1991), Rangitoto was not generally occupied by Māori because of its barren rock landscape and because the island had been made tapu (sacred, and therefore off-limits) due to the battle in which Tamatekapua was gravely wounded. However, it is known that the island was used as a hunting ground for the native kaka parrot, numerous lava caves were used as burial sites, and the summit was used as a lookout point (DOC, n.d.a; Yoffe, 2000). Many of the iwi of Auckland retain spiritual, customary, and ancestral connections to Rangitoto (Ngati Tamaoho, 2012; OTS, 2012). The Ngai Tai iwi claim to have occupied, in unbroken succession, the neighbouring island of Motutapu since the fourteenth century and Rangitoto since it erupted (Murdoch, 1991). From the late eighteenth century to the arrival of Europeans, Ngai Tai allowed another iwi, Ngati Paoa, to occupy Motutapu, Rangitoto and Motuihe islands when on fishing expeditions. In return Ngati Paoa allowed Ngai Tai to occupy Waiheke Island at times. During the Musket Wars in the early 1820s, led by Ngapuhi, a Northland-based iwi which expanded southwards, those inhabiting Motutapu fled south to the Waikato area. The Ngai Tai and Ngati Paoa inhabitants returned in 1836 after reciprocal attacks were made on Ngapuhi in lower Northland. However, their life on Motutapu and Rangitoto had been severely disrupted by the Ngapuhi raids and the arrival of Europeans in the area (Murdoch, 1991). As will be seen in this chapter, Māori iwi have had little involvement in the management of heritage on Rangitoto. Rangitoto is one of four islands in the Hauraki Gulf which are part of a Treaty of Waitangi settlement claim between the iwi of Auckland and the Crown (the New Zealand Government). This Treaty settlement will result in more participation from Auckland iwi and a ‘chance to rekindle and restore ancient relationships between people and place to build the mauri [life force] of nature, to exercise
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manawhenua [power from the land] and kaitiakitanga [guardianship of a place’] (Ngati Tamaoho, 2012).

5.2. EUROPEAN ENTERPRISES

As European settlement in Auckland increased in the mid-nineteenth century there was pressure from Europeans on Māori to sell the islands in the Hauraki Gulf to be used for economic enterprises, particularly farming. There were a number of sales of Rangitoto to Europeans (which were later deemed to be invalid) in the 1840s (Murdoch, 1991). On 17 January 1854 the Auckland Provincial Government officially purchased the island from Ngai Tai for £15 (Ell, 1980).

Because Rangitoto was unsuitable for farming, there were a variety of innovative enterprises on Rangitoto in the late nineteenth century. In 1892 a licence was granted to John Stubbs to operate a salt works industry at McKenzies Bay for £5 a year (Yoffe, 2000). Shallow holding ponds for sea water were constructed and the evaporation of the water left salt to be bagged and sold. The venture failed, however, due to a lack of suitable labour and a drop in the price of salt (NSTA, 1975). Today all that remains are some of the rock walls of the salt pond. Another (somewhat unusual) enterprise failure was the attempt to harvest Fijian land crabs as a culinary delicacy, but a combination of factors, including a lack of sand for burrowing, contributed to its failure (NSTA, 1975; Yoffe, 2000). More success was found with beekeeping. From the 1920s Mr H. V. Handley kept bees on Rangitoto and in the 1960s his son took over the licence (Cottrell, 1984). The Waitemata Honey Company also leased sites on Rangitoto and Motutapu Island for beehives (Cottrell, 1984). Much success was also found with quarrying scoria from the island, which occurred from 1898 to 1930 (HGMP, 1983). The Government Quarry Reserves managed all the quarrying on the island apart from sixty acres at Islington Bay which was managed by the Auckland Harbour Board (Woolnough, 1984). Large quantities of Rangitoto rock were used for harbour works, tramways and drainage, and in the construction of two churches (St Matthews and St Pauls) in Auckland (Woolnough, 1984). A small community was established close to the quarry at Islington Bay. About fifty families lived at the bay. There was also a small school with up to twenty children present at any one time (Woolnough, 1984). Quarrying gradually became unprofitable and ceased in 1930. In 1955 the Government made tentative plans to renew quarrying on the island, but this was received with much opposition by the public, illustrating the way Rangitoto was seen as a place where nature should be and no-longer valued as an
economic resource for industrial enterprises. For example, the Akarana Māori Association stated in a letter to the editor of an Auckland newspaper: ‘[w]e consider it should be the aim of the future to endeavour to preserve this island so far as it is possible as a sanctuary for native flora and bird life. The granting of quarry rights in the past has led to lamentable destruction of natural beauty’ (unreferenced quote from Woolnough, 1984: 19). Quarrying on the island was ceased (Figure 5.4).

Figure 5.4 The former quarry close to Islington Bay (2011).

Rangitoto was also used for the disposal of obsolete ships from the late nineteenth century to the middle of the twentieth century. Due to rapid changes in technology, ships quickly became outdated. In order to dispose of them in a quick and uncomplicated fashion, ships were driven ashore at locations out of sight from Auckland City to rust or rot away (ARC, n.d.). The normal procedure was for the ships to be stripped of their masts, boilers and machinery and filled with inflammable rubbish. The ships were then grounded on the shore, covered with kerosene and ignited (Figure 5.5) (Cottrell, 1984). Wreck Bay and Boulder Bay, on the northeast coast of Rangitoto (Figure 5.2), are graveyards for at least thirteen ships dumped on the island between 1887 and 1947 (ARC, n.d.). There are a few relics of the shipwrecks on the foreshore (Figure 5.6; 5.7).
Figure 5.5 The remains of the Dartford wreck on Rangitoto at Wreck Bay (Motutapu is in the background) (RIHCT, n.d.). It was beached on Rangitoto on 25 July 1946 (ARC, n.d.). Its remains have not been positively identified.

Figure 5.6 Wreck Bay as it is today (2012). The photo is taken from roughly the same angle as Figure 5.5. Pieces of old metal and wood are scattered around the bay. The remains from the steamer Ngapuhi are seen in the centre (close up in Figure 5.7).
5.3. RANGITOTO’S POPULARITY

During the late nineteenth century Rangitoto increasingly became a popular recreation destination for picnickers and day-trippers. Some even braved the unstable and rugged scoria slopes to reach the summit before any paths were made. For example, in May 1879, after 75 minutes of walking, a group of seven reached the summit with ‘bleeding hands and bruised bones and very nearly shoeless feet’ (Woolnough, 1984: 8). As a result of the island’s popularity as a recreation destination, in mid-1890 the island was scheduled as a Recreation Reserve under the Public Reserves Act 1881 (Cottrell, 1984; Woolnough, 1984). As pointed out in Chapter 4, this designation as a reserve is significant in that it was very early for New Zealand. The island was valued as a place of nature to be enjoyed by the public. The island was governed by the Corporation of the Borough of Devonport and administered by the Rangitoto Island Domain Board (RIDB) (Yoffe, 2000). During weekends many Aucklanders would sail across the harbour from Auckland or Devonport (in the North Shore) to Rangitoto and it soon became apparent that more recreational infrastructure, such as a wharf and
walking tracks, were required (Woolnough, 1984). During the 1890s funds were raised to construct a wharf and create a track to the summit: the Auckland Harbour Board granted £100 and provided building material, the Government granted £130, the Devonport Ferry Company transported the material free of charge and donated £100, and the public showed their enthusiasm for using the island for recreation by raising £90 (Woolnough, 1984). The wharf and summit track on the island were completed and the track was officially opened on 3 November 1897 before a crowd of 250 (Ell, 1980).

Being so close to, and accessible from, Auckland, Rangitoto was an ideal spot for holiday-makers. There was pressure from visitors to have overnight stays on the island and for there to be more visitor facilities. To maintain and develop recreation infrastructure on the island more money was required by the RIDB. Consequently the RIDB allowed camp sites to be leased, enabling temporary structures to be erected for overnight stays at certain locations on the island. The first site leases were issued in 1911 with William Pooley appointed caretaker (Yoffe, 1994). This decision by the RIDB seemed innocuous enough, but created unprecedented and significant legal and social issues in the coming decades. Despite being illegal under the Public Reserves and Domains Act 1908 this development was encouraged as it provided a source of income to fund recreational facilities for the increasingly popular island. The bach lease holders also acted as guardians of the island by helping prevent vandalism and fires which would destroy plant life (Woolnough, 1984). The first structures to appear were tents, constructed out of packing cases or canvas. However, from 1918 tents were not allowed to be established as they did not have adequate sanitary conditions. From then on only permanent building sites with adequate sanitation were approved (Yoffe, 1994). Through the 1920s the early baches evolved into more substantial timber buildings (Treadwell, 1994).

During the late 1920s and early 1930s baches, or “shacks” as they were known at the time, were built at three locations on the island: Rangitoto Wharf, Islington Bay and Beacon End (Figure 5.8). The baches were constructed in orthodox and unorthodox fashions – often driftwood and the wood from the shipwrecks on Boulder and Wreck Bay were used to construct the baches (Collins & Kearns, 2006).
These three bach settlements generated vibrant summer-time communities (Yoffe, 1994). Themes of co-operation, friendship and fellowship are evident throughout the stories of the bach settlement communities as families fished, worked, played, cooked, and celebrated events together (Yoffe, 1994; 2003). Susan Yoffe\(^{15}\) (interview 14/4/2010), a founding member of RIHCT with an unparalleled knowledge of the history of the baches, describes the fond memories held by those of the bach communities:

> “There were community functions like fancy dress parties, Father Christmases, swimming sports, dingy races… The holiday time is always a special time in anybody’s life. There is no work. There is no school. The father is home… Family times… and you met up with friends who you hadn’t seen since last summer.”

Rangitoto became increasingly popular for recreation during the 1920s and 1930s. In 1925 the Devonport Ferry Company transported 16,080 passengers to and from Rangitoto for daytrips and overnight stays (Woolnough, 1984).

From the late 1920s to the mid-1930s, labourers from Mount Eden prison were employed to construct recreational infrastructure (Yoffe, 2009). Three hundred and forty short-term prisoners worked on the island over seven years (Woolnough, 1984). At any one time a group of approximately fourteen men of good prison conduct and with short-term sentences were employed. The men lived on the island in a rock-walled camp under the supervision of a

---

\(^{15}\) Susan Yoffe passed away suddenly on 13 November 2012.
warden. Their camp was located near the McKenzie Bay Road entrance to the present Kidney Fern Glen, in close proximity to the wharf (Figure 5.2). Some remnants of their camp remain today (Figure 5.9).

Figure 5.9 Remains of the rock-walled camp where the prison labourers lived (2009). Susan Yoffe, who was leading the guided tour, is facing the camera on the right.

The prisoners were paid through revenue derived from campsite rentals and ferry landing taxes. By May 1927 the southern coastal road was four kilometres long and by the end of 1930 the road to the summit was complete. The work had cost the RIDB £2,785 but it was estimated the work was worth £25,000 in terms of normal labour (Yoffe, 2009). By the time the prisoners were withdrawn from the island in 1934 the tidal swimming pool (Figure 5.10), the changing rooms, the archway to the men’s toilets (Figure 5.11), the reef across the bay at Rangitoto Wharf, the tennis courts (Figure 5.12) and pavilion at Islington Bay, and all the coastal walks around the island had been constructed (Yoffe, 2009). Most of these structures and tracks are still present and are in use today.
Figure 5.10 The tidal swimming pool as it appears today (2012). It fills with water as the tide comes in.

Figure 5.11 The archway to the former men’s toilets (2012).
5.4. VOICES OF CONCERN ABOUT THE BACHES

As early as 1921 the Commissioner for Crown Lands wrote to the Under-Secretary of Lands to point out that the site leases were an illegal breach of the Public Reserves and Domains Act 1908 and suggested the Devonport Borough Council be advised of this breach and remove the leases (Yoffe, 2000). However, the leases were not removed. It appears the revenue gained from the leases outweighed any benefits of enforcing the Public Reserves and Domains Act. During the 1920s the central government turned a blind eye to the bach developments on the island. However, in the next decade, the DLS and other authorities ceased turning a blind eye and started to take the line that private leases on public land were illegal. Even so, as Treadwell (1997: 1) eloquently describes, the original decision to allow the construction of baches was ‘a window’ which had been ‘left open long enough to allow seeds of a settlement to drift through and establish themselves along the shoreline of the island.’

During this time advocates for the conservation of the island’s natural heritage found voice. Their concerns were part of the growing national sentiment towards revering the natural (native) heritage of New Zealand, outlined in Chapter 4. Conservationists and members of the
public began to heavily criticise the administration of the island. One of the most active and forthright advocates of this kind was the Auckland botanist Lucy Cranwell who began her career at the Auckland Institute and Museum as the inaugural Botany Curator in 1929 and became an internationally-renowned botanist and palynologist (Cameron, 2000). In December 1931 Lucy Cranwell delivered a public address on the value of Rangitoto to botanists and of the negative consequences of settlement (the construction of baches) on the island. Yoffe (1994: 42) writes that Lucy Cranwell’s name is ‘still remembered with acrimony by the bach-holders.’ Bach owners, however, insisted that they should be allowed to stay as they saw themselves as caretakers of the island and they believed they contributed to the visitor facilities that benefited other members of the public as well as themselves (Yoffe, 2003). Lucy Cranwell was not the only voice arguing for the protection of nature on Rangitoto. Also during this time, Woolnough (1984) writes that Sir Arthur Hill, Director of Kew Gardens, insisted that Rangitoto remain a nature sanctuary and condemned the introduction of exotic plants to the island by bach owners.

A conflict was emerging between those who wanted Rangitoto not to be “disturbed” by non-native species (including humans) on the one hand, and bach owners who wished to stay overnight on the island and make parts of the island their own with the building of structures and the establishment of gardens. It appears that there was a general anxiety from the public that Rangitoto would lose its distinctive natural charm and become more and more like the developing city of Auckland.

A newspaper report from 12 December 1931 makes a strong critique of the destruction of nature by humans in general and particularly on Rangitoto (Auckland Star, 1931). The article emphasised both the peculiar value and the scenic splendour of the vegetation on the island, while also criticising the construction of settlement (baches) on the island:

> It might have been expected, then, that the people of this city, and those whom their public interests are entrusted, would cherish with infinite care this priceless asset, and would defend it tenaciously against all enemies or dangers that may threaten to encroach upon it. The people of Auckland themselves can say how far removed is this from reality (Auckland Star, 1931).

Despite the wide-scale destruction of native forest in New Zealand in the past, the article argues that the example on Rangitoto shows explicitly that New Zealanders have not learnt their lesson of conserving natural areas (Auckland Star, 1931):

> For if they really profited by those bitter experiences they would never have allowed the hand of the spoiler to be laid ever so lightly upon Rangitoto. They would have prevented its shore from being desecrated by “shacks” and “baches”; they would have
declined to allow exotic trees and shrubs to be introduced to strangle and destroy the native vegetation; they would have indignantly refused to permit the construction of a motor road which must sooner or later in that loose soil, where it is denuded of vegetation, cause landslips that, in course of time, may overwhelm the islands marvellously interesting and beautiful flora, and obliterate its most characteristic features for ever.

Strongly evident is the view of Rangitoto being a place of “nature” – a place to be protected from “the hand of the spoiler” (human activity). As explained in Chapter 4, this was a relatively recent view. In the 1800s and into the 1900s humans and their activities were rarely seen in this negative way. Humans were out to tame and control nature through activities such as clearing the forest for pasture. Despite the island having had extractive endeavours such as quarrying and being a place for recreation, Rangitoto was still considered by many as its distant appearance suggested: a green natural island wilderness. The intrinsic value of nature was emphasised as something which deserves unreserved respect and something which adds value, vibrancy and uniqueness to society:

> Without a proper reverence for the beauty of Nature, unalloyed and undefiled, without a keen and vivid appreciation of the value of the artistic and the picturesque aspects of existence, there can be no true civilisation; and without them, Auckland, though populous and wealthy, will be, like all other cities and peoples that have concentrated their hopes and energies simply on the material side of life, stagnant and soulless and dead (Auckland Star, 1931).

During the 1930s there were significant shifts towards the conservation of nature on Rangitoto. In 1932 the RIDB made attempts to eliminate exotic plants, shrubs and trees from the island. During the decade relief workers were used to clear the island of noxious weeds (Cottrell, 1984). On 27 March 1935 a delegation from the Auckland Institute and Museum, comprising of Mr Johnstone, Miss Cranwell and Mr Pyecroft, spoke to the RIDB on the preservation of Rangitoto’s vegetation (Auckland Star, 1935a). The delegation sought the preservation of the island’s botanical characteristics. They expressed concern at the growth of settlement on the island (the baches), the construction of roads, the threat of fire, and the degradation made by imported opossums, wallabies and deer. They wished to co-operate with the RIDB on any steps that would prevent Rangitoto from ‘losing its natural charms’ (Auckland Star, 1935a). Cranwell suggested there be sectors designated in which baches could be built, with a road acting as a fire break. She also suggested a policy of destroying exotic fauna which had been introduced to the island (Auckland Star, 1935a).
On 6 April 1935 an article in the *Auckland Star* criticised the management of Rangitoto, advocating the preservation of its natural values in order to change the way the island was being ‘transformed from something to admire into something of which we all be ashamed’ (Auckland Star, 1935c). The bach residents and the introduction of exotic plants and animals were underlined as the causes for the deterioration of the natural values of the island. The fundamental mistake, according to the article, was to allow any residence at all, apart from those who would act as caretakers. The article argued that the scenic beauty and the scientific interest in the island made the case for the preservation of Rangitoto ‘overwhelming.’ Exotic plants on the island were ‘not only out of place’ but were also intruders which ‘threaten the supremacy of native flora.’ Bach residents’ exotic gardens’ seeds were being ‘scattered far and wide’ and the article suggested ‘alien animals’ should be ‘exterminated, and every effort made to prevent their return’ (Auckland Star, 1935c). The article concluded with a statement that if Aucklanders and New Zealanders continued to commit the ‘deadly sin’ of ‘indifference to the unique beauty and interest of the New Zealand landscape’ on Rangitoto, then ‘[w]e shall have inherited a magnificent estate and squandered it ignobly’ (Auckland Star, 1935c). The article emphasised that Rangitoto was a warning of what could happen to other such places: ‘unnecessary destruction of bush and birds, erection of ugly buildings in beautiful places, plastering the landscape with advertisements, tasteless mingling of exotic and native’ (Auckland Star, 1935c). The article does write that the public attitude towards the preservation of forest and animal life was changing, but in a very slow way; and warned that ‘[u]nless it [the positive attitude towards nature preservation] moves more quickly, this country is going to be wounded with still more terrible and perhaps ineradicable scars.’ It called for public conscience to assert itself with Rangitoto being a test case (Auckland Star, 1935c). For, ‘[i]f this island is spoiled, what hope is there for other places?’

Four days after the article was published, a letter to the editor defended the case of the bach owners (Auckland Star, 1935d). It stated that the bach residents have the ‘best interests of Rangitoto at heart, quite as much as any society, botanical or other, otherwise they would not be there.’ The letter stated that exotic animals on the island were ‘introduced by some zoologically-minded people, just as some botanically-minded people want to destroy them.’ To some extent this letter implicitly argued that although baches, residents, exotic animals and plants were “introduced,” it did not meant that they did not belong there or did not have some kind of value. The letter suggested that the island should not be purely considered as “untouched nature” but should be considered as a place which is to be enjoyed by everyone.
(including bach owners) and everything (including exotic plants and animals). This letter prompted an editor’s note which stated that the Auckland Star did not wish to suggest public be kept off the island but that any settlement should be prohibited. The editor finished by stating: ‘[s]urely there are enough islands and mainland bays in the gulf without sacrificing this unique area’ (Auckland Star, 1935d).

A day after the first letter to the editor, a second was published (written by a person with the pseudonym “Settler”), along the same lines as the original article published five days earlier (Auckland Star, 1935e). This letter emphasised the drastic environmental and scenic change on Rangitoto over a forty year period. In 1895 the “Settler” visited Rangitoto for the first time and was able to experience ‘Nature undisturbed, unadorned by the hand of man.’ Forty years later in January 1935 the “Settler” visited again to find a ‘great attempt at modernisation with motor roads, unfinished tennis lawns and fancy buildings’ (Auckland Star, 1935e). The “Settler” believed that the island ‘should have been left in its natural state, otherwise we are destroying a valuable national asset known all over the world’ (Auckland Star, 1935e). This letter illustrated the growing public attitude towards the conservation of natural values. The letter drew on nostalgia towards the past environment of Rangitoto and promoted the notion that human interference in places of nature was negative.

In March 1935 the RIDB stated that it was their duty not only to preserve the island as a ‘botanical wonder ground’, but also to make it as attractive as possible to all ‘lovers of Nature’ (Auckland Star, 1935b). In other words the RIDB wanted to both preserve the natural values of the island and let people enjoy the natural values, but not allow the island to be settled and commercialised. On 4 May 1935 the Waitemata County Council passed a resolution expressing their serious concern for the natural values of Rangitoto:

this gem of the Waitemata, instead of being conserved in its natural state, is being – in a measure – commercialised. This Council considers that in the public interests steps should be taken immediately by the public of Auckland to ensure that Rangitoto Island should be retained in its natural state for the public for all time (Woolnough, 1984: 56-57).

A similar resolution was also passed by the Auckland City Council (ACC) in June 1935 (Woolnough, 1984).
5.5. THE RANGITOTO BACHES ISSUE

In April 1937, as a result of the concerns raised by members of the public and conservationists towards the negative impacts of the baches on the island’s natural values and the illegality of the baches, the first Labour Government decided that no new bach leases were to be issued and that existing leases were to expire after 20 years (Woolnough, 1984: 58). The following were declared:

a) No portion of the Island was to be set aside for residential purposes
b) No further permits were to be issued for new dwellings or for additions to or alterations to existing dwellings
c) Present dwelling owners to be given 20 years notice to evacuate and remove their buildings from the island
d) No sale or transfer of existing premises to be permitted but buildings could be sold for immediate removal

These strict guidelines meant bach owners were limited in their ability to modify or develop the bach structures therefore “freezing” the structures in their 1937-state (Brassey, 1993; Treadwell, 1994).

The bach owners believed they had been treated harshly. In a newspaper article from 15 April 1937, this decision was put down to the ‘Work of Botanists’: a ‘certain section of the public [botanists] has been allowed its wishes and the general public [interested in recreation] has been ignored’ (Auckland Star, 1937). In another article a day later, entitled “Owners Protest”, opposition to the government’s decision was voiced: ‘[a]pparently the Government does not realise the enormous amount of time and work that owners of baches have put into improving the island… Foliage and trees have been protected, people have been prevented from poaching oysters and outbreaks of fire have been extinguished’ (NZH, 1937).

5.5.1. The World War II interlude

The onset of World War II altered the perceptions and dialogue about Rangitoto. New Zealand entered the war when Britain declared war on Nazi Germany in September 1939. As with other islands in the Hauraki Gulf, extensive World War II defence installations were constructed on Rangitoto (DOC, n.d.a; Jamieson, 2004; Veart, 2007; Wilcox, 2007). Because the military structures were part of the war effort, it appears there was no concern expressed over the impact of defence installations on the natural values of the island or resentment from
bach owners over not being able to access their baches. No members of the public were able to arrive on the island during the war.

In 1938 Royal Engineer officer Col. Forster recommended that a fire command post, wireless room and fortress observation post be located on the summit of Rangitoto and they were built later that year (Figure 5.13) (Veart, 2007). The elevated position and commanding views from the summit meant that Rangitoto was the ideal location for these operations. In November 1940 a twelve pound artillery battery emplacement was built to defend the entrance to the Motukorea Channel and was test fired in July 1941 (Veart, 2007). From April 1942 to May 1943 a substantial controlled mine base was built at Islington Bay, providing the navy with a storage and servicing area for naval mines (Figure 5.14). The buildings included a main mine depot, a mine store, two magazines for mines and primer charger, examination rooms for overhauling mines, two cable tanks and accommodation. The total floor area for all the buildings was 660 square metres (Lawlor, 1994). Along with this development, a landing, called Yankee Wharf, was constructed. Later in the war, in 1945, a RDF (radar) station was built on the summit. Also during this period, a causeway connecting Rangitoto with Motutapu, was built over the small and narrow channel between the two islands. The causeway was made of stone and scoria, being 141 meters long with a short bridge to let the tide run through (MRT, n.d.). From this time onwards the two islands would technically be one island, but would nevertheless remain distinctive.

Figure 5.13 The remains of the observation post on the summit of Rangitoto (2012).
Most of these military installations are still visible, if only the foundations. The remnants of the controlled mine base (Figure 5.14) allow one to realise the enormity of the structure and the ‘extent to which New Zealand was prepared to go to defend the nation’s major port in that this was carried out on an inhospitable volcanic island where all construction was difficult’ (Veart, 2007: 6).

5.5.2. The baches post-World War II

By the 1950s a change in thinking regarding the baches had occurred. In the lead up to the 1957 deadline the President of the Auckland Botanical Society, Dr L. H. Millener, spoke out in favour of the bach owners, claiming that they acted as guardians for the vegetation and had helped threatened plant life by preventing fires and removing pines. This was ironic given that during the 1930s, natural scientists had argued against the existence of baches. He contended that although a legal error was made, this ‘ensured the safety of the larger part of the vegetation over the last half a century’ (Woolnough, 1984: 64). The bach owners also argued that they should be viewed as guardians of Rangitoto and therefore should be allowed to stay on the island (Whelan, 2009). Because of these protests and the fact that the bach owners had been excluded from using their baches during World War II, the first National Government did not take such a hard-line on the bach owners. In 1956 the Reserve and Domains Act 1953 was amended with the addition of section 27(4) to allow the bach owners
on Rangitoto to stay. Until then no-one was allowed to live on a public reserve. Dave Bayley (interview, 19/5/2010), who has worked at DOC since its establishment in 1987, stated:

“the Minister of Land was so successfully convinced by the bach people that he got Parliament to amend the Reserves and Domains Act and allowed them to stay through that little provision.”

In December 1956 the Government informed the bach owners that leases would be granted for the lifetime of people who were in occupation on 1 April 1955. Ninety-five leases were issued at this time and renewed every 33 years (Yoffe, 1994). In a few cases bach owners shrewdly placed the lessee title in the name of a minor in the family, thereby allowing a longer lease.

As bach owners died and the lessees expired many of the baches fell into disrepair and were often vandalised. The RIDB was disestablished in 1968 and management of the island was taken over by the Hauraki Gulf Maritime Park Board, managed by the DLS. During this time the management of the island was focused on recreation and the preservation of its flora and fauna (Julian, 1992; Wilcox, 2007). The island was seen to be a “natural place” to be experienced by day-trippers, and, according to Dave Bayley (interview, 19/5/2010) “Lands and Survey [DLS] were really trying to get Rangitoto back to its natural state” – a state that could not be achieved if it contained baches, gardens or boatsheds (Treadwell, 2005). Once a bach came into Crown (Government) ownership it would be demolished, with the plan to remove all traces of baches from the Rangitoto landscape (Whelan, 2009). As a consequence of this policy, over fifty of the baches were demolished during the 1970s and 1980s: ‘dozens of cherished family heirlooms and historic examples of Kiwi ingenuity were literally torched to the rock’ (Graham, 2008: 35). Graeme Campbell (interview, 22/7/2010), the former Auckland Conservator for DOC (1989-1995), outlined the situation:

“the standard practice of the park board was that when the lessee died you had a ritual burning of the bach and these had become a great occasion for celebration and all of the park board staff assembled for ‘firefighting purposes’ and had a great party and celebration.”

Interviewees also commented that the pastel colour (e.g. pink and light yellow) of the baches irritated people during this time who wanted the island to appear green and natural.

In 1980 Rangitoto was re-designated from a Recreation Reserve to a Scenic Reserve. This reclassification further emphasised scenic natural features and values as opposed to the human and cultural heritage of the island. A Recreation Reserve implies a bach-friendly
environment whereas a Scenic Reserve implies an area that people look at rather than stay at. At this stage the historical significance of the cultural heritage of the island, and especially the baches, was scarcely recognised. As explained in Chapter 4, although there was growing awareness of New Zealand’s cultural heritage, New Zealand’s history was generally seen to be young and insignificant. If buildings were treasured as heritage, they were typically nineteenth century grand buildings.

From the 1980s there were signs of change in perception of the baches, not just as holiday homes, but also as heritage. In a short book on Rangitoto, Woolnough (1984) brought to attention the historical significance of the holiday bach community on Rangitoto and questioned the management of the island. By employing the policy of removing the baches once the lease expired, Woolnough (1984: 68) wrote that ‘we commendably preserve our flora and fauna,’ yet by doing so we also ‘destroy our human history by stamping out all signs of habitation.’ Woolnough (1984: 68) stated that rightly or wrongly people have lived on Rangitoto for almost eighty years and questioned whether we should ‘try to pretend that they never existed?’

Such a change in approach coincides with broader changes in society. Building codes and building consents (relating to safety) became stricter from the 1960s, such that home-built baches (and communities generated from these baches) became less common throughout New Zealand. Baches were instead being replaced with grander holiday homes in subdivisions. Graeme Murdoch (interview, 10/9/2010), the former Director of Heritage at the ARC and former staff member of DOC, explained that the baches

“started to become a part of being kiwi… So they became a kiwi icon and as they started to disappear we realised that the only enclaves of kiwi baches were those left largely on public land.”

The Rangitoto baches were becoming important as being a component of New Zealand’s cultural history and identity.

A report by DOC archaeologist John Coster in 1988 on the demolition of the Rangitoto baches stated that the DLS bach strategy resulted in ‘neither quaint reminders of a past era nor pleasing vistas of undisturbed natural beauty’ as the demolitions left ‘unsightly areas of smashed concrete, piles of burnt rusting iron and scattered broken glass on the sites of many of the baches’ (Coster, 1988: 38). The removal of the baches from the island to a great extent
made the island seem less “natural” due to the remnant rubbish left over. There is still evidence of these ‘unsightly areas’ close to bach sites on Rangitoto today (Figure 5.15; 5.16).

Figure 5.15 The remains of a water tank and bach close to a bach site at Islington Bay (2011).

Figure 5.16 More remains of a bach on a bach site at Islington Bay (2011).
5.5.3. DOC management of the baches

When DOC was established in 1987, it took over the management of the island. By this time only 33 baches of the original 140 leases issued in 1957 remained (Treadwell, 1994). In 1990, in line with the bach terms of agreement, DOC renewed the remaining leases for a further 33 years or for the life of the bach owners. During the next two decades successive Ministers of Lands and Conservation refused to consider extending the leases for which the lessee had died. However, during this time ‘strenuous advocacy for the baches’ from organisations and individuals went into convincing DOC and the wider public that the baches were worthy of heritage protection and therefore should be retained (Farrant, 1999: 14).

In 1991, in response to the growing acknowledgement of the baches as being of heritage importance, a moratorium was placed on bach removal by DOC to allow historical and architectural assessments of the baches to be carried out (Macready, 2003a). In 1993 Jeremy Treadwell, a conservation architect, was commissioned to carry out a historical assessment of the baches, community hall and boatsheds (Treadwell, 1994). Because the baches were in private lease, only an exterior inspection was possible. The report noted that the baches were largely unaltered from their 1920s and 1930s form which included gable roofs, the roof ridges generally being oriented to be parallel with the shoreline and the largest wall openings being directed towards the water (Treadwell, 1994). It was these characteristics which Treadwell (1994) believed distinguished the Rangitoto baches from the collective diversity of other New Zealand baches. He stated that the baches formed an important part of New Zealand’s social history which has not been long recognised. The baches and the associated buildings and structures, such as the tennis pavilion at Islington Bay were ‘an expression of the sense of permanence and confidence felt by the bach owners about their community’ and were the product of an ‘unusual relationship between a local authority and a private recreational interest group operating within a nationally designated reserve’ (Treadwell, 1994: 53). Overall, Treadwell’s report concluded that the baches, boatsheds and other structures associated with the bach community had considerable architectural and historical importance at a local and national level. Collectively the baches were deemed to be significant and 18 were identified as being individually significant. The report recommended that all the baches and associated structures be preserved in accordance to governing legislation.
Also in 1993, Robert Brassey, of the DOC historic heritage group, made clear in an internal DOC statement that he wanted to ensure the baches were left intact and the sites not ‘returned to their natural state’. He was, however, happy with the removal of all above ground (rubbish) materials (such as concrete, rusting iron and broken glass) and any invasive plants (Brassey, 1993). In 1994 Susan Yoffe submitted her Masters thesis which examined the social life of the three bach communities (Yoffe, 1994). The thesis is to this day the most significant piece of work detailing the history of the bach communities. It has been widely cited and Yoffe herself became a significant spokesperson for the preservation of the baches from the 1990s onwards.

In December 1994 Brassey prepared a draft “Issues and Options” paper on the Rangitoto bach settlements. The paper was distributed around the Department for comments and discussion. In the document the significance of the baches was described as well as the numerous issues relating to the restoration or destruction of the baches. Like Treadwell (1994), Brassey (1994) also wrote that the baches were significant because they were representative of the New Zealand bach tradition: a way of life now rapidly being lost through the establishment of holiday resorts and the more rigorous enforcement of building codes and property rights. He explained that because there had always been uncertainty about the bach leases, not much effort went into modifying the structures and as a result, the baches retained their 1930s form; they were “frozen in time”. Brassey (1994) stated that the baches, together with the extensive network of community facilities, were a tangible expression of an under-appreciated aspect of New Zealand’s social history. Consequently, they were collectively significant, and he re-emphasised the Treadwell (1994) recommendation that they all be preserved and no one individual bach should be preserved and others demolished.

However, the difficulty faced by DOC was to achieve a balance between recognising this historical and social significance of the baches and upholding the principles of the Reserves Act 1977 (which deny private ownership on public land). Brassey (1994) noted that the baches which had been passed to DOC had deteriorated and had been vandalised. He also stated that the ‘inflexible’ Reserves Act 1977 classification system created ‘difficulties in administering reserves with dual natural/cultural values’ (Brassey, 1994: 2). The Reserves Act 1977 identifies one primary value (such as natural values), with other secondary values (such as cultural heritage values) allowed to be conserved so long as they did not interfere with the primary value. A major point emphasised by bach supporters during the 1990s was
that a Scenic Reserve in the Reserves Act 1977 did allow for the protection of historical features on the Reserve. As a possible alternative Brassey (1994) suggested that a part or parts of Rangitoto be reclassified as a Historic Reserve. This would mean that leases and licences could be issued for residential domestic purposes under Section 58A (1) of the Reserves Act 1977. Brassey (1994: 3) described this as being a ‘simple and inexpensive process’ but something that would need to be publically notified and ‘might attract opposition from nature conservation groups.’ Sarah Macready (interview, 27/5/2010), who was an historic heritage employee of DOC from 1989 to 2007, commented on this Historic Reserve proposal:

“I didn’t think it was going to be acceptable so there wasn’t much point in wasting time with it… You are running up against the fact that it is an island and it is an entire ecological area in itself and I just saw that as a more divisive suggestion. I couldn’t see that one working.”

Dave Bayley (interview, 19/5/2010) was an advocate for part of Rangitoto becoming a Historic Reserve. He suggested that the Historic Reserve could be managed by an organisation other than DOC, such as a community trust. In a Historic Reserve, custodians can live in historic buildings for private accommodation. It is likely DOC was against the idea as they were wary of losing control, especially on such an ecologically significant island.

Three main issues connected to political/public opinion were noted by Brassey (1994) which illustrate the perception of the baches by DOC and the general public at the time. The first was a general acceptance by the public that the Rangitoto baches were worthy of preservation due to their historical and architectural value. There had been a ‘surprisingly low level’ of response to the draft Conservation Management Strategy (CMS), and general lack of negative response to media publicity over the reversal of the demolition policy. However, Brassey (1994) noted that DOC remained vulnerable to public criticism over the justification for its policy of halting the demolition of baches as the policy was essentially based on the recommendations of just one conservation architect, Treadwell (1994). He suggested that it would be wise to broaden the basis for this policy through mechanisms such as the NZHPT Historic Places Register. The second issue concerned the descendants of former leaseholders. Having been denied the opportunity to continue using their family baches on Rangitoto, in some cases in spite of extensive lobbying to Ministers of Parliament, Brassey (1994) noted that it was very likely that they would react negatively if they found any inconsistency or unfairness in policy which had been in place since the 1930s. DOC therefore had a duty to stay firm on bach lease agreements to be fair to earlier bach owners who had reluctantly
passed over their baches to DOC in accordance with the law. The third issue was that nature conservation groups which advocate the (re)creation of a natural landscape on Rangitoto may oppose moves to acknowledge the heritage status of the baches (Brassey, 1994).

Practical issues were also noted by Brassey (1994). For example, with baches being vacated and with no permanent DOC staff on the island there was a high threat of malicious damage including vandalism, illegal entry and theft. He remarked that baches which continued to be used by bach owners were also highly vulnerable to inappropriate modification which would greatly diminish the heritage significance of the baches, however well-intentioned they may be (Brassey, 1994). In addition, he warned that any maintenance of baches and boatsheds would be an enormous task as they were generally in a poor physical state. The cost of repairing the baches was a significant issue for DOC, as Ewen Cameron (interview, 11/6/2010), an ecologist, and former member of the Auckland Conservation Board, recalls:

“The back of my mind there was that you didn’t want DOC to end up with a huge on-going restoration bill of these baches [as we were told that] they were built of secondary timber and driftwood and it was no easy job keeping the baches … If they were going to be saved it was going to be payment of continuous dollars to keep them there.”

Treadwell’s (1994) and Brassey’s (1994) reports illustrate the general change in attitude towards the baches from the 1990s. Baches were not being constructed to “blot” the natural landscape, but had already been present in the landscape for over 65 years. Despite having originally been illegal, the growth of the community spirit of the bach owners and the formal historical and architectural assessment of the baches and associated structures signified that the baches had become cultural heritage worthy of protection and preservation. However, as alluded to in Brassey’s (1994) third issue above, this attitude at the time was not held by everyone, particularly natural heritage managers.

In 1995 the Auckland DOC CMS was established and two objectives from the strategy related to the Rangitoto baches:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rangitoto Island Key Area 18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18.2.3 Identify, record and conserve places of historic or cultural heritage significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.2.4 Protect in public ownership representative examples of the Rangitoto baches</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although places of cultural heritage significance were to be conserved in the CMS, the following objective stated that the Rangitoto baches should be conserved by way of representative samples in public ownership. Thus in the CMS the outcome and resolution of the baches issue had therefore seemingly been decided, with a few baches being left as samples and the rest being removed. However, this contradicted Treadwell’s (1994) report and Brassey’s (1994) draft report which concluded that all the baches and associated structures be retained due to their historical significance. A representative sample was seen as a compromise. But it was one which meant neither side was fully satisfied: those promoting the heritage value of the baches would be angered by the destruction of baches, while those supporting their demolition would not be happy about their retention.

During the time the CMS was established, other aspects of Rangitoto’s history were also being officially recognised as significant: the Rangitoto shipwrecks were designated as regionally significant heritage to be protected by the Auckland Regional Council (ARC) and DOC (ARC, n.d.; DOC, 1996b); the tracks and structures produced by the prison-labourers were recognised as historically significant (Macready, 2003b; NZHPT, 1997a); and the World War II military installations were considered to be of ‘high historical significance,’ representing a complex network relating to World War II (Veart, 2007: 5).

In 1996 the baches debate escalated. Increasingly, heritage managers and bach community members felt that the DOC policy to remove baches was unreasonable and was a way to selectively remove culture from a “natural” island. On 23 May 1996 the Minister of Conservation, Nick Smith, advised DOC that he was comfortable on lifting the moratorium for the removal of unoccupied baches. He did suggest, however, that a small number of baches (three or four) could be retained as house museums (Treadwell, 1998). The announcement of the lifting of the moratorium generated much antagonism. Elizabeth Andrew (interview, 8/6/2010), a member of RIHCT, spoke of the groundswell from the bach owners and cultural heritage advocates at the time the moratorium was lifted:

“it was felt that Nick Smith was really overreacting to something and that there were better solutions out there and that’s what we [RIHCT] went out to find… We did everything we could and in the end we put a proposal together to the Minister who sort of backed off.”

In July 1996 the conservation architect, Jeremy Salmond, told the Auckland Conservation Board that ‘if the department was so keen to remove the human influence from Rangitoto in favour of the natural environment then structures such as the roads built by convicts as well
as other developments on the island ought to be removed’ (English, 1997). On 3 December 1996 a letter to the editor from bach-owner Lois Allan, published in the *North Shore Times Advertiser*, emphasised the significance of the baches and called for them all to be retained: ‘[b]eing on public land provides an opportunity to ensure their protection which would not be possible on private land’ as it is free from redevelopment (Allan, 1996). She wrote that they were a ‘part of the New Zealand heritage and should never be lost’ (Allan, 1996). Treadwell (1997: 2) remarked that this decision to end the moratorium created a ‘remarkable situation’ whereby DOC was ‘not merely neglecting its duty’ but was also ‘acting in direct opposition to one of its core responsibilities [that of protecting cultural heritage].’

On 23 January 1997 an issues and options paper opposing the removal of baches was prepared by the Auckland DOC Conservancy, with opinions from NZHPT, ARC, conservation architects, bach owners and others opposed to lifting the moratorium, and given to Nick Smith, the Minister of Conservation (Macready, 2003a). In March 1997 the ARC gave unanimous support towards the preservation of the remaining baches (NZH, 1997). A month later the three bach settlements were registered on the NZHPT Historic Places Register as historic areas (including the baches and associated structures) by Wayne Nelson, Gavin McLean and Chris Orsman in which the historical, physical and cultural significance of the baches was outlined (NZHPT, 1997a, 1997b, 1997c). On 19 April Brian Patchett (1997) of the NZHPT wrote a letter to the *New Zealand Herald* which described the Rangitoto baches as a ‘national asset’ belonging to all New Zealanders. He also emphasised that structures associated with the baches, including the community hall, paths, stone archway, swimming pool and stone walls and seats, also have considerable historic and cultural value, as important to New Zealand’s heritage as grand buildings.

The concern about the protection of the baches from bach owners or other members of the public culminated in the establishment of the Rangitoto Island Historic Conservation Trust (RIHCT) in July 1997. Its mission statement was to ‘conserve and interpret the historic Bach Communities on Rangitoto Island for the benefit of all New Zealanders’ (RIHCT, n.d.). RIHCT was established to raise awareness of the historical significance of the baches in order to help retain and protect the baches from demolition. The objectives of RIHCT are to research and interpret the baches and bach communities by collecting, archiving and making accessible historical records of the baches and bach communities, and also promote awareness of the natural environment of the island (RIHCT, n.d.).
With the establishment of RIHCT, the Conservation Minister, Nick Smith, revised his position. He stated that if RIHCT was successful in obtaining funding for the conservation of some of the baches, and provided the structures are made accessible for public use, it might be possible to consider the retention of more baches rather than three or four as was originally suggested (Macready, 2003a).

In 1999 Auckland City Council (ACC) completed a historic significance assessment of the baches to determine how many could be retained. The majority of the baches were rated “B” in significance, meriting inclusion criteria into the District Plan, which would accord legal protection to the baches (Macready, 2003a). By 1999 there was significant support from the ACC, NZHPT, Civic Trust and the ARC for the retention of the baches (Farrant, 1999). On 11 May 2000 a meeting was held with members of RIHCT, ACC, NZHPT, and DOC to prioritise baches for preservation; aiming to establish a list of ten high priority baches based on assessments by DOC and ACC. It was agreed that the baches for which leases had expired would not be demolished as a matter of course, but would be closed to the public until either the condition of the structure required removal or they were conserved. By the end of the following month a joint significance assessment from DOC, ACC and NZHPT categorised the baches into three ratings: 13 were given an “A” rating (individual baches of particular significance), 9 a “B” (significant baches, retention of which is important to preserve a group’s significance or representativeness), and 15 a “C” (baches which may be significant but are in poor condition and/or not essential to preserving group significance or representativeness) (Macready, 2003a).

A new Labour Government was elected in 1999, and the new Minister of Conservation, Sandra Lee, further updated DOC’s position. The Department supported the aims of RIHCT and the idea to retain a representative sample of the baches for the public to visit or use. Lee understood that it could take a few years before any baches could be restored and made available for public use. Because of this Lee said that DOC would consider a management arrangement whereby the families of deceased bach owners could continue to use and maintain the baches for a defined period of time at the end of which baches must be vacated. By 2000 only around ten life tenants and their families remained. The families applied to have the leases renewed but this was not granted (Whelan, 2009). As a compromise, on 1 June 2001 the families of bach owners were offered three year caretaker status, which Sandra Lee had been in support of. This meant that the baches would not deteriorate once the leases
were ended, thus buying time for heritage assessments and the raising of funds for restoration.

In October 2003 the wealth management company, AMP, announced major sponsorship for the restoration of three baches between 2003 and 2005 consisting of $60,000 per year. AMP (headed by Richard Gordon) had approached DOC in search of a suitable project to sponsor. They were after a marketing campaign based in Auckland which had enough community interest and they felt that the images and stories of the baches (relating to New Zealand’s holiday tradition) were suitable for their sponsorship. The sponsorship was brokered by the New Zealand National Parks and Conservation Foundation under Jocelyn Watkin (Elizabeth Andrew pers. com.). RIHCT set about using the sponsorship money for restoring one bach per year.

However, in 2004, once the three year caretaker period was over, the baches issue again came to a head. On 6 August DOC gave notice to the caretakers that their leases had expired, and that they would have to vacate their baches by 31 October (Macready, 2003a). At the RIHCT Annual General Meeting that year this decision was announced. Elizabeth Andrew recalls that the mood of the meeting quickly changed from a celebration of the sponsorship deal to one of shock. Bach owners were not willing to give up the dwellings which their families had enjoyed for decades – in some cases over 70 years. However, DOC argued that it was time for the bach owners to give up their leases as they had enjoyed several decades on the island, despite the dwellings originally having been built illegally and their occupation being in opposition to the Reserves Act 1977 governing the island. The bach families applied to have their caretaker licences renewed, but when the Minister of Conservation, now Chris Carter, rejected these applications, many of the bach owner families banded together to form the Rangitoto Island Bach Community Association (RIBCA) (RIBCA, n.d.). This association was established separate to RIHCT but there was some overlap in members. The main objective of RIBCA was to retain all the baches for private use by the bach owners and to seek judicial review of the Minister’s decision to refuse their applications (Whelan, 2009).

The difference between RIBCA and RIHCT is highlighted by Stephen Penk (interview, 17/4/2010), chairman of the Executive Committee of RIBCA:

“RIBCA is quite a different body all together. Essentially it is the community of people associated with the 35 baches that remain on the island who want to retain all of them. So there is a distinct difference in objectives between RIBCA and RIHCT. [RIHCT] is concerned only with the historic nature of the baches rather than the preservation of the community. RIBCA is concerned with the preservation of the
baches community, or such of it that remains, associated with the 35 baches that still
remain standing.”

In declining the renewal of caretaking leases, the Minister of Conservation, Chris Carter,
acknowledged the historic significance of the baches on Rangitoto and fully supported plans
to conserve a representative sample, provided public uses could be found for them. Macready
(2003a) commented that DOC intended to close and secure the vacated baches until either
they could be conserved, subject to funding and acceptable usage being found, or until their
condition deteriorated to the point where they would have to be demolished – demolition by
neglect.

In 2006 the baches issue was taken to the High Court in the case of Rangitoto Island Bach
Community Association Inc v Director-General of Conservation (2006; henceforth RIBC).
The hearing was held on 20th and 21st February 2006. In bringing proceedings for judicial
review, RIBCA argued that DOC’s decision to decline their applications for renewal was not
valid because the Minister had failed to take into account the Hauraki Gulf Marine Park Act
(HGMPA) 2000, namely sections 7 and 8, which include the term “community” (Table 5.1).

Table 5.1 Sections 7 and 8 of the Hauraki Gulf Marine Park Act 2000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hauraki Gulf Marine Park Act 2000 (emphasis added):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 7 - Recognition of national significance of Hauraki Gulf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) The interrelationship between the Hauraki Gulf, its islands, and catchments and the ability of that interrelationship to sustain the life-supporting capacity of the environment of the Hauraki Gulf and its islands are matters of national significance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) The life-supporting capacity of the environment of the Gulf and its islands includes the capacity—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) to provide for—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) the historic, traditional, cultural, and spiritual relationship of the tangata whenua of the Gulf with the Gulf and its islands; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) the social, economic, recreational, and cultural well-being of people and communities:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) to use the resources of the Gulf by the people and communities of the Gulf and New Zealand for economic activities and recreation:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) to maintain the soil, air, water, and ecosystems of the Gulf.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 8 - Management of Hauraki Gulf

To recognise the national significance of the Hauraki Gulf, its islands, and catchments, the objectives of the management of the Hauraki Gulf, its islands, and catchments are—
(d) the protection of the cultural and historic associations of people and communities in and around the Hauraki Gulf with its natural, historic, and physical resources:
(f) the maintenance and, where appropriate, the enhancement of the natural, historic, and physical resources of the Hauraki Gulf, its islands, and catchments, which contribute to the recreation and enjoyment of the Hauraki Gulf for the people and communities of the Hauraki Gulf and New Zealand.

RIBCA argued that the Rangitoto bach settlements had generated “communities” which related directly to the HGMPA 2000. Using the two sections of the HGMPA 2000, RIBCA argued that the Act required DOC (the Director General of Conservation) to preserve the baches, enhance the relationship between the occupants and those baches, and preserve the bach community as a whole. During the case, DOC acknowledged that it had not considered the HGMPA 2000 when refusing to renew the caretaker leases but maintained that the Reserves Act 1977 overrode the HGMPA 2000 (Whelan, 2009). DOC argued that as a Scenic Reserve, the island should not have a number of exclusive private occupations in perpetuity.

The court case judgement was made on 23rd March 2006. Judge Harrison ruled that DOC had to take the HGMPA into account when making a decision and directed DOC to reconsider the bach owners’ application for occupation rights. He declared that the Reserves Act 1977 did not trump the HGMPA 2000 and instead the two Acts should be considered together (RIBC, 2006: para 63). Harrison held that during the commencement of the HGMPA in 2000 the holiday bach settlements on Rangitoto did constitute a community, and for this reason sections 7 and 8 of the HGMPA 2000 should be carefully considered and adhered to by the Minister. He stated that when the Act was passed into law the Government and DOC knew of the presence of the remaining baches on Rangitoto, their enduring relationship with the island, the historical significance of the baches, and that where leases had expired the lessees would assist with their preservation (RIBC, 2006: para 66). Harrison dismissed DOC’s argument that the bach settlements no longer should be considered as communities as the number of baches had greatly diminished and were of a different character and nature from the original (RIBC, 2006: para 67). He judged that even though the bach settlements...
consisted of groups of people living there during holiday periods, they still remained a community with shared interests, values and heritage as seen with the formation of RIBCA (RIBC, 2006: para 68). For this reason Harrison held that the Minister (DOC) had erred in the law when not taking into account the HGMPA 2000 and that the Minister (DOC) was compelled to take into account the Act, particularly sections 7 and 8. Harrison concluded that the Minister and his advisors adopted an unduly restrictive approach towards the baches on Rangitoto and that whatever views DOC held about the legality of the bach owners’ original acts of occupation, the focus should now be on the present situation and preserving the bach community (RIBC, 2006: para 81).

Stephen Penk (interview, 17/4/2010) mentioned that the inclusion of “community” in the HGMPA 2000 was the “trump” card for RIBCA in the court case:

“To put it crudely, an argument based on the community aspect was the only one that was ever going to succeed – and it only succeeds because of that particular provision within the HGMPA without which we [RIBCA] would not have had a leg to stand on basically.”

Dave Bayley (interview, 19/5/2010), of DOC, also reiterates this point:

“Oh yes, if the HGMPA had not been in force we [DOC] probably would have won the court case and they [RIBCA] would have been evicted and we [DOC] would be looking after the baches ourselves, except for the 10 which are still owned by existing lessees. So we [DOC] have basically tolerated the squatting of RIBCA and the bach caretakers until we [DOC] decide what to do.”

Informants on both sides agree that since the court case both sides have been more cooperative:

From DOC: “Naturally we have always been a little wary of RIBCA but we have had three meetings with them now and each meeting we get a lot more positive with each other and in fact RIBCA is now beginning to have interrelations if you like with the Trust [RIHCT]” (Dave Bayley interview, 19/5/2010).

From RIBCA: “Originally DOC was seen by the bach community as the enemy. They were the people that were wanting to get us out. We wanted to stay. It was us and them... But with changes in personnel and changes of attitude within DOC and I guess an amelioration or more reasonable attitude on the part of [RIBCA], it is now becoming a matter of co-operation rather than contest or competition” (Stephen Penk interview, 17/4/2010).

Susan Yoffe (interview, 14/4/2010) explains that there is also now a much better relationship between RIHCT and DOC:
“DOC are now realising what an advantage it is to have the baches and the work that the Trust [RIHCT] has done is valued but, we have been in existence for 12 years now and I would say for the first 8 years they just did not want us. They didn’t really know what to do. We got some funding and cleared the prison camp and they would not let us have a generator to run the chipper thing, you know silly things like that. But now they are very very cooperative.”

RIBCA believe that the ruling has given hope for their continued access to the baches, an incentive for restoration and their wish to come up with a deal with DOC for occupation with some access for the public (Graham, 2008).

However, there are some feelings within DOC that RIBCA are more about personal rights rather than the preservation of heritage:

“Bach-holders are most often focussed on retaining their personal connections with the baches, rather than being concerned with protecting the physical values of the baches as historic buildings. So you need to ensure that these [architectural] values do not fall between the cracks” (Anonymous).

Although DOC now generally accepts the historical significance of the baches, there is not the same level of acceptance with the private and exclusive use of the baches. It is for this reason that DOC works more closely with RIHCT, whose aim is to restore the baches and let them out to organisations or members of the public, rather than RIBCA, whose aim is to retain the private use of the baches by the bach owners. DOC’s preference is to have one bach community trust on Rangitoto. The public/private issue is still being debated and worked through by DOC, RIHCT and RIBCA. Robert Brassey (interview, 13/4/2010) explains the need for the baches to be used, rather than being left as they are:

“I think the RIHCT has done a very good job under the circumstances… The problem is there is no point in restoring more baches unless they have got a use for them. You do not want to have them sitting there needing to be maintained. It is ok to keep one or two as house museums but really they should be used and they could be generating revenue which would help pay for their maintenance.”

Means to reduce tension, such as having open days in which the public can view the baches, or having a certain proportion of the year set aside for public use and the rest to be used by the bach owners, have been put forward by DOC and RIHCT. However, RIBCA have been uneasy with these suggestions and argued for their exclusive right to use the baches.

The bach owners have retained caretaker status indefinitely and DOC is currently working on and reviewing their policy towards the baches in response to the court ruling. DOC is in an awkward situation. On the one hand the Reserves Act 1977 classifies Rangitoto as a Scenic
Reserve: a place of ‘intrinsic worth’ possessing ‘such qualities of scenic interest, beauty, or natural features or landscape’ which is protected and preserved for the ‘benefit, enjoyment, and use of the public.’ On the other hand, there are living and remnant histories which are not “scenic” or “natural” but are aspects which are now recognised as important cultural heritage to be conserved. The ways to manage the baches is a problem for DOC:

The baches “have been there for so long and they do, whether we like it or not, provide a charm and a feature that Rangitoto has. There is a cultural, historical element there that has to be preserved. How to preserve it though is another problem! A managerial nightmare!” (Dave Bayley interview, 19/5/2010).

Since the court case of 2006 it has been up to the Minister of Conservation to consider the next steps. The Minister will review the court case and make a decision whether to completely evict the bach owners or, more likely, consider other options. The Auckland DOC conservancy was in the process of writing a final draft paper on options for the baches in mid-2011. However, the major national restructuring of DOC in late 2011 meant that DOC’s propositions to resolve the issue regarding the retention of the Rangitoto baches were deferred while other higher work priorities were met (Dave Bayley, pers. com.). Further restructuring in mid-2012 has given the task of resolving the baches issue to DOC’s National Office in Wellington. An employee of the Auckland Conservancy who is familiar with the baches issue will be contracted to assist the National Office (Dave Bayley, pers. com.). Potential options considered include a short-term licence for the bach owners, a long-term licence for the bach owners, baches being leased out for use by the general public (with former bach owners being given first option to book a bach), or DOC controlling and funding all work done on the baches (and not allowing the bach owners to do any alterations). When completed, the paper will be sent to DOC’s lawyers in Wellington before it is given to RIBCA for their comments. Then there will be a final recommendation which will go to the Minister of Conservation. Dave Bayley (interview, 19/5/2010) hopes that a compromise can be reached regarding the rights of RIBCA people and the rights of the public regarding access: “I think at the end of the day RIBCA have a lot to offer the baches and Rangitoto and helping out the Department. I don’t think there is any point in having a war with them.”

5.5.4. The baches today

Today 33 of the original 140 bach leases recorded in 1937 remain intact. Some of them are still owned and used by lease holders, some are still being used despite their lease expiring (RIBCA members), two have been restored by RIHCT, a further two are undergoing
restoration by RIHCT, while others have been left in situ (such as Figure 5.17; 5.18; 5.19; 5.20).

Figure 5.17 Two baches on the coast of Rangitoto (2011).

Figure 5.18 A bach close to Rangitoto Wharf still being used and maintained (2010).
Figure 5.19 Another bach close to Rangitoto Wharf (2012).

Figure 5.20 A bach and boatshed at Islington Bay (2011). Note the boat ramp on the right leading up to where a boatshed once was.
There are many imprints of former sites of baches still apparent in the landscape in the form of gaps in the pohutukawa forest near the water’s edge. These sites are described well by Yoffe (2003: 10):

Dotted along the island’s coastline were remnants of the 140 baches that clung to the volcanic rock - a set of concrete steps leading to nowhere, a chimney, demolition rubble, an old sink, a discarded fridge the only nostalgic signs of families who swam, boated, fished, picnicked and socialised together.

This kind of scene is illustrated in Figures 5.21 and 5.22. Of the 33 original baches at Islington Bay only 13 remain. Susan Yoffe (interview, 14/4/2010) explains that the state of the former bach sites today is evidence that “you can never obliterate the old signs of human habitation… it is part of the human history of the island.”

Figure 5.21 A former bach site at Islington Bay (2010). Note the boat ramp (left) leading up to where the boat shed once was; the steps (centre) leading up to where the bach was; and the chimney, left of the steps (partly obscured by a tree).
Since its establishment in 1997, RIHCT set about restoring baches and making them available for public use, such as by families and groups including canoe clubs, bird watchers and artists. In addition to this, historical research by Susan Yoffe in the 1990s and 2000s and RIHCT has resulted in an extensive archive of oral histories from bach owners, historical photographs and documents that record the life of the bach communities. This research has undoubtedly been the backbone of the movement to retain the baches as historical buildings. Susan Yoffe organised the erection of eight interpretation signs at former bach sites at Rangitoto Wharf explaining the history of each individual bach and with photos (Figure 5.23; 5.24):

These signs will be erected “to humanise it [Rangitoto] and to show when people walk past and all they see it a blank space but if we get something up it will represent the history and show people what these communities were like” (Susan Yoffe interview, 14/4/2010).

The signs evoke emotions of nostalgia as they explain the ownership of the bach, interesting stories (with photos) of happenings and activities (such as how couples met and later got married). The writing then abruptly finishes with the date they were demolished. Reading
these signs makes one feel saddened by the fact they were demolished, and makes one wonder why they were demolished.

Figure 5.23 An interpretation sign close to Rangitoto Wharf explaining the history of Bach 17 which has been demolished (2012).

Figure 5.24 Another interpretation sign close to Rangitoto Wharf explaining the history of Bach 15 (2012).
Currently RIHCT has restored two baches completely: Bach 38 (at Rangitoto Wharf, completed in 2005, Figure 5.25) and Bach 114 (at Islington Bay, completed in 2011, Figure 5.26). The pride and joy of the RIHCT is Bach 38, the Trust’s first restoration project. The bach was built in 1927 and had three owners: Walter and Mrs Pooley (1907-1940), Bert and Sadie Biddulph (1940-1952) and Charlotte MacDonald (1952-2001). Over the years the bach fell into disrepair and was in a dilapidated state when Toni Taylor (owner and fourth generation of the family associated with the bach) offered it to the RIHCT for restoration and use (Figure 5.25). Dedicated volunteers from the RIHCT worked on the project from 2001 to 2005. The bach is located close to Rangitoto Wharf (the main wharf for the island) and is now a museum and the RIHCT headquarters (RIHCT, n.d.).

![Bach 38 Restoration 2001 to 2005 - Outside](image)

**Figure 5.25 A comparison of Bach 38 from 2001 to 2005, after its restoration (RIHCT, n.d.).**

In 2008 Bach 38 gained an “honourable mention” at the UNESCO Asia-Pacific Heritage Awards for cultural heritage management (UNESCO, 2008). Susan Yoffe (interview, 14/4/2010) made the application to UNESCO:

“...I just saw it online and thought: ‘Wow! Here we go! Why not?’ and it was wonderful. You know, this little wooden bach with no architectural merit [built by ordinary people], no age merit, no religious affiliation, not associated with anything famous... It is really about the community and the community spirit of the Rangitoto baches.”

With this mention, Bach 38 was placed alongside much grander cultural heritage such as the Archiepiscopal Palace in Goa, India; the historic Bethanie building in Hong Kong and the
Crown Property Bureau Building in Thailand. It was also the first New Zealand winner of a UNESCO heritage award (Kemp, 2008).

Figure 5.26 Bach 114 (at Islington Bay), restored by RIHCT in 2011.

Two further bach restorations, Bach 78 (Islington Bay) (Figure 5.27) and Bach 52 (Rangitoto Wharf, Figure 5.28), are currently underway (Elizabeth Andrew pers. com.; Susan Yoffe pers. com.).

Figure 5.27 Bach 78 (Islington Bay), currently under restoration by RIHCT (2012).
Figure 5.28 Bach 52 at Rangitoto Wharf (2012), currently undergoing restoration by RIHCT.

5.5.5. Current issues relating to the Rangitoto baches

For many, the presence of baches on Rangitoto (as a Scenic Reserve) is now no longer an issue. Dave Bayley (interview, 19/5/2010) explains that there has been a general acceptance of the baches from DOC and the public:

“Well my view is that the public accepted the baches some years ago and we [DOC] never receive any complaints from the public and we never received any complaints within DOC or outside that the baches are injurious to the natural features of the Reserve… Because the baches have been there for over 90 years [sic] they are a feature of the place now, whether we like it or not, and that has been brought out in the court case of 2005.”

However, not everyone is comfortable with the retention of the baches and there are a number of issues relating to their management, which will now be discussed.

5.5.5.1. Ngai Tai involvement

Ngai Tai have refused to work with DOC, RIHCT or RIBCA regarding the management of the baches because they feel that their iwi should be treated as the tangata whenua (people of the land) of Rangitoto instead of only stakeholders, as Emily Karaka (interview, 28/9/2010), of Ngai Tai, explains:
“We [Ngai Tai as tangata whenua] are certainly invisible. We are just not there. It is certainly a sore point for our members. I must say that when a settlement for the [Treaty] claim comes and if it is done right then certainly we should be the largest land holders in Auckland.”

For this reason, Emily Karaka criticises the retention of the baches:

“They [the baches] were all under a moratorium to be removed. They are illegal dwellings anyway and yet they [the bach owners] are referred to as the inhabitants of the islands in the [Fullers Ferry] pamphlet I have just shown you. Unlawful. They were all to be removed and then suddenly they are now restored as picture book trophies of some past. That is shocking. That is actually a failure under the plan. And when those people have dominance and have some say as to what is happening… That is the conflict you are talking about.”

She further comments on the perceived poor treatment of Ngai Tai by DOC:

“They [DOC] make you meet with them every two months to answer something and dump on you what they want happening for resource consents and then run away. I objected to the Rangitoto wharf. That is what stopped the wharf… You stop that until you have settled with us…They tried to reinterpret our history in the consent. It was shocking. It was cultural genocide. I mean look at this [the Fullers Ferry pamphlet] and they are supposed to be working with us. I am not disgruntled, I am actually pissed off!”

What can be taken from these comments is that Ngai Tai are not so much against the baches per se as they are against Ngai Tai not being treated as tangata whenua – or specifically being seen to be of lesser importance as the bach owners. It is likely that after the Treaty negotiation has been finalised, this antagonism towards the retention of the baches by Ngai Tai may diminish.

On 8 September 2012 a deed to settle historical Treaty claims for the Auckland region was signed by the Crown and a Tāmaki Collective (Finlayson, 2012; OTS, 2012). This settlement, if passed in legislation, will recognise Ngai Tai (and the other iwi) as tangata whenua of specific islands in the Hauraki Gulf, including Rangitoto and Motutapu. In the deed of settlement, it is proposed that the Crown will hand back ownership of the islands (including Rangitoto) to the Tāmaki Collective. After a month, the Tāmaki Collective will transfer the islands back to the Crown in a symbolic gesture. Three areas of Rangitoto, however, will be vested in the permanent ownership of the Tāmaki Collective: the summit of Rangitoto (Nga Pona-toru-a-Peretu); Islington Bay Hall, which was formally a dance hall and pavilion overlooking the tennis courts; and Bach 80 at Islington Bay. The draft bill states that the hall and Bach 80 will be given in fee simple title to the Tamaki Collective for cultural events.
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Bach 80 will also be able to be used for accommodation and a further single-storey building or structure is also permitted to be built for this purpose on the open space of the Bach 80 property, as long as it is less than 200 square metres in area.

In addition, the Tamaki Collective (including Ngai Tai) will have a far greater involvement in heritage management through co-management provisions. Four co-governance provisions have been proposed in the deed: a relationship agreement between the Tāmaki Collective and the Minister of Conservation and DOC, a role for the Tāmaki Collective alongside the Auckland Conservation Board in developing conservation management plans for Rangitoto, Motutapu, Motukorea (Browns Island) and Motuihe, three seats on the Auckland Conservation Board reserved for the Tāmaki Collective, and annual meetings between DOC and a new authority (Maunga Authority) to discuss strategic governance issues relating to conservation land in the Auckland Volcanic Field (OTS, 2012).

5.5.5.2. Persisting attitudes from nature conservationists

Many nature conservationists, like the botanists of the first half of the twentieth century, are still uneasy with the retention of the baches on Rangitoto. Some natural heritage managers find it incomparable, and even concerning, to worry about preserving 80-to-90-year-old historical features (such as the baches) on the island in an ecosystem which is centuries-old:

“Now, how old are the baches? [“About 90 years”] 90 years old? That is peanuts! When we are looking at a tree, a tree is three or four hundred years old – older than any building in [the whole of Auckland] (David Havell interview, a Biodiversity Technical Support Officer from the Auckland DOC Conservancy, 26/5/2010).

This quote exemplifies the common attitude from nature conservationists that cultural heritage in New Zealand is insignificant because it is comparatively young compared to New Zealand’s natural heritage, or the cultural heritage of the Old World.

The debate over the use of the baches for private purposes on a conservation estate reserve has been used as an argument by nature conservationists to remove the baches, as Dave Veart (interview, 2/6/2010), the DOC Historic Program Manager for the Auckland Area, explains:

“That public/private issue is sort of a convenient argument in some ways too as it gave a sort of moral high ground to people who basically just didn’t like having little buildings on this amazing pohutukawa forest.”
5.5.5.3. Lack of funding and resourcing for the conservation of the baches

Because of the natural heritage bias of DOC and its limited funding, there has been a lack of resources and personal to assist with the conservation of the baches. As a result, many baches which have come into the ownership of DOC in the 1990s, after the lessee of the bach had passed away, have become dilapidated and rundown. As one walks around the three bach settlement coastlines there are baches and boat sheds with fading paint, rotten walls, and overgrown gardens (Figure 5.29; 5.30). With no owners, no-one living in the baches, and not enough resources to restore the baches, they have deteriorated nearly to the point where they are beyond repair. This situation is not what those who lobbied for the retention of the baches in the 1990s desired. Although the public and DOC have accepted that the baches are historically significant, this attitude has not necessarily been translated into practical management.

The deterioration of the baches under the ownership of DOC is an argument used by RIBCA to justify the private use of their baches. DOC and RIHCT agree that the use of the baches by members of RIBCA is an advantage as it means less work and expense for the two organisations, despite their use being illegal: RIBCA “refuse to leave which of course is a great advantage because DOC don’t have the capacity to look after these baches and our Trust [RIHCT] certainly doesn’t” (Anonymous). Most interviewees state that DOC should provide more financial support to maintain and restore the deteriorating baches.

Figure 5.29 A dilapidated bach at Islington Bay on Rangitoto (2011). Note the corrugated iron on the door and windows.
To a great extent, since the 2006 court case DOC has simply left the issue, and no decisions have been made about whether to allow members of RIBCA to continue to use the baches or whether the baches should be rented out to members of the public:

“I think [there has been a resolution] but I think it has probably happened by accident. Or at the moment by inaction. If it was left up to people particularly in DOC I think there is still a desire to have the baches removed. … At the moment it seems to be a bit of a standoff” (Bruce Petry interview, 30/4/2010, a conservation architect for Salmond Reed Architects, with a general knowledge of heritage in Auckland).

RIHCT envisioned more to have been restored by now; however, these restoration projects have been slow and have required a considerable amount of funding and built heritage expertise. The resolution at the moment from DOC has been to maintain the status quo: allow RIHCT to (gradually) restore the rundown baches owned by DOC, and allow the use of the baches by RIBCA. The general consensus is that it is better to let RIBCA stay in order to maintain the baches. The alternative of DOC managing all the baches and renting them out is currently not supported by DOC due to money and resource constraints.

**5.5.5.4. Renovations by bach owners**

Another issue to emerge concerns the renovations some bach owners have made to their baches. These renovations have often not been done in the same style as the original bach. DOC and RIHCT have expressed alarm at these because one of the main reasons for the
retention of the baches has been because they have been preserved in their 1930s appearance. A former employee of DOC points out that often bach owners do not always have the knowledge of best practice methodology for built heritage conservation:

“Because the bach-holders are not heritage specialists they do not always recognise that the nature of the renovations being undertaken may be eroding the intrinsic values of the buildings. It would be better if they were given guidance on how to do that. Some bach-holders have engaged Conservation Architects on occasion to provide that guidance.”

Some interviewees believe that DOC has been too soft on the bach owners who have renovated their baches and believe that the Department should have got on top of the issue when they first discovered such renovations. Presently, it is hard for DoC to make a hard-line decision since many bach owners have now spent so much effort and money on renovations. The same interviewees also extended this opinion to the public/private debate. Had DOC taken a harder line with the bach owners in the 1990s – that is, not allowing bach owners to continue using their baches when their leases had run out – there would not have been the complicated issues that have arisen today. There would have been a lot of opposition from those who ended up forming RIBCA during that time, but it would have saved time and resources in the future, such as the 2006 court case.

5.5.5.5. Exotic species from bach gardens

Approximately 60% of the invasive pest species found on Rangitoto were introduced as garden plants next to the baches (Wotherspoon & Wotherspoon, 2004). These exotic trees and plants are treated as exotic weeds by natural heritage managers on Rangitoto. Despite Treadwell (1994: 19) stating that the gardens around the baches were features which ‘deserved further study’ and were ‘another manifestation of the bach owners’ commitment to their island homes’, potentially invasive weeds in bach gardens have been and are still being removed. Exotic plants of the bach gardens are not considered to have enough historical importance to warrant being conserved in Rangitoto’s native forest (Figure 5.31).
Bach owners have also been told what not to plant on the island and have been educated about the negative impact caused by plants from their bach gardens, as Sarah Macready (interview, 27/5/2010) explains:

“Bach owners used to take over all sorts of plants and other things to prettify the place. But they don’t do that anymore (or maybe very occasionally). I think [at the moment] the baches are quite well policed and most of the bach owners are pretty aware of what to take and what not to take and they are fully supportive. So I don’t think that aspect is such an issue anymore.”

However, the spread of seeds from the gardens is still a major issue for DOC. Because of Rangitoto’s distinctive environment many, normally innocuous, exotic plants have become invasive weeds (DOC, 2001). Succulents and other plants with drought-resistant features have done considerably well on Rangitoto (Wotherspoon & Wotherspoon, 2004). Many of these are not spreading quickly and therefore do not pose a threat to native vegetation. However, pitted crassula and agapanthus, have become serious weeds (DOC, 2001). To resolve the issue of bach garden weeds there is a combination of continuing education of bach owners about the weeds, and weed control from DOC. Bach owners are not allowed to
plant any plants in their garden which are considered as pests to the island, and the weeds generated from the gardens are being actively eliminated by DOC weed staff.

5.6. NATURAL HERITAGE CONSERVATION

Despite the progressive change in attitude towards the protection of the baches (and the general change in respect to New Zealand’s cultural heritage), natural conservation projects have remained central to the island’s management. Rangitoto’s native (predominantly pohutukawa) forest is considered to be the primary value of the island and one in which other values (such as the historical value of the baches and their non-native gardens) need to be worked around. The largest and most ambitious of these was the three-year pest eradication programme announced in 2006 for both Rangitoto and Motutapu to rid the island of all its remaining animal pests. The project has been deemed a success and it has created the largest pest-free island sanctuary in the Hauraki Gulf Marine Park, and one of the largest pest-free islands in New Zealand, if Rangitoto and Motutapu are treated as one island due to the causeway which connects the islands (DOC, n.d.c).

DOC has sought to create conditions on Rangitoto where the native plant communities of the island can be unimpeded by exotic plant species (Brown, 2006). In order to carry out these objectives weed control programmes have been set up. The DOC weed team and a small team of more highly trained botanists search specific sites at least once a year to keep a tab on the distribution and number of weed species (Brown, 2004). Exotic species which are invasive are considered by both DOC and the general public to be contaminants in Rangitoto’s “natural” landscape (Wotherspoon & Wotherspoon, 2004). Approximately 50 weed species out of a total of over 200 exotic species pose some concern for DOC on Rangitoto, such as *rhamnus*, tuber ladder fern (*Nephrolepis cordifolia*) and mothplant (*Araujia sericifera*) (Brown, 2006).

Significantly, most of the weeds are associated with past human activity, such as the three bach settlements, Wilson’s Park (an exotic park from the nineteenth century), World War II structures, and old quarries (DOC, 2001). As shown previously, the exotic species from the bach gardens have been managed by DOC staff. There are also remnants of exotic plantings from the numerous campaigns in the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century to “beautify” Rangitoto with exotic fauna. Members of the public would catch a ferry to Rangitoto and plant their favourite plants on the island (Wotherspoon & Wotherspoon, 2004).
Wilson’s Park on Rangitoto is a good example of historical trees being treated as exotic tree-type weeds (Figure 5.32). In the early twentieth century, two Englishmen, Leary and Wilson, attempted to beautify Rangitoto by creating a botanical park near the summit of Rangitoto (Wotherspoon & Wotherspoon, 2004). Many exotic species were planted including cacti, figs, pines and paw-paws (Woolnough 1984). Because of the Mediterranean-type climate on Rangitoto these species flourished. However, today many of the plants and trees in, and spreading from, Wilson’s Park are considered as invasive exotic weeds and have been managed as such:

“The island has changed a huge amount over quite a short period and so a lot of those plants have been shaded out by the pohutukawa growing there… There is a big flowering gum tree there [on Rangitoto]… [Wilson’s Park] has also been hit by us where we have controlled a range of things that were spreading out of there” (Phillip Brown interview, 4/6/2010, a programme manager for biodiversity at DOC).

Brown (2004) explains that several restricted species are located in Wilson’s park such as elephant’s ear, tecomaria, agapanthus, acanthus, stinking iris, pitted crassula, and mothplant. At least every second year an area 100 to 200 metres either side of the Wilson Park track is searched and controlled for weeds.

Figure 5.32 The entrance to Wilson’s Park, where exotic trees were planted during the early twentieth century.
In 1993 there was interesting correspondence between the botanist Professor Geoff Baylis and a member of DOC. In his letter, Baylis (1993) stressed the historical importance of the Scarborough Lily (*Vallota speciosa*) in Wilson’s Park:

I hope the islands administrators appreciate that this is a valuable scenic resource and have taken steps to preserve it from the attentions of some doctrinaire ranger whose horizons are limited by the National Park Act.

In reply, Julian (1993), of DOC, stated that because the lily was not invasive, the lily will not be eliminated:

The Scarborough lily is not one of the species that threatens conservation values… it cannot be considered to be invasive… Control/eradication will instead concentrate on aggressively invasive plants such as hakea, radiata pine, and *Rhamnus alaternus*.

Julian (1993) also explains a lot about the change in attitude towards cultural heritage on Rangitoto:

You will be pleased to hear that the policy on returning Rangitoto to a probably unattainable pristine state by demolishing baches and removing all associated plants and structures has changed over the years. Now the historical values of the baches, their gardens, and other areas associated with the community on the island have been recognised and there has been a stay of execution. In fact, where bach garden plants are not going to threaten conservation values, they will be left were they are and, in some cases, will be actively preserved. I would imagine that this approach will also be used for the plants of Wilson’s Park Track.

The above correspondence highlights that, like the baches, there has been a shift in the treatment of exotic trees on Rangitoto. Exotic trees and plants can be accepted as historical. Once cultural heritage elements, such as structures or plants, are not seen to be actively harming the forest or bird life, then natural heritage advocates and managers can accommodate cultural heritage, even if it may impact on the native “natural” appearance of the place.

**5.7. CONCLUSION**

This chapter has highlighted competing perspectives between those wishing to retain and conserve the baches and those supporting the protection of the island as natural. Three main themes are apparent: Rangitoto as a place of nature, Rangitoto as a recreational island; and the gradual acknowledgement of the baches, and other historical features, as important cultural heritage.
It is clear that interest in the botany of Rangitoto and concern about the natural heritage of the island has been ever-present since European settlement. Reserved in 1890, Rangitoto was also one of the earliest islands in New Zealand to be classified as a reserve. Rangitoto has been considered as distinctive (and separate) from Auckland which should be protected from the growing city – an antidote to the growing urban “evils” of Auckland, and, in extension, to the growing urbanisation and deforestation of New Zealand during the twentieth century (Figure 5.33). The island has been a focal point for public concern expressed by scientists, academics and members of the general public over how development (the building of structures) on Rangitoto was “spoiling”, “damaging”, “sacrificing”, “contaminating” and “destroying” the native flora and fauna of the island (the naturalness of the island).

But within this modern dualistic view, Rangitoto has also been an important place for recreation from the late 1800s. Rangitoto has not therefore been perceived as wholly a place of nature which should be closed off from the public. Rather, it has been an island of significant natural values which people are allowed to visit to experience (as long as they do

Figure 5.33 Photo from the summit of Rangitoto showing the distinction between Auckland city and the green forest of Rangitoto (2011).
not stay permanently or overnight and do not greatly harm the natural heritage). Facilities (such as toilets, wharves, tracks and roads) have been constructed on Rangitoto to *facilitate* these visitors. These facilities were not considered as blots on the natural landscape but were seen as providing amenities to those who wished to escape the growing city of Auckland and visit a relative wilderness. But, any developments which would allow permanent settlement on the island (the baches and boat sheds) and any flora or fauna considered as exotic weeds or pests were staunchly criticised, opposed and at times actively removed. Most of the original baches were “pulled out” like weeds. There was a strategic forgetting of the past to suit an ideal promoted by advocates of natural heritage. The removal of baches was creating the *illusion* of the island being natural: a place where people can visit, but not “spoil” through permanent settlement.

It is evident that there has been a trajectory of change, with cultural heritage slowly gaining recognition among governmental organisations and the general public from the late twentieth century. Whereas in previous decades there had been very little, if any, acknowledgment of cultural heritage values on the island, from the late 1980s the significance of cultural heritage on Rangitoto was gaining traction. This movement was part of a wider change in attitude towards New Zealand’s history outlined in Chapter 4. Earlier in the twentieth century, there was a tendency to view New Zealand as a “young” country with an insignificant history. In the mid-1980s the RIDB remarked that any ‘man-made structure even if it may be over a hundred years old, is often seen as an intrusion rather than as a monument to some earlier time or event’ (Woolnough, 1984: 69). This kind of attitude dominated the management of the island up until the late 1980s when New Zealand’s cultural history began to gain more credence. European cultural heritage on Rangitoto from the first half of the twentieth century, such as industrial structures, shipwrecks, World War II structures, and bach holiday settlements, was recognised as heritage to be protected and preserved. Importantly, at this time these historical features were not being actively built (or wrecked) but had been part of the Rangitoto landscape for several decades. These features were not impacting on the natural landscape, but had become “natural” to the landscape of Rangitoto: aspects of heritage to be restored, or at least protected (Figure 5.3). In addition, the spiritual and ancestral connections with Rangitoto from Auckland iwi are being acknowledged in the Treaty negotiations.
Since the significance of cultural heritage on Rangitoto has been acknowledged, there has been a significant attempt to achieve a balance between natural heritage and cultural heritage. Natural heritage conservation (pest and weed removal) by DOC is continuing alongside cultural heritage conservation by DOC, RIHCT and RIBCA (the restoration of baches, the preservation of structures and ruins, guided heritage tours). The Treaty settlement will acknowledge the Tamaki Collective as the tangata whenua of the island and will provide for more of an involvement by Māori in heritage management decisions. However, there is an undercurrent from natural heritage managers and other members of the public that the restoration of baches is unwarranted. In addition, the structure, funding, and organisational ethos of DOC has limited the extent to which the baches can be actively restored. Many cultural heritage managers therefore believe that although the management of the island is getting more balanced, natural heritage conservation is still overly favoured.
CHAPTER 6.

Motutapu Island

Despite neighbouring Rangitoto, Motutapu is physically, and to an extent perceptually, in complete contrast to Rangitoto. As the tour guide on the Motutapu “Big Weekender” says: “By crossing this causeway we walk from an island just a few hundred years old (Rangitoto) to an island hundreds of millions of years old (Motutapu)” (Figure 6.1). Motutapu is geologically ancient (once part of the super-continent Gondwanaland), has fertile soil excellent for cultivation, and, as a consequence of European settlement, is dominated by pasture grass, with little native vegetation (Figure 6.2; 6.3). Motutapu therefore does not have the same sense of naturalness as Rangitoto, with its extensive pohutukawa-dominated forest and distinct volcanic landscape. Instead, Motutapu is considered to have huge ecological restoration potential as a large pest-free island habitat for native species.

Figure 6.1 The view of Motutapu from Rangitoto across the man-made causeway connecting the two islands (2011).
Figure 6.2 Aerial map of Motutapu Island (DOC, n.d.e).
Motutapu Island may be shielded from view from Auckland by Rangitoto, but it is by no means shielded from human activity. Motutapu’s history covers the full span of New Zealand settlement by Māori and Europeans and has some of the best preserved evidence of early Māori settlement from the fourteenth century, European farming from the mid-nineteenth century, and military use of the island during World War II. In the early 1990s, however, plans were made by ecologists and biologists to revegetate the island which did not fully recognise or account for Motutapu’s historic landscape. These plans generated a severe backlash from archaeologists and cultural heritage advocates who were outraged that anyone would want to plant on one of the most complex and intact Māori archaeological landscapes in the Auckland region. Over the past two decades there has been conflict and debate between those supporting ecological restoration and those wanting to preserve the cultural heritage of the island. Janet Davidson (interview, 16/8/2010), one of New Zealand’s leading archaeologists, summarises the situation well:

“I think Motutapu is a head-to-head clash between revegetation and preservation and management of cultural heritage – probably the most striking case that I am aware of in the country.”

The difficulties between these groups stem from the multiple heritage values of Motutapu, as explained by Gardener (1993: 35):

Nowhere else is there an island of such traditional significance to Ngai Tai. Nowhere else in the Auckland area is there such a collection of archaeological sites (more than 300) still undisturbed by urban sprawl. No other islands in the Gulf are large enough
(3841 hectares) to allow threatened species to build populations of sufficient size for long-term survival.

The Motutapu Restoration Trust (MRT), formed in 1994, has sought to conserve all heritage (natural and cultural) values by running a programme to remove exotic pests and weeds, re-establish native vegetation, and (re-)introduce native birds to the island, while also conserving the island’s significant Māori archaeology, early farming buildings, and World War II structures. The central management concern for the MRT has been: how can the island’s cultural heritage be protected and preserved while the island becomes “natural” through ecological restoration? This chapter will first outline the history of Motutapu; before focussing on the contentious debates and outcomes relating to this question.

6.1. THE HISTORY OF MOTUTAPU

6.1.1. Māori history and archaeological landscape

Motutapu is considered to have been one of the earliest places settled by Polynesians in the Auckland region (Cameron, Hayward & Murdoch, 2008; Davidson, 1978; Dodd, 2008a; Lowe et al., 2000). There are four archaic sites recorded, all located on the western side of the island at open stream mouths (Dodd, 2008a). This archaeological evidence is backed up by oral tradition regarding the naming of the island. According to local Māori folklore, Motutapu was named “Te Motu tapu a Taikehu” after a place in Hawaiki (the ancestral homeland of Māori) (Cameron, Hayward & Murdoch, 2008; Cottrell, 1984). The shortened form of the name, Motutapu, means sacred (tapu) island (motu). Graeme Campbell (interview, 22/7/2010) emphasises the spiritual significance of the island for Māori: “Motutapu. Its name means Sacred Island. Why is it sacred? It is sacred because this is one of the few places where you can stand and you can go straight back to Hawaiki in spirit.”

The island has strong associations with the descendants of both the Arawa and Tainui waka (early settlement canoes in Māori folklore), and the island was the home to prominent ancestors of several iwi and hapū associated with these waka (Dodd, 2008a). Ngai Tai maintained tangata whenua (rights of occupation and ownership) of the island for centuries with only minor incursions from other iwi (Dodd, 2008a). Tipa Compain (interview, 13/8/2010), of Ngai Tai, explains his iwi’s historical connection with Motutapu: “Our history

---

16 Archaic sites in New Zealand are evidence of initial Polynesian settlement and exploration of New Zealand approximately 700-800 years ago (Wilmshurst et al. 2008).
goes way back… Our relationship to our islands and what that means is embedded within those that descend from all of [our] ancestors… It is embedded in our genealogy, our whakapapa.”

Archaeological evidence suggests that prior to the Rangitoto eruption small Māori settlements were located on the low lying coastal land near stream mouths along the leeward western coastline and sheltered eastern bays of Motutapu (Dodd, 2007). The livelihood of those who lived on the island was typical of early Polynesian settlement in New Zealand, based predominantly on the hunting of forest bird species (Allen, 2010; Davidson, 1978; Dodd, 2007).

The Rangitoto eruption around 550 years ago smothered Motutapu in ash and caused widespread deforestation. Initially this event prompted a shift from broad spectrum hunting of forest birds to intensive fishing and shellfish gathering (Davidson, 1978). However, the volcanic ash gradually produced highly fertile soil suitable for horticulture. Davidson (1978) writes that the archaeological sites of Motutapu reveal that for at least 400 years after the eruption there was an abundance of food resources from land and sea as a result of the fertility of the soil for gardens and the sheltered fishing grounds of the Hauraki Gulf. Several Pā sites are located on the island. Pā sites are often seen to be evidence of frequent conflict; however, Davidson (1978) suggests that because of the relatively small amount of habitable land within the Pā sites, settlement on Motutapu was most likely a peace-time horticultural-based occupation with sporadic tensions and conflict between groups resulting in the construction of Pā.

The island has been a central place of study for archaeologists in New Zealand (and particularly in the Auckland region) due to its rich archaeological record, its close proximity to the city of Auckland and its farming history (which has helped preserve the sites better than if it was subdivided or if it had been covered in regenerated forest) (Davidson, 1978, Dodd, 2007). The archaeology of Motutapu is considered so significant because it is represents what would have been on the mainland had it not been subdivided or developed. From the late 1950s numerous archaeological surveys and excavations were undertaken. Dodd (2008a) writes that Motutapu was one of the first archaeological landscapes in Auckland to be systematically surveyed and investigated. According to Graeme Murdoch (interview, 10/9/2010), Motutapu could be considered the birthplace of archaeology in Auckland: “It was where the discipline began in the 50s and the first excavations and so on
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were mainly in the offshore islands on the public estate. So you have these people who were very much in love with it [the archaeology on the island].”

Dodd (2008a) considers the archaeological landscape to be of international importance. Likewise, Janet Davidson (interview 16/8/2010) commented that: “In the Auckland region it [Motutapu] is extremely important because so much has been lost on the mainland… So it is a sample of something that we have lost from pretty well everywhere else.” The island was intensively surveyed for archaeological sites in the 1960s and 1970s (Davidson, 1978). Over the years there have been numerous publications relating to excavations, dating, faunal remains, lithic assemblages, human remains, and site recording surveys on Motutapu (see Dodd [2007] for publication lists).

In the 1990s, the proposed replanting of the island stimulated renewed archaeological interest. University of Auckland archaeological field surveys and excavations were carried out in the mid-1990s in order to improve the understanding of the archaeological landscape and in turn also heighten the awareness of the archaeology (Dodd, 2007). The Anthropology Department at the University of Auckland ran field schools on the island in the mid-1990s which produced about 300 site record forms which were given to DOC (Irwin, Ladefoged & Wallace, 1996). Archaeological study was also used to help determine the types of species to be planted on Motutapu in order to make the replanting as authentic (“natural”) as possible (English, 1995).

The most famous archaeological site on Motutapu is the archaic Sunde site, located on the north-western side of the island, which provided the first archaeological evidence that people were on Motutapu before the Rangitoto eruption. The site was discovered in 1958 by Rudy Sunde, a member of the Auckland University Archaeological Society. He took part in archaeological excavations at Pig Bay on Motutapu in 1958/59, led by Jack Golson, who was a lecturer at the Anthropology Department at the University of Auckland (Figure 6.4). Janet Davidson, who later carried out many archaeological investigations on the island, explains that Sunde would often get up early in the morning to go for a walk (sometimes in search of a feed of rock oysters). One morning during the excavations at Pig Bay, he walked around the coast to a bay and found a piece of worked stone from below the ash in an eroding section of the coast – evidence of Māori settlement before the Rangitoto eruption. In 1961, Roger Green, who had replaced Jack Golson as Head of Anthropology at the University of
Auckland, persuaded an American Fulbright Scholar, Stuart Scott, to do an excavation at the site (see Scott, 1970). A photo of excavations from the 1960s is seen in Figure 6.5.

Figure 6.4 Pig Bay excavations in 1958/59 (Matapihi, n.d.).

Figure 6.5 Archaeologist Garth Rogers working on the Sunde Site in the 1960s (Matapihi, n.d.).
Reg Nichol, a PhD student at the University of Auckland Anthropology Department, undertook further research on the Sunde site in 1981 and 1982, including discovering the famous footprints in the ash at the site (Figure 6.6) (Nichol, 1988). The fossilised human and dog footprints in the ash proved that Māori were living on Motutapu when Rangitoto erupted (Auckland Conservator, 2007). The footprints lay hidden for centuries until the 30cm thick slab of ash was exposed by coastal erosion (Gregory, 2005). Excavations of the site in the 1980s uncovered the remains of 10 species of seabird, six species of bush bird and several extinct bird species including moa, crow and eagle. There were also the remains of tuatara, seals, dogs, and large quantities of fish bone (Cameron, Hayward & Murdoch, 2008). It was also discovered that the site was a significant place for early adze manufacturing (Dodd, 2007). The 250kg slab containing the famous footprints was loaned to the Auckland Museum in 2005 (MRT, n.d.).

Figure 6.6 The footprints in the Motutapu ash, held at the Volcanoes Exhibition at the Auckland Museum.
In total there are 372 archaeological sites recorded on Motutapu, including four archaic sites, thirteen Pā, numerous open settlements, midden deposits, storage pits, and agricultural areas. It is very likely, however, that many more sites are unrecorded and that many are now not identifiable as they would have been damaged, obscured or destroyed by decades of farming and military activity (Dodd, 2008a).

6.1.2. Early European farming

On 11 January 1840 the northern part of Motutapu was bought by the early European settler Thomas Maxwell, who was married to Ngeu Ngeu, the daughter of Ngai Tai Chief Tara te Irirangi (Cottrell, 1984; Dodd, 2007). The land transaction (which also included the islands of Otata, Motu Horopapa [Noises Group] and Motu Hurakina [Rakino] in the Hauraki Gulf [Figure 1.3]) was signed by Tara te Irirangi, chief of Ngai Tai and Ngatai, a chief of Ngati Paoa, and four other chiefs. The purchase was one of the earliest European acquisitions in the Auckland area (Dodd, 2008a). The payment to the chiefs was: ten casks of powder, four double-barrel guns, 80 blankets, one case of muskets, six cloaks, 20 cartridge boxes, five caps, five pairs of black trousers, five gown pieces and five shawls (Cottrell, 1984).

From 1840 to 1845 Maxwell leased out the land to James Moncur. The southern end of the island was later purchased by James Williamson and Thomas Crummer in 1845. Norfolk Pines were planted on the island during this time in the Home Bay area (Figure 6.21) (MRT, n.d.). In March 1857 the whole island was granted to Robert Graham. Davidson (1978) writes that during this time, the island was predominantly covered in light scrub and native grasses, with small remnants of coastal forest on parts of the island furthest from Rangitoto. With the advent of European purchase and farming, the landscape (like much of New Zealand) was transformed into one dominated by pastoral grasses. While Graham was owner of Motutapu, he laid down 1,200 acres (486 hectares) of grass in just one year (Cottrell, 1984). Graham also imported pedigree sheep and cattle (which won farming prizes), deer, emus, buffaloes, hares, wallabies, quail, water fowls and pheasants (Cottrell, 1984).

In late 1869 the three Reid brothers, William, and the younger twins, James and John, purchased the island from Graham for £8000 and the family retained ownership for nearly 75 years until 1943 when it was purchased by the Public Works Department (Bathgate, 2011). The brothers were from a family of farmers from Lanarkshire, near Glasgow in Scotland. Once they purchased the island they set about fencing and clearing scrub from the island (Cottrell, 1984). The island became a favourite spot for holiday-makers and picnickers. The
most important social occasion was the Manchester Unity of Oddfellows Premier Picnic, held in February each year, which regularly attracted over 10,000 visitors to the island from as far away as Hamilton, Paeroa, Warkworth and Thames (Cottrell, 1984). In 1903 ten steamers were used for the Premier Picnic, transporting 12,000 to 14,000 people to and from Home Bay on Motutapu (Cottrell, 1984).

A homestead was built by James Reid at Emu Bay around 1869/70 and was lived in until 1901. The homestead, which was in a poor state, was demolished in 1976 by the DLS – around the same time as baches on Rangitoto were being demolished (Dodd, 2007). The site has the remains of four building foundations as well as plantings from the time (Dodd, 2007). Another homestead and a number of outbuildings were also built at Home Bay from the 1840s (Dodd, 2007; Hames Sharley, 1997). William Reid died in 1870, John Reid died on 21 July 1899, and the last of the Reid brothers, James, died in 1908. James Reid (aged 63) had married Eliza Craig (aged 20), the daughter of the Motutapu farm manager John Craig, in 1900. The present Reid homestead at Home Bay was built in 1901 after their marriage (Figure 6.7; 6.21) (Hames Sharley, 1997). Eliza Reid continued living in the homestead until her death in 1942. Both James and Eliza Reid are buried on a hill behind Home Bay, in a half-acre section which is still in the ownership of the Reid family (Figure 6.21) (Hames Sharley, 1997).
6.1.3. World War II military sites

In June 1933 the Government decided to extend Auckland’s coastal defences with the installation of a new battery on the north-west coast of Motutapu as part of a nationwide army modernisation programme (MRT, n.d.). The Motutapu battery was the first substantial expression of government anxiety at growing tensions in Europe and Asia and was New Zealand’s first counter-bombardment battery (NZHPT, 2000). In April 1936 work began on the construction of gun emplacements, associated buildings, and access roads (Hames Sharley, 1997). It is claimed that in 1938 Sir Ernest Marsden (who split the atom with Ernest Rutherford) carried out top secret radar experiments (shore to sea, shore to air radar tracking systems) on the island (Bathgate, 2011; MRT, n.d.). The battery was built following British designs and a British Army Royal Engineers Officer was sent to New Zealand to supervise the work. The establishment was later enlarged between 1940 and 1942 to become the country’s largest battery installation (NZHPT, 2000). Over £500,000 was spent on construction during the war period, and the island accommodated up to 1000 personnel (Dodd, 2008a). By 1938 all guns were in place. New Zealand entered the war on 3 September 1939, and the next day the Motutapu battery was manned with a skeleton crew. A tent camp was initially set up at Administration Bay until permanent accommodation for approximately 160 men of the battery staff was completed in 1940 (Hames Sharley, 1997).

In December 1941 Pearl Harbour, Hawaii, was attacked by the Japanese army. This greatly heightened the threat of attack on Auckland and New Zealand. From 1942 to early 1943 an attack from the Japanese seemed imminent. Evacuation plans were prepared and air raid drills were held regularly in schools (MRT, n.d.). In January 1942 3.7 inch howitzer guns were set up on the island. These had the ability to fire on the main landing beaches. Also during this time, barbed wire was laid along all the main landing beaches and pillboxes (low-roofed concrete emplacement structures) were built to guard batteries and adjacent gullies. In January 1943 Auckland was identified as a fall-back launch point for a United States (US) invasion of the Pacific, and Motutapu was selected as their base (Dodd, 2008a). Two projects were completed on Motutapu for the US Navy: a magazine farm and camp at the head of Islington Bay, and a large ammunition store at Home Bay (Hames Sharley, 1997).

In August 1943 the US and Allied troops retook Georgia and the Solomon Islands and the threat of attack subsided (DOC, 1996b; MRT, n.d.). The infantry left the island in late 1943 and the battery closed in February 1944. The war ended in 1945 and within five years the
Motutapu battery complex had been abandoned. In 1944 the barbed wire from the coast was removed and all of buildings were dismantled apart from the mine base, HMNZS Emu (an Anti Submarine Fixed Defence Station) and the artillery camp in Administration Bay (DOC, 1996b). The remaining personnel left in September 1946. The camp at Administration Bay continued to be used by the territorial force until the early 1960s (DOC, 1996b; Dodd, 2007). The gun cannons were removed and melted down for their metal around 1962, leaving only their foundations (Figure 6.8) (DOC, 1996b).

Figure 6.8 Three large gun emplacements on northern-central Motutapu (MRT, n.d.).

The artillery camp barracks at Administration Bay (northeast Motutapu) were decommissioned and handed over to be utilised as an outdoor education camp in 1966. The Motutapu Outdoor Education Camp Trust (MOEC) was formed in 1991 and is the current concession-holder of the camp. Four barrack-style dorms form the hub of the camp, housing up to 184 people (Figure 6.9). Another building closer to the beach, the former Officers’ Quarters, is also used by the MRT for the “Big Weekender” (formerly “Make a Weekend of it!”) experience (Figure 6.10). During this programme, a group of up to 35 people is met at Rangitoto wharf by a MRT volunteer on a Saturday morning and then taken on a guided walk over Rangitoto and Motutapu to Administration Bay (approximately four hours). There the group can visit the museum to learn about the history of the island, use the outdoor education camp facilities, and be taken on a tour of the World War II gun emplacements and structures. The group then stays overnight at the camp before participating in tree-planting on the Sunday with other volunteers. The programme is offered around four times a year.
Figure 6.9 The Administration Bay camp. The photograph shows the four barracks (dorms) on the right and with the resource room at the end (2010).

Figure 6.10 The former Officers’ Quarters at Administration Bay (2010).
Dodd (2008a: 7-8) describes the present-day World War II military landscape as being ‘largely intact’, including ‘the main 6-inch gun emplacement with three gun pits [Figures 6.8 and 6.11], underground magazines, shelters and stores [Figure 6.12]; the battery observation post, engine and radar rooms [Figure 6.13]; the Emu observation post and engine room for the anti-submarine defences; the ground level plotting complex with miniature range, plotting and generator rooms; the underground plotting complex with command exchange, radio, plotting generator, battery and fuel rooms, as well as access tunnels and corridors; the search light emplacements and directing station; personnel camps at Administration Bay and the battery; the US Navy magazines north of the causeway and store at Home Bay; and numerous pillboxes to protect the battery from a commando assault [Figure 6.14, 6.15].’ The MOEC buildings have been preserved in their original design but have also been upgraded to make them more comfortable and safe for those using the accommodation (MOEC, n.d.). As Dave Veart (interview 2/6/2010) points out, the military landscape is significant because: “It connects the place to world events. I mean Motutapu and the military stuff on Rangitoto is all Second World War and it connects the island to the enormous global event.”

Figure 6.11 The inside of the nearest gun emplacement of Figure 6.8 (2009).
Figure 6.12 An underground store from the World War II military installations (2012).

Figure 6.13 Engine and Radar rooms on Motutapu which had been disguised as farming shed during World War II (2009).
Figure 6.14 A pillbox next to plantings (2010). Pillboxes had a view to the sea and were used to guard batteries and adjacent gullies.

Figure 6.15 A view of the top of the pillbox showing the view over the trees towards the coast (photo: John Eccleton, 2008).
6.1.4. The Motutapu farm

Despite the use of the island for defence purposes, farming on Motutapu continued throughout the war period. Like other islands in the Hauraki Gulf, in 1943 the island was purchased by the Public Works Department and began to be farmed by the Land Development Department, part of the DLS. Mr E. Bull was appointed the first permanent farm manager for the Crown and he and his family took up residence in the former Reid homestead at Home Bay (Cottrell, 1984). The Reid Homestead remained in almost constant use as the farm manager’s home from 1943 until 1990 (Hames Sharley, 1997).

The Land Development Department continued to farm the island until July 1966. On this date the island was designated as a Recreation Reserve and became part of the Hauraki Gulf Maritime Park. Management of the farm was transferred to the Superintendent of Land Development in Whangarei. During this time, the Motutapu farm was profitable and significantly contributed to the income of the Hauraki Gulf Maritime Park Board. In order to minimise interference with farming, members of the public only had limited access to the island; however, in 1969 the public was given permission to visit all beach areas and to some specific areas of foreshore which had been fenced off (Hames Sharley, 1997). In July 1980 farming management was transferred to the Commissioner of Crown Lands in Auckland. After 1984 the Reid Homestead was lived in by Ken Hart, a general farmer on Motutapu and then by Roger Keyworth, a Maritime Park Board carpenter, and his family (Hames Sharley, 1997). From August 1990 DOC pest eradicators (primarily possum hunters) lived in the house for around ten years until the MRT began restoring the Reid Homestead in early 2008.

In 1987, as part of a nation-wide government restructuring, all farmland once managed by DLS was split into DOC and Landcorp. DOC became the landlord and Landcorp became the tenant. However, this arrangement was not successful and Landcorp exited all its DOC leases in 1992. On Motutapu, the lease was put out to public tender which was won by Rick Braddock who has managed the Motutapu farm ever since. Although there are many logistical problems of transporting animals and machinery to and from the island, Motutapu is large enough to be profitable. Braddock saw Motutapu as an opportunity to demonstrate sustainable farming practice in partnership with conservation (MRT, n.d.). He commented: “I think whoever farms that island, assuming that pastoral farming continues, needs to be fully supportive of and almost passionate about all of those other attributes [archaeology, World War II sites, ecological restoration] because they are probably even more important than the
pastoral farm side of things” (Rick Braddock interview, 21/9/2010). On the MRT website, Braddock comments on the way farming and ecological restoration can co-exist ‘without conflict’ (MRT, n.d.). He states that the tree-planting helps to prevent erosion of the land, creates shelter belts for the stock, and helps to off-set the methane produced by sheep and cattle. Braddock claims the farm to be the very first and only pest free and carbon neutral farm in the world (MRT, n.d.; Robinson, 2008). Braddock also explains how the farm also works in harmony with cultural heritage preservation. He states that pastoral farming is acknowledged as a suitable way to protect archaeological sites from being taken over by other vegetation and to keep archaeological sites visible. He further argues that farming is a suitable medium for visitors to view the World War II landscape features, and also emphasises that:

“[Pastoral farming] is as much about our culture as a lot of things are. People tend to forget that. Because it is the existing use out there they think we have got to change everything… Isn’t farming part of our culture and part of our heritage and part of what we are? … We are becoming disassociated with our rural heritage and background.”

He further explains that in a small package, Motutapu can be seen to be quintessential New Zealand:

“I think Motutapu is the New Zealand brand. It epitomises most things about New Zealand. You have got Māori history. You have got a volcano [Rangitoto]. You have got New Zealand pastoral farming. You have got military occupation. And you are sitting in the Hauraki Gulf which is pretty well known for the islands and the sailing (…) So if you wrap all that up into one and you are asked to define what your view of New Zealand was you would probably mention those five points.”

6.2. THE MOTUTAPU RESTORATION DEBATE

Prior to Braddock’s tenure and the formation of MRT, both the natural heritage and cultural heritage of Motutapu was in a poor state. By the late 1980s the island was infested with invasive weeds and mammalian pests, such as possums and wallabies that were threatening farming activities and remaining bush remnants (Campbell, 2006). The historic farm buildings, military features and the Home Bay wharf were abandoned and were decaying. The visiting public had fallen in number, discouraged by diminished access, facilities and safety (Campbell, 2006). It was out of concern for the diminished state of the island that ideas were voiced by academics and environmentalists to ecologically restore Motutapu along the same lines as Tiritiri Matangi Island (Gardener, 1993).
As a first step, in 1990 a 1080 poison blitz (aerial dropping of poison), financed by a $50,000 donation from the Auckland Central Rotary (Baskett, 1996), was carried out by DOC on Motutapu and Rangitoto to rid the islands of possums and wallabies (Smitheram, 1992; Stickly, 1990). The second step was the creation of a conservation vision for the island. In late 1991 John Craig, Neil Mitchell and Craig Miller of the University of Auckland’s Centre for Conservation Biology produced a plan to ecologically restore both Motutapu and Rangitoto, written up in an article three years later (Miller, Craig & Mitchell, 1994). They believed a programme of pest eradication and revegetation of the island, coupled with open public access and interpretation, would create the best example of an island open sanctuary in the world. They argued that together the islands formed the single largest island area from which mammalian pests could be eradicated in New Zealand and that the islands were isolated enough to prevent large-scale reinvasion of pests. In addition, because the islands were geologically and physically diverse, a vast array of habitats, ecosystems and species could be sustained. They explained that all vegetation planted would have to be of species known to have been on Motutapu or raised from seed collected on the island or neighbouring islands such as Waiheke (Gardener, 1993). They called for New Zealand to maintain its status as a country with innovative and ambitious conservation practices and take up this conservation vision for Rangitoto and Motutapu in order to protect and conserve the native habitats and threatened species of New Zealand. The plan was to plant two-thirds of Motutapu in native vegetation and gradually (re)introduce native species, particularly birds. In the wake of this proposal, volunteer tree-planting projects were established. The World Wide Fund for Nature New Zealand sponsored the establishment of a native plant nursery to provide trees for the revegetation. The nursery was opened in March 1992 by the Duke of Edinburgh Prince Philip who was the International President of the World Wide Fund for Nature at the time (DOC, 1992).

Whilst tree planting was being publically applauded, the plan raised alarm in archaeological circles. The revegetation of Motutapu was discussed a month after Prince Philip’s visit at the annual NZAA conference. Key concerns expressed were that archaeologists had not been consulted and that the significant archaeological landscape of the island could be destroyed or obscured as a result of tree-planting. The conference sent a combined letter expressing their apprehension of the plan to both DOC and the World Wildlife Fund for Nature (Gardener, 1993).
An example of such concern was that the proposed plan indicated that, to preserve sites, tree planting would avoid archaeological or military sites, but would be planted in close proximity to the site. The issue raised by archaeologists and cultural heritage managers was that sites would lose their historical context and be cut off from their wider landscape. For example, World War II pillboxes were built in places with wide views to guard from impending commando assaults. But, as a result of tree-planting in 1992, a former pillbox close to Home Bay is now completely surrounded by trees and visitors are unable to physically visualise how the site was once used – unless they climb up on to the top of the pillbox (Figure 6.14; 6.15). With trees nearby historical sites, there was also the concern that seedlings could damage or obscure sites with their roots and foliage.

In June 1992 DOC released a working plan for the revegetation of Motutapu based on the plan from the University of Auckland’s Centre for Conservation Biology. The plan provoked numerous submissions to DOC from cultural heritage managers (particularly archaeologists) and members of the public. Their key concern was for the cultural heritage values of the island to be given higher priority (Dodd, 2007). Archaeologists Irwin, Ladefoged and Wallace (1996: 254) explained that the plan ‘maximised natural history values, of the island, of which little remained, and minimised the cultural heritage values of the island, of which much remained.’ The New Zealand ICOMOS believed the plan clashed with the Recreation Reserve classification of the island, and the NZHPT called for more consultation with archaeologists (Gardener, 1993). Professor Geoff Irwin (interview 20/9/2010), an archaeologist from the Anthropology Department at the University of Auckland, explains his reaction to the plan at the time:

“My reaction at the time when it happened was while being sympathetic to the natural thing, it seemed to us [archaeologists] that there weren’t many natural values left, but there were certainly a lot of cultural ones… It was much more of a cultural heritage situation than a natural one. But of course the natural scientists had a pretty compelling reason for using the island as a lifeboat for endangered birds.”

Graeme Murdoch (interview, 10/9/2010) was part of the Auckland Conservation Board at the time the working plan was released:

“Well I was on the Board in the middle of it… As a Board we took part in planting the first trees… I was a bit disturbed by what was driving it. When I looked around the region and thought of the buffers and the corridors that could be planted. I wondered why people wanted to plant it so much.”
As a result of these submissions, the Auckland Conservation Board recommended wider public consultation and participation to assist with preparing a revised plan. DOC began a series of consultations, meeting separately with stakeholders. Tensions were high:

“We set about writing a working plan for Motutapu and ran head-on to the most vicious internal debate led by the archaeologists who then using their networks of the Historic Places Trust created this huge bloody issue around whether the conservation values at Motutapu were natural or historic. And f***! Did we have some public meetings! There was shouting… It was a very excited issue” (Anonymous).

Gardener (1993: 36) wrote that these private meetings generated ‘confusion and suspicion’ amongst the interested parties. As a result, the Auckland Conservation Board decided to convene a public workshop between DOC and all stakeholders (Gardener, 1993). The meeting was held in March 1993 at the University of Auckland and was chaired by Jim Holdaway, a member of the Conservation Board. Because of their historical associations with Motutapu, Ngai Tai were invited to the meeting, but they declined to come as they thought the workshop was not the right forum for their concerns (Gardener, 1993).

Graeme Campbell began the meeting by explaining DOC’s goal to revegetate the island through community involvement. He stated that the meeting was a way to bring together people of ‘two apparently irreconcilable concerns: cultural and biological conservation’ (Gardener, 1993: 37). John Craig then spoke of the original plan put forward in 1991 and explained that the goal was to create a functioning ecosystem and not simply an educational showpiece. Janet Davidson emphasised the cultural heritage perspective by explaining that the revegetation of the island would not restore a past landscape but would rather alter an important cultural landscape. Geoff Irwin (interview 20/9/2010), recalls that:

“there was an airing of views. It was a bit spirited at times. I don’t know whether you would call it acrimonious… It was an opportunity for people to sound off. As I remember it began with the plan: ‘We are going to cover the island with forest so we can put the birds back on’ and the archaeologists were saying: ‘You jolly well can’t!’ So it was a debate I think and a protest.”

Janet Davidson (interview, 16/8/2010) remembers having “a sort of snarling match with some of the revegetators,” whilst Garry Law (interview, 9/9/2010), a former staff member of the ARC with an archaeological background recalls:

“That was the one where I said I can pull the trees out faster than you can plant them. Which is fairly heated for me! And I haven’t [pulled out the trees]… I do remember several people got heated.”
The meeting broke into small discussion groups to each formulate working plan objectives to present back to the wider group. Each group consisted of a mix of people from different backgrounds, such as archaeologists and ecologists. Gardener (1993) writes that the results from “group five” caught everyone’s attention. John Craig, the speaker for the group, explained that their discussions began with a heated confrontation between the archaeologists and the biologists. However, he then suggested that they all go 50/50. In other words, he recommended finding an equal balance between the conservation of cultural heritage and natural heritage. Gardener (1993) writes that this suggestion lessoned the confrontation and argument and meant their group could work together to come up with a common goal which reflected both of their perspectives. The goal the group conceived was to ‘protect and enhance most archaeological sites while providing sufficient habitat to accommodate threatened species’ (Gardener, 1993: 37). The island would therefore feature cultural heritage complemented by native fauna and flora: the two could co-exist. This goal, including a pest and weed eradication programme and an invitation for iwi to participate in the plan, was adopted by the meeting.

After the meeting, a comment was made that: ‘After all, the left and the right hand are both part of the same body’ (Gardener, 1993: 37). This suggests recognition that natural and cultural heritage are both part of the same thing – the heritage of the island – the inheritance of future generations. By the end of the meeting archaeologists and biologists were much more willing to interact together and discussed the planting of flora which would have been around when Māori were on the island. There was recognition that cultural heritage mattered on the island, as illustrated in the following quotes:

“I think people were just quite shocked that there was that reaction [from the archaeologists] and went away to think about it… The proponents were a bit shocked. They thought that it was a lovely project and they thought they would get approval. But they didn’t. I can certainly recall their faces looking like ‘gosh we have got to go away and rethink things’” (Garry Law, interview, 9/9/2010)

“I suspect the people that were putting up the proposals to revegetate Motutapu initially were not aware of the high archaeological values and to a certain extent the reaction they would get from the archaeologists” (Bruce Hayward, interview, 17/6/2010; a former archaeologist and member of the Auckland Conservation Board).

After the meeting of the stakeholders in 1993, archaeologists had much more input into the subsequent restoration plan. Both sides became aware of each other’s perspectives:
ecologists learnt of the significance of the archaeological landscape, and archaeologists learnt of the ecological potential of the island as a habitat for native flora and fauna.

On the 16th of February 1994 the Motutapu Restoration Trust (MRT) was established to lead the restoration and enhancement of the natural and cultural heritage of Motutapu. A working plan was prepared by the DOC Auckland Conservancy in consultation with stakeholders and it was endorsed by the Auckland Conservation Board on 31 August 1994 (DOC, 1994). This plan was much more balanced than the original 1992 plan, showing clearly the change in opinion and attitude as a result of the earlier submissions, consultations with stakeholders, and the public workshop. The revised plan recognised the need to make the ‘cultural and historical values’ of Motutapu the ‘primary objective of management’ (DOC, 1994: 2). The plan provided practical guidance on how to implement this integrated conservation programme, including requiring archaeological surveys and site investigation before any planting is undertaken. The postmodern constructivist notion of the island as a “cultural landscape” is heavily emphasised in the plan, taking precedence over the ‘opportunity for ecological restoration’ (DOC, 1994: 6, emphasis added). The objectives of the original 1992 plan were shifted around in the 1994 plan so the cultural heritage aspects came first (DOC, 1994: 4):

- Motutapu is an historic and cultural landscape of high integrity and the primary goal of management will be its protection and enhancement
- Together with Rangitoto, Motutapu represents an unrivalled opportunity for ecological restoration close to a metropolitan centre which can contribute significantly to threatened species survival in New Zealand
- The restoration programme represents a unique opportunity for the community to participate in conservation programmes

There were also additional cultural heritage references in the 1994 plan, with research from archaeologist Janet Davidson and DOC historic heritage manager Dave Veart added to the references. The 1994 plan is seen in the MRT’s goals and objectives (Table 6.1).
Table 6.1 The MRT’s visions and aims (MRT, n.d.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Our vision is to restore the natural and cultural landscapes of Motutapu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The natural landscape similar to that which existed on Motutapu after the Rangitoto eruption around 600 years ago.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The cultural landscape handed down by Māori, early settlers, farming and the military.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We aim to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Restore native ecosystems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Replant several hundred hectares in native forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Collect and propagate seeds from indigenous plant stock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Protect the growing volunteer forest from plant pests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• See the removal of the seven remaining animal pests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Re-introduce threatened species of plants, birds, reptiles and invertebrates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide opportunities for volunteers to experience hands on conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Encourage links with the wider Auckland community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Protect and maintain the WWII gun emplacements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Restore appropriate military sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop the restored Reid Homestead as a volunteer base and a visitor centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Re-establish Māori links with Motutapu through cultural activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Protect and interpret the archaeological sites on the island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Facilitate life-long learning for all ages</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the MRT visions and aims show, there was a strong effort to enhance, protect and preserve both the natural heritage and the cultural heritage of the island, as Mary Flaws, a member of the MRT (interview 14/9/2010), explains:

“I know that it was designed to be balanced. So it was ecological restoration and cultural landscape restoration. It is a long-term plan… It was to be inclusive and have participation by iwi… I think the plan set some very good objectives… As I say it was meant to be balanced and holistic.”

Translating this vision into actuality is, however, more difficult. As highlighted with some examples in Chapter 3, in general, the (often nature conservation) interests of members of the community trust and volunteers greatly influence what the core activity of the community
trust is (Bade, 2008). As Mary Flaws also explains, tension arises over where the MRT should direct its energy:

“Some would say that the core business was raising the plants and getting them in the ground to create a habitat for birds. Others think that the cultural landscape restoration is equally as important as the planting.”

The bias towards natural heritage is expressed symbolically. The logo of the MRT (Figure 6.16) is centred on a bird (tui) and plants, and whilst there are Māori motifs (koru, spiral shapes based on the shape of a new unfurling fern), there is nothing symbolising other cultural heritage, such as the archaeological sites, military history or the farm.

Figure 6.16 The MRT logo (MRT, n.d.). Note the lack of symbols relating to archaeology, military history or the farm.

A major issue in the aim to conserve both natural and cultural heritage of the island is the management of historical exotic trees. Historical trees refer to trees associated with earlier uses of the island. However, because they are exotic, they are in direct opposition to the ecological restoration of the island to a native habitat. Historical trees can be treated as exotic weeds. The most significant influence on ecological restoration of Motutapu is the biodiversity value of adjoining Rangitoto. According to DOC, because the two islands are linked by a causeway and mudflats at low tide, the two islands must have the same biodiversity goals, such as the removal of mammalian pests and invasive weeds. As one former staff member of DOC remarked, DOC is “managing Motutapu for Rangitoto.”
The threat of invasive exotic plants on Motutapu (and Rangitoto) is taken seriously because such plants could put the ecological restoration of the islands in jeopardy:

“There is definitely pressure to remove historic [significant and old] plants, if they are historic, that are spreading. Especially if it costs [a lot]. The weed budget on Rangitoto is in the hundreds and thousands of dollars. It causes people who are spending that much money difficulty if the source is still there. Some of these plants will disperse kilometres quite easily… Most of the tensions are with historic species that are very invasive and are potentially very expensive to manage” (David Havell (interview, 26/5/2010).

At Home Bay there are two large Morton Bay Fig trees and a single large Port Jackson Fig tree, which were planted when the Reid Homestead was constructed (Figure 6.21). Removing the trees would mean the source of the seedlings which had been spreading from the area would be removed. However, cutting down the trees would also completely alter the historical context and character of the Reid Homestead and Home Bay area. It would also remove significant visual markers of the area. For example, historians and cultural heritage managers often find such trees useful for establishing the location of sites from old photographs. Phillip Brown (interview, 4/6/2010) thought “for the amount of trouble they are causing, which isn’t a lot, that is a really poor trade-off.” As a way to resolve this issue it was decided that the trees behind the Home Bay area would be removed. These trees are progeny of the original trees but not associated with the Reid homestead. A compromise was therefore reached whereby these trees, which had been spreading prodigy around the area, were removed, but the original trees were retained. This kind of on-going management is common with historical trees in areas being ecologically restored – the original trees are often left, while the seedlings of the originals are continually removed (Bade, 2010).

6.2.1. Achievements of the MRT

The MRT is working hard to achieve its stated aim and objectives. As can be seen in the website promotion (Table 6.2), they have focussed attention on three areas: ecological restoration, protection and preservation of cultural heritage, and promotion of the Trust’s activities. The slogan of the MRT is “Breathing new life into an ancient landform.” Volunteer involvement is a critical part of the MRT’s achievements. Not only is the MRT entirely run by volunteers, but they also manage other volunteers.
Table 6.2 The MRT achievements as listed on their website (MRT, n.d.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Natural Landscape:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Seen the eradication of possums and wallabies from Rangitoto and Motutapu by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Department of Conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fenced off forest remnants on the coastal fringe and inland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Built a nursery to raise native plants on the island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organised volunteers to plant over 350,000 native trees and plants on hillsides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and wetlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Achieved 70 hectares of planted native forest in 17 years and witnessed native</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plants having grown above seven metres tall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rescued large areas of native forest from invasive weeds including moth plant,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>woolly nightshade and apple of Sodom with an intensive volunteer weed programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Organised two pre-eradication bird surveys by Ornithological Society of New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zealand who recorded 27 native bird species including kereru, NZ dotterel, tui,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grey warbler, variable oyster catcher (all indigenous)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Taken part in two pre-pest eradication reptile surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fenced off 15 hectares of Central Gully to exclude stock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Funded contractors to make the initial assault on moth plant infestation in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Gully</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Celebrated in 2010 the eradication of seven remaining pests - ship rats, Norway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rats, mice, rabbits, hedgehogs, feral cats, and stoats by the Department of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Landscape:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identified and continue to protect archaeological sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Commissioned a conservation plan for the historic military installations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Restored and interpreted some of the many military sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Secured School House which provides a base for volunteers staying on the island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Commissioned a conservation plan for historic Reid Homestead in Home Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Restored the exterior and interior of the Reid homestead as a volunteer base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Upgraded and reopened the wharf at Home Bay to allow scheduled ferry sailings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Overseen the opening of “Walk Motutapu” a network of walking tracks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other achievements:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Built up a data base of more than 1,500 volunteers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Founded the &quot;Friends of Motutapu&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Launched this amazing website <a href="http://www.motutapu.org.nz">www.motutapu.org.nz</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Publish a newsletter twice a year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Publish a monthly emailed eNews to the contacts database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Instigated “THE DUAL Motutapu-Rangitoto Traverse” - an annual multisport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fundraising event - 50 km mountain bike ride, marathon and half marathon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Enjoyed support from a long list of sponsors and trusts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Since the establishment of the MRT over 15 years ago thousands of volunteers have collected seeds, propagated seedlings in the nursery, planted over 400,000 native trees and removed thousands of invasive exotic plants (MRT, n.d.). On Queens Birthday Monday in June 1996 a tree-planting world record was set by the MRT. The aim was to surpass the record for the most trees planted by fewer than 300 people in a day (NZH, 1996). On that day 219 people planted 5500 trees on the slopes and wetland of the 20-hectare Home Bay planting valley and the world record was claimed (Baskett, 1996; NZH, 1996) (Figure 6.17).

A considerable amount of research goes into selecting species to plant on the island which may have been there before human settlement. Selection of species is informed by environmental data from past archaeological investigations, and by sourcing seed from the local area (Dodd, 2007). These procedures ensure the planting is “natural” or “authentic” as possible. To aid this, when planting, volunteers are directed to mix the types of trees they are planting “like nature would do”.
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Figure 6.17 The first “volunteer” forest of Motutapu located at the Home Bay valley (2009).

The MRT runs volunteer days two to three times a month in winter during weekends. Ferries leave from downtown Auckland at 9.15am on Sundays and planting or weeding begins on the island at around 10am. After working for a number of hours volunteers go back to the Reid
Homestead where speeches are made about the achievements of the day, and volunteers are rewarded with a sausage sizzle and a cup of tea in the afternoon before the ferry leaves to take the volunteers back to Auckland at 4pm. Visits by overseas groups or local corporate businesses can also be arranged over the summer period for weed removal and propagating seedlings in the nursery.

On 27 August 2011 Rangitoto and Motutapu were officially declared pest free by DOC. The occasion was marked by the first release of threatened native wildlife on Motutapu: two breeding pairs of takahe and up to 20 tieke (saddleback) (DOC, 2011a). Also in that year the technical committee of the MRT released its 10-year ecological plan and an audit of ecological work was carried out by DOC. On 29 November 2011 two threatened native New Zealand freshwater species were released on Motutapu: 120 redfin bullies (New Zealand’s most colourful native fish) and 120 koura (native crayfish) were released into the stream at Home Bay (DOC, 2011b). In April 2012 stage one of the plant nursery expansion began, funded mainly by the Air New Zealand Environment Trust. Five Coromandel Brown kiwi were (re)introduced to the island in October 2012 and there are plans to release 50 over the next five years (MRT, n.d.).

The MRT has also produced a considerable amount of historical research by volunteers, as shown on the MRT website (MRT, n.d.). There have been two notable historic building restorations: the Reid homestead in 2008 (Figure 6.7) and the red barn at Home Bay (Figure 6.18) (which is over 100 years old according to the MRT) in December 2011. In 2008 the exterior of the Reid Homestead was restored and painted to resemble its early twentieth century appearance, and inside, ceilings, skirting boards and doors were restored. Work was completed by the end of 2008 and the homestead is now being used as a museum, information centre, and base for volunteer tree-planters (Figure 6.7). In March 2011 the fretwork missing from the veranda of the Reid homestead was completely replaced to resemble as closely as possible the original (based on a 1902 photo). Also in that year, in July and August the exterior of the Reid homestead was again painted by volunteers, and in January 2012 the outbuildings and coolstore behind the Reid homestead was painted (Figure 6.19). In October 2011 a footbridge was re-instated across the stream at Home Bay on the site where there had been a footbridge in the early twentieth century (Figure 6.20). During the Auckland heritage festival, held in September/October each year, and during the “Big Weekender” programmes, volunteers provide guided tours around features of the islands history such as the archaeological sites and World War II structures. There are future plans to
interpret farming stories in the Reid homestead, and have more walking tours from Rangitoto to Motutapu (Mary Flaws, pers. com.). The whole Home Bay area is shown in Figure 6.21.

Figure 6.18 The Red Barn at Home Bay which was restored in December 2011 and now used as a base for tree-planting volunteers (2012).

Figure 6.19 The outbuildings behind the Reid Homestead at Home Bay which were restored in January 2012 (2012).
Figure 6.20 The footbridge at Home Bay, which was re-installed in October 2011 on the site of a previous footbridge used in the early twentieth century (Photo: John Eccleton).

Figure 6.21 The Home Bay area with labelled features (Photo provided by John Eccleton).
6.3. CHANGING CONCEPTUALISATIONS OF MOTUTAPU

Since the early 1990s, when the original Motutapu Plan was proposed, there have been calls, particularly from cultural heritage advocates, for the island to be conceptualised as a cultural landscape. This change in thinking is a part of the wider change towards postmodern thinking, explained in Chapter 3. The 1995 Auckland CMS explicitly highlights Motutapu as a “cultural landscape,” stating that the island is of ‘prime importance in discovering and understanding the human history of Auckland’ (DOC, 1995). As with Rangitoto, in the mid-1990s aspects of Motutapu’s cultural heritage were officially recognised or assessed as being significant. The World War II military structures of both Motutapu and Rangitoto were included in the Auckland Conservancy Register of Actively Managed Historic Places in 1996 (DOC, 1996b). Also in that year an architectural consultant group, Hames Sharley, produced an assessment of the historic landscape of Home Bay in 1996. Hames Sharley (1997: 5) stated that the Home Bay area is the ‘most intact evidence of the development of farming by Europeans on Motutapu’ and ‘given the modifications that have occurred to the interior of the Reid homestead, its exterior and its relationship to other structures, historic trees, and the broader Home Bay environment are of primary importance.’ In 1997 Dave Pearson Architects carried out a conservation plan for the military structures and three years later a remedial and maintenance specifications report was made by Salmond Reed (MRT n.d.). On 15 September 2000 the MOEC buildings at Administration Bay were registered as a Category 1 Historic Place under the HPA 1993 (meaning a place with a ‘special or outstanding historical or cultural heritage significance or value’) by Michael Kelly, a heritage consultant (Macready, 2007). In 2003 a heritage assessment of the buildings was carried out by Dave Pearson Architects (MRT, n.d.).

There have been suggestions from cultural heritage managers that the island should be reclassified from being a Recreation Reserve to being a Historic Reserve, to emphasise the island as a cultural landscape. For example, Dodd (2008a) advocates for the reclassification of Motutapu to a Historic Reserve to reflect its primary values as a place of a highly significant archaeological and World War II landscape. This thinking is echoed by David Towns (interview 26/5/2010), of DOC:

“It should probably be categorised as an archaeological or historic site. So that would then make it clear to the people doing the restoration work that they work within the constraints of that kind of classification.”
However, a reclassification of the island has not progressed. The reason given by DOC employees is that a reclassification would take too much time and effort and that there are many cultural heritage laws and guidelines which must be adhered to in any case:

“Basically people think that if we are reasonable enough we can work it out anyway. So what is trying to be done now is to try and work out a plan for Motutapu that enables the restoration trust to conduct its activities in an environment which effectively is a historic site” (David Towns interview 26/5/2010).

It is also much easier to have a farming lease on a Recreation Reserve rather than a Historic Reserve.

6.3.1. An example: the DOC Issues and Options paper of 2005

An example of how the conceptualisations of Motutapu changed between the 1990s and the early 2000s is provided by a 2005 DOC discussion paper. In February 2005 Rebecca Rush of DOC circulated a discussion document to key stakeholders of Motutapu (Motutapu Farms Limited, MRT, RIHCT, MOEC Trust, NZAA, and the University of Auckland) in an attempt to identify shared visions and outcomes for Motutapu until 2015 (Rush, 2005). Iwi and natural heritage managers were not (or refused to be) consulted in Rush’s (2005) paper. Stakeholders were asked to comment on 12 conservation issues and options to resolve them. These included what proportion of the island should be planted, what cultural heritage should be preserved and restored, and how iwi should be involved in the project. The submissions from the stakeholders illustrate clearly the desire to manage the natural and cultural heritage of Motutapu in balance. For example, Davidson (2005: 1) wrote that ‘Motutapu has the potential to offer a unique world-class experience to both New Zealand and overseas visitors by striking a careful balance between natural and historic heritage and providing high quality interpretation of both.’ Geoff Irwin (2005: 3), from the University of Auckland, stated that a ‘balance of cultural and natural conservation resource values should be found.’ Likewise, Garry Law (2005: 6), representing the NZAA, remarked that he wanted the island to be managed in a way that ‘emphasises experiencing its natural and [cultural] heritage values.’

In the submissions, archaeologists repeated calls from the 1990s to preserve archaeology in the face of ecological restoration. Law (2005: 2) welcomed the new emphasis of the document on cultural heritage: ‘the recent past has seen an emphasis on vegetation restoration which in my view has been quite unbalanced.’ He highlighted the high significance of the heritage landscape of the island and stated that ‘the complete revegetation which seems to have been the objective of some is not compatible with protecting this’ (Law, 2005: 2).
Similarly, Davidson (2005: 1) stated that it would be a ‘tragedy to sacrifice the historic heritage values by turning the island into merely another revegetated flora and fauna attraction.’

In terms of the management of natural heritage values, all stakeholders involved in the paper supported the option to continue with the 1994 MRT Working Plan of the island which aimed to increase the proportion of indigenous forest on the island to about one third of the island’s area while maintaining most of the island as a farm. Law (2005: 3) remarked that there was ‘no magic number for the proportions of grass and revegetation,’ but rather a matter of defining what areas should be retained in grass or revegetated. Irwin (2005: 2) stated that an initial proposal to have a band of forest around the coast with a farm concealed in the middle would be a ‘travesty of the historical situation.’ His preferred option was to revegetate about two thirds of the island – for the sake of endangered species – and to retain the rest of the island in pasture in the areas where most archaeological sites are located. Law (2005) commented that negotiating the proportion of land to be planted would require compromises from those advocating the preservation of archaeological sites and those supporting the revegetation of the island. In other words, in order for there to be a balance there would have to be give-and-take from both sides. All stakeholders also supported pest eradication (Rush, 2005).

The passive management of archaeological sites by maintaining farmland over the sites was supported by archaeologists. Law (2005) wrote that the open appearance and wide vistas which farmland provides was a suitable context in which archaeological sites could be situated and experienced by visitors. The stakeholders also supported a representative sample of archaeological sites and military sites being restored and interpreted. The archaeologists did not support the on-site restoration of archaeological sites and instead advocated for interpretation or animated reconstruction. Davidson (2005) writes that, like nature restorations, the reconstruction of archaeological sites is problematic as archaeological evidence is often ambiguous or equivocal. The adaptive reuse of built structures (such as the Reid Homestead and the buildings at Administration Bay) was strongly supported by stakeholders. Irwin (2005) emphasised the importance of the military buildings at Administration Bay.

Stakeholders identified that the interpretation of historic sites was important. Davidson (2005: 1) wrote that for the visitor experience potential of the island to be realised, and for people to
understand and appreciate the values of the island, there would have to be ‘high quality interpretation of historic as well as natural features so that visitors can truly appreciate the unique nature of the island.’ Carefully developed heritage trails with good signage and written material was suggested as suitable methods of interpretation. The “Guns of Motutapu” short documentary, produced by Chris Keenan of the MRT, was also highlighted as a good example of visual interpretation. The documentary outlines the history of the island from pre-European times through to the ecological restoration activities being undertaken by volunteers. It also includes a virtual restoration of the gun emplacements and military sites. Visitors to the island can see the film at the old Reid Homestead at Home Bay, at the Resource Room at Administration Bay, and – during the heritage festival – in one of the bunkers close to the three large gun emplacements.

There was significant support for cultural aspirations of iwi to be built in to the Motutapu programme (Rush, 2005). The stakeholders of the paper suggested there was opportunity for more interpretation at Māori sites, the development of Māori farming practices, and the installation of a sculptured gateway. However, Ngai Tai, who claim tangata whenua of Motutapu, has not been involved in MRT activities for a number of years for reasons explained in the next section.

6.4. ONGOING TENSIONS

Although Motutapu is now, in the main, considered as a cultural landscape, there are still ongoing tensions regarding the management of cultural heritage on the island. Like on Rangitoto, on Motutapu there are still conflicting views regarding the place of cultural heritage on the island. As explained in Chapter 3, in island restoration contexts, historic sites are often viewed as an obstacle or impediment to the goal of ecological restoration. Archaeologists and cultural heritage managers are often seen in a negative light and perceived as being killjoys by environmentalists and ecologists. Archaeologist Andy Dodd (2007: 264) remarks: ‘After all, these days in light of impending climate change it is one’s moral obligation to plant more trees but not to preserve one’s historic heritage.’ In many island ecological restoration contexts to some extent this remark offers some truth. Phillip Brown (interview, 4/6/2010) explained that one day he was showing a member of an organisation around Motutapu when the man suggested to him to cut down the historical Morton Bay figs at Home Bay (Figure 6.21):
“He was saying that we should go down there now and kill those big Morton Bay figs. He goes: ‘Oh you don’t have to be involved, you stay here and tell me where the heribicide is!’... And I was like: ‘Yeah, na. I don’t think so!’ So there are people right out there that are that concerned about [historical trees spreading weeds].”

Equally, there also continue to be views against tree planting in general on Motutapu. These people question why tree-planting is done in the first place when it can harm such important archaeology. They argue that Motutapu could in fact be an island which celebrates only its archaeological landscape. Other islands in the Hauraki Gulf, with less of a significant archaeological, military, or farming landscape, could be planted with trees, leaving the heritage landscape of Motutapu intact.

Although there has been a general moderation of these views as a result of the debates of the 1990s, they nevertheless still persist. In addition, there are concerns about the involvement of Ngai Tai in the management of the island from within and outside the iwi, and the management of tree-planting on the historic landscape of Motutapu.

6.4.1. Ngai Tai concerns

Ngai Tai were originally heavily involved in the MRT programme. In the first few years of the MRT Graeme Campbell worked closely with Emily Karaka from Ngai Tai on plans for traditional Māori plantings on the island, interpretation of Pā sites, and a pou (Māori gateway). Pita Turei of Ngai Tai wrote up plans to base the teaching of waka star-navigation on Motuapu, and had ideas for Matariki (Māori New Year) activities on the island (Mary Flaws, pers. com.). However, after a few years Ngai Tai stopped being active members of the MRT. Interviewees from the MRT spoke of how Ngai Tai have always been invited to participate in activities organised on Motutapu but have chosen not to or even refused to be a part of activities. Rick Braddock (interview, 21/9/2010) explains:

“they have always been welcomed by the Trust. We have had funding available for some of what they wanted to do. If they got their act together… We had funding to build a pou, an entrance.”

Mary Flaws (interview, 14/9/2010) states that the MRT has always had a willingness for Ngai Tai to be involved in the MRT:

“The cultural planting of flax hasn’t happened. I don’t know why. We have tried to give opportunities to Ngai Tai before. Pita Turei had some great ideas for carvings… But it didn’t get finished… We have always tried to work with Ngai Tai in whatever we have done.”
The main reason the iwi has not featured in much activity done by the MRT is because they have an issue with working with a community trust when, according to the Treaty of Waitangi, the management of the island should be between the Crown and the tangata whenua (Ngai Tai). Emily Karaka (interview, 28/9/2010), of Ngai Tai, states that a “pitiful” relationship with DOC began with the establishment of the MRT which

“gradually disseminated us from the Treaty partner, to a stakeholder, to an interest holder, to part of 12 groups… It is time for a Treaty order of DOC… You know. Trolley us out for a karakia, trolley us out to transport this species from there to there. Is that cultural input? No it is not. It is a shocking farce. That is exactly what it is. And it is racism too. It is blatant racism: knowingly doing what they do. Our young people are really pissed off… We are the oldest people in Auckland.”

The Ngai Tai interviewees spoke of their relationship with DOC as, at best, strained. DOC had been launched with expectations of an entirely new, efficient and effective relationship with Māori (Napp, 2007). Under Section 4 of the Act, DOC was to ‘give effect’ to the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi. However, it is arguable whether this has happened (PCE, 1996). Taiepa et al. (1997: 236) write that there has been a ‘lack of trust’ and ‘fundamental reluctance’ to co-manage places with Māori due to Eurocentric approaches and divergent philosophies. Tipa Compain (interview, 13/8/2010) of Ngai Tai explains that the current relationship between Ngai Tai and DOC needs to be reversed: “We should be looking after them and we should be approaching DOC to ask how they want to be involved in the management of those islands.”

Members of the MRT commented that it would be advantageous for the Trust to know exactly what the desires and wishes are of Ngai Tai in terms of the management of their cultural heritage. There have been cases in the past where the MRT have attempted to promote archaeological sites through walking tracks, believing they were doing a good thing for Ngai Tai. However, Ngai Tai have objected to these tracks because they do not want people visiting particular places. Kelly (2000: 132) writes that this issue relates to the differences between the Eurocentric view of archaeological sites, which views these sites as having significance for their ‘potential scientific value, for their physical integrity, or for their impressive dimensions’, and the Māori view which sees ‘significance in terms of the cultural value a place has for individuals, a hapū [sub-tribal group], or an iwi.’ Tipa Compain (interview, 13/8/2010) commented that the archaeological sites “need to be left alone” and managed by iwi with associations with Motutapu. Emily Karaka (interview, 28/9/2010) also supported this statement:
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The best way to manage archaeological sites “is by having kaitiaki [tribal elders] there. By having the natural caretakers there. We are not there and that is the concern. And that is the concern over all archaeological sites. But not having our people involved in the manpower on the ground is really a bone of contention after so many years… We are looking at post-settlement now. We don’t want to be in grievance. We have moved from that. I am exhausted by it!”

Emily Karaka (interview, 28/9/2010) also had some concerns about managing archaeological sites: “The day of conquest is over... It has got to be a living culture, just like the living environment. That was the aim of the Restoration Trust [to breathe new life into the land].” In other words, if visitors are only seeing archaeological sites then they are seeing Māori as an inert culture instead of a living culture in the present day.

As explained earlier, Motutapu is part of a Treaty negotiation settlement. Tipa Compain and Emily Karaka both spoke about the grand aspirations of Ngai Tai regarding Treaty settlement. The primary concern was for Ngai Tai to be reinstated as tangata whenua (people of the land) of the islands:

“The aspirations I guess in the negotiations are to have fee simple title which means basically we have the say on ‘what’, ‘how’, ‘when’ and ‘where’ with respect to the taonga [treasured possessions, such as archaeological sites], and who we engage with to, I guess, support that: might be those councillors, might be the Department of Conservation, could be anybody” (Tipa Compain interview, 13/8/2010).

Tipa Compain (interview, 13/8/2010) explains that Ngai Tai want to be in a position of respect: “We don’t want to be seen as another stakeholder. We are not a stakeholder. We are actually the mana whenua.” This is perhaps the main reason why Ngai Tai did not take part in Rush’s (2005) issues and options paper: Ngai Tai did not want to be seen as merely a stakeholder. Emily Karaka (interview, 28/9/2010) spoke of Motutapu as a symbol expressing the rangatiratanga (chieftainship) of the iwi in the Hauraki Gulf:

“Motutapu is the jewel in the Crown. There is the potential there to reconfirm our rangatiratanga across the Gulf and Auckland... Come the end of next year [2011] you will see the return of Ngai Tai. That is the expectation of Ngai Tai. And I can speak for Ngai Tai.”

As stated in the September 2012 deed of settlement, the Crown will transfer ownership of Motutapu to the Tāmaki Collective, who will then gift the island back to the Crown after a month (Finlayson, 2012). The deed will also allow more of an involvement of iwi in the heritage management of the islands as detailed in Chapter 5.
6.4.2. Managing archaeology and tree-planting

The MRT management of the island recognises the need to manage both cultural heritage and the ecological restoration together. As a result of the debates and discussions of the 1990s, the current management plan of Motutapu acknowledges and emphasises the significance of the cultural heritage of Motutapu. It is acknowledged that planting on, or in the vicinity of, archaeological sites is detrimental to archaeology because trees and their roots can obscure, damage or destroy archaeological features. However, at the same time, leaving pockets of pasture within revegetated land can create “weed islands” which assist exotic weed infestation (Dodd, 2007), and leaving areas unplanted is also in opposition to plans to revegetate as much land as possible to create a large enough habitat for native species. A careful balance is therefore needed to protect and preserve as much archaeology as possible while also achieving the goals of tree-planting on Motutapu.

In areas where tree-planting is being done, historic (archaeological or military) sites are sectioned off and excluded from planting. If an archaeological site is discovered during planting, then planting is ceased and the MRT or DOC is alerted:

“I am aware that the [Motutapu] plan was to avoid impact on our heritage sites. I know there were meetings with archaeologists who felt very strongly on that. I know that that has been always been in the uppermost thought when selecting new areas to plant… If anybody planting encounters midden then we stop and move away. So I think we are learning as we go” (Mary Flaws interview, 14/9/2010).

The plan is to only plant in areas where there are no, very few, or badly damaged archaeological or military sites. Major or intact archaeological sites and military complexes are not to be planted with trees, but are instead left in pasture or planted with shallow-rooting native scrubs or grasses. These areas are then periodically mown in order to exemplify the contours of the archaeological sites and the features of the military sites. In this way, the objectives of planting can be achieved, leaving historic sites intact.

However, there has been some criticism levelled towards this largely reactive approach by Andy Dodd, an archaeologist and former Auckland DOC Historic Heritage Technical Support Officer. He states that ‘infrastructure and planting areas have not been predetermined specifically for the minimization of impact on archaeological areas’ (Dodd, 2007: 263). He calls for archaeologists to be the driving force behind the management of planting on Motutapu, rather than doing reactionary management. He states what the actual driving forces are behind tree-planting:
“Ideally, you would identify a certain number of paddocks where you remain committed to having those in farm and you would plant in areas where there are low archaeological values. In reality, the drivers for which paddocks get planted or not tend to get made on the basis of ease of access, whether it is productive farmland or not, and its proximity to remnant vegetation. The amount of archaeology on those paddocks does not get considered as one of the principal reasons to plant on it or not” (Andy Dodd interview, 21/9/2011).

Dodd (2008a) also calls for a formal Motutapu Conservation Management Plan to be established. He states that that such a plan would enable the archaeological landscape of Motutapu to be managed in a proactive fashion rather than a reactive one in reaction to tree-planting activities. In other words, it would be the archaeologists dictating terms rather than tree-planters. A formal conservation plan would also provide an opportunity for input from Ngai Tai and the NZHPT (Dodd, 2008a). This plan, however, has not yet been established, due to the Treaty settlement not being finalised.

Dodd (2007) has noted that despite the marking out of archaeological site boundaries, some sites have been inadvertently planted and seedlings have had to be removed on Motutapu. There have been issues with tree-planters not being aware of, or not caring, what archaeological sites look like and how significant they are. Rebecca Stanley (interview, 4/10/2010), a natural heritage specialist at ARC, explains that the briefing of volunteer tree-planters will be improved:

“We are going to be working on briefing the public at a planting day a bit better… We need the opportunity to inform planters about the values at a site including the archaeology. We should tell people what we do and why. Not just tell them that they can plant a tree.”

Thus, although there has been an acknowledgement of the significance of Motutapu’s cultural heritage in the face of ecological restoration, there are still issues relating to the procedure for planting in the archaeological landscape.

6.5. CONCLUSION

Clear themes can be drawn from this discussion about the history of Motutapu and the management of its natural and cultural heritage. The first theme is the desire in New Zealand society to “restore” landscapes (particularly islands) back to their “original” state. As stated in Chapter 4, this social movement of doing something for the environment has hugely increased in popularity from the 1990s and relates directly to New Zealand’s image and identity portrayed to the world as being “Clean and Green” and “100% Pure”. To a great
extent Motutapu is being restored more for romantic or redemptive reasons than purely ecological reasons. As highlighted by the thousands of volunteers who have planted trees on various Hauraki Gulf island restoration projects, tree-planting has become a popular recreational activity for Aucklanders (Figure 6.22):

“It has become part of the modern age. I mean New Zealanders, one of their most popular forms of recreation now is to go out and work for an hour, or the keen ones for four hours and plant native trees on public land and their own land… I see it as a very recreational thing” (Graeme Murdoch interview, 10/9/2010).

Figure 6.22 Volunteer tree-planters on Motutapu (2012).

A second theme is the relatively recent wish to acknowledge, protect and preserve cultural heritage such as farming landscapes, military structures and archaeological landscapes. In the past this kind of cultural heritage was not considered significant enough to warrant protection because it was not considered old or worthy enough. The archaeology of the island has been studied in detail since the 1950s but, it was not until the 1990s (when the plan to plant the island with vegetation was put forward) when management of archaeological sites shifted from passive to active, with greater efforts to conserve sites as a consequence of the
ecological restoration project. This reactionary approach is perhaps typical of New Zealand heritage management, especially regarding legislation and practices. It is often the case that in order to preserve and protect archaeology there has to be some kind of threat, such as the development of a building complex or – in the case of Motutapu – the replanting of a landscape.

Third, cultural heritage is presented as old and without associations with the present-day. The archaeological sites, the military sites and the homestead are all considered as reminders of the past, not a “living” feature of the past. Consequently, Māori (whether a result of the structure of heritage management or from a lack of willingness on the part of Māori iwi) currently play little role in the conservation and presentation of the cultural heritage of the island. However, once the Treaty settlement process is complete, Māori should become more engaged in cultural heritage conservation, especially relating to archaeological sites.

The fourth theme is the aspiration to manage both natural heritage and cultural heritage in a suitable balance. The aim of the MRT, MOEC and DOC is to manage the island so that visitors can experience cultural heritage and natural heritage, while ecological restoration is being done. The MRT (2005: 12) writes that it is ‘the combination of both cultural and natural heritage values and landscapes that sets Motutapu apart [from other places].’ The submissions to DOC relating to the Issues and Options paper illustrate this theme well. Although there are still views supporting planting over archaeological sites, in the main, it is now a “travesty” and a “tragedy” to plant the historical landscape of Motutapu.
CHAPTER 7.

Changes and Challenges on Rangitoto and Motutapu

The previous two chapters have illustrated conflicts and difficulties with managing cultural heritage in a “natural” protected area island context in New Zealand. A number of similar themes can be drawn out from both case studies which are characterised by “changes” and “challenges.” The chapter first focuses on the two conflicting points of view which resulted in the conflict and tension regarding both the baches on Rangitoto and the ecological restoration of Motutapu. The second section highlights how conflict and tension was resolved by discussion, negotiation and an evolution in thinking from modernist to postmodernist understandings. The third section explains that in spite of the evolution in thinking, there is still an evident natural heritage bias on both islands, which relate to wider ideas and attitudes towards natural and cultural heritage in New Zealand and internationally.

7.1. TWO CONFLICTING POINTS OF VIEW

It is evident from Chapters 5 and 6 that the retention and preservation of cultural heritage on Rangitoto and Motutapu provoked tension and debate within and between different parties with vested interests in these islands. There is no clear cut dichotomy of perspectives – natural heritage managers versus cultural heritage managers – rather, different parties placed different weighting on or concern for cultural heritage values. Two core points of view (POV), however, can be drawn out: POV 1 – that natural heritage values should take precedence over cultural heritage values on the islands and POV 2 – that there should be greater recognition and conservation of cultural heritage values on the islands. POV 1 has its foundation in modern dualistic thinking and has an environmentalist undertone, whereas POV 2 aligns closely with postmodern constructivist thinking (Figure 7.1).
7.1.1. Point of view 1

Three main threads of argument underpin POV 1. First, cultural heritage on the islands is considered to be insignificant, or at least less significant than the natural heritage values of Rangitoto or potential natural heritage values of Motutapu. Second, as humans have had (and continue to have) such a considerable impact on the environment, advocates for POV 1 argue that it is our duty to create sanctuaries of nature where native species can thrive, even if these may disregard or destroy cultural heritage values of the islands. Third – and linking with the previous argument – there is an argument that the advantages of keeping a place as “natural” as possible or creating a place of nature outweighs the under-acknowledgement or removal of cultural heritage values in these places. For Rangitoto and Motutapu, POV 1 argues that natural heritage should be heavily prioritised over the “insignificant,” “ugly” or “bad” cultural heritage of the islands. This point of view encapsulates a modern dualistic understanding. It views natural heritage and cultural heritage as mutually exclusive, placing them against each other in competition.
7.1.2. Point of view 2

Those with POV 2 have one fundamental argument which follows postmodern lines of thinking: that both Rangitoto and Motutapu are cultural landscapes which have an important human history that needs to be acknowledged, recognised and valued. POV 2 argues that it is illogical to say that a place is “natural” or becoming “natural” because everything has been, and will be, influenced by humans (culture). Everything is, therefore, a cultural landscape: a product of the interaction between people and the environment.

Consequently, this point of view argues that it is unacceptable and unfounded to ignore or remove cultural heritage from a place considered to be “natural” or becoming “natural”. Interviewees with POV 2 explained that it was “dishonest,” “foolish” and “impossible” for there to be a purely natural landscape. They pointed out the irony in considering Rangitoto as natural when the eruption of the island was witnessed by people on neighbouring Motutapu. Rangitoto has therefore never existed outside the influence of culture, making the claim of the island being “natural” (free from human influence) nonsensical. This point of view conflicts with POV 1 as it emphasises the importance of cultural heritage values on the (“natural”) islands. For example, those with POV 2 are directly opposed to the demolition of the baches on Rangitoto for natural heritage conservation reasons, and trees being planted over Motutapu’s significant archaeological landscape to “restore” parts of the island to its “original” state.

Even so, there is still understanding and sympathy towards natural heritage conservation from those with POV 2, especially in regard to Rangitoto due to its volcanic figure and the way vegetation has become established on the loose scoria. Although there is concern about tree-planting on or in close proximity to historic sites on Motutapu, many interviewees with POV 2 are happy with the idea to ecologically restore Motutapu and many also take part in tree-planting and weeding activities on the island: they are proud to be “doing their bit” for native flora and fauna species.

However, where POV 2 differs from POV 1 in this regard is the firm belief that the remnants from the layers of human history on the island – the cultural heritage – should be recognised, protected and not be ignored, while natural heritage conservation continues. In other words, POV 2 supports the notion that there cannot and should not be places of pure nature, and that having both natural heritage and cultural heritage on a landscape enhances the experience for a visitor. This perspective emphasises that one cannot ignore history or pretend something did
not happen: “History isn’t bad or good. It is history” (Sarah Macready interview, 27/5/2010). The general idea underpinning this perspective is that society should acknowledge the actions of people from the past in “natural” areas as it helps each generation fully understand and appreciate the history of the landscape and the interactions between humans and the environment.

7.1.3. Conflict and tension

It is clear that these two different points of view regarding the place of cultural heritage on the islands have resulted in conflict and tension. The Rangitoto baches issue led to letters to the editor of local newspapers; heritage consultant reports; books being published; historical assessments; internal DOC papers; public, local government and government agency backing; and the establishment of community trusts focused on the retention of the baches. Similarly, the planned revegetation of Motutapu generated academic conference meetings; submissions to DOC; public meetings; historical assessments; and internal DOC discussion documents in which concern at the revegetation plan was expressed and support for the conservation of cultural heritage, especially the archaeological landscape, was articulated. Out of these interactions and engagements between, and within, groups actively interested in the management and uses of the islands, has come an evolution in thinking, specifically whereby those with the modern POV 1 have become sympathetic to the postmodern constructivist POV 2.

7.2. CHANGES: AN EVOLUTION IN THINKING

What can be seen in the last 20 years or so on both Rangitoto and Motutapu is a moderation of attitudes towards cultural heritage on these islands from those with POV 1. This change mirrors the increasing acknowledgement and concern over the significance of cultural heritage in protected areas by scholars and those involved in the active heritage management of these areas in New Zealand and around the New World, discussed in Chapters 3 and 4. Instead of being destroyed or ignored, cultural heritage is increasingly retained and taken into account in the management of both islands – there is a significant attempt to achieve a balance between natural and cultural heritage. Like the Rangitoto baches issue, during the 1990s many people who strongly supported the ecological restoration of Motutapu became at least receptive to the idea of promoting the conservation of archaeological and historic
features on Motutapu. Bruce Hayward (interview, 17/6/2010), a former member of the Auckland Conservation Board, illustrates this change in mindset regarding Motutapu:

“Within DOC to a certain extent it was a gradual change in perceptions and values… So now I am an advocate for protecting those [cultural heritage] values alongside the biotic and the geologic heritage values.”

Byrdie Ayres (interview, 12/8/2010), who was an ecologist for DOC, states that over the years she has now changed her understandings about nature and culture and now considers a landscape to be a cultural landscape:

“Since I have left the Department I guess I have been further influenced by landscape architects and other ecologists. And what we think of as ‘pristine’. I mean everything we look at is a cultural landscape. And particularly Motutapu… I think that it would be better thinking that [a landscape] is a continuum and basically you have got to go to some pretty remote places in New Zealand to get a pristine natural indigenous landscape and I don’t even know if you can do it to be honest because the Māori occupied so much and used so much. So I think I come at it from a somewhat different perspective two decades later.”

Similarly, Graeme Campbell (interview, 22/7/2010), the former Auckland Conservator for DOC (1989-1995), explained the change in understanding among those involved in the ecological restoration of Motutapu:

“So quite quickly we moved from this as a nature conservation programme to this as natural and historic and what we are doing is a cultural thing. We are not recreating a natural forest. We are creating a forest which is a cultural expression of something which has got some science behind it.”

It appears that through embracing the cultural landscape approach, something previously “foreign” or “unnatural”, such as a bach or a historical exotic tree, can now be accepted on these islands. The ultimate outcome of these changes in understanding since the 1990s has been the acknowledgement that cultural heritage deserves protection and conservation on the islands. It is now considered inappropriate to plant over archaeological features on Motutapu and to demolish the Rangitoto baches. These attitudes represent a marked change in thinking: from once being ignored, dismissed as insignificant or even removed, these aspects of cultural heritage are now considered to be important and vital to the islands. However, even with this change in thinking, there is still a notable bias towards natural heritage in the management of both islands.
7.3. CHALLENGES: NATURAL HERITAGE BIAS

What is evident on both islands is that it appears to be easier for natural heritage to be managed (in terms of staffing, resourcing, funding, and work done) than cultural heritage. Despite the evolution in thinking acknowledging the significance of the cultural heritage of the islands, why is natural heritage conservation considered to dominate over cultural heritage conservation? The main answer is that although peoples’ individual attitudes might change, there are still ingrained dualistic structures and general attitudes which continue to be detrimental to the conservation of cultural heritage in “natural” protected areas. There are four primary reasons: the nature conservation ethic, islands being seen as conducive to nature conservation, the DOC management “culture,” and a lack of Māori involvement in heritage management. These will now be discussed in turn.

7.3.1. Nature conservation ethic

The case study chapters back up the findings of Chapter 4 that there is a general desire in New Zealand society (and indeed internationally), accentuated by recent movements to generate environmental awareness and live sustainably, to “right the wrongs of the past” and restore forests and help endangered native flora and fauna. Western notions of nature and culture kindle the need for humans to have places which are natural, or at least have more naturalness than other places. Harmon (2007: 381) explains the strong feelings and emotions associated with the impact humans are having on the environment:

[T]he response [to this impact], it would not be too strong to say, is one of anguish. People who care about saving nature tend to care very much; there are few dilettantes among the ranks. Such people feel deeply, even viscerally, distressed at the predicament we have created for the non-human world.

These kinds of feelings are plainly seen with the desire to keep Rangitoto as natural as possible and to ecologically restore Motutapu. The conservation of cultural heritage features, such as baches or archaeological sites, are seen to spoil this ideal.

For example, many interviewees questioned why an aspect of cultural heritage should be protected and conserved when it represented the “damaging” and the “spoiling” of the natural environment:

This attitude “has manifested itself in a continuing kind of tension between the cultural and the natural… There is a cultural issue here. Why do we suddenly say that the cultural elements of society must play this secondary role to nature? … There was
this kind of regret and it has polarised attitudes in relation to nature” (Jeremy Treadwell interview, 14/7/2010).

The baches or quarrying sites on Rangitoto are therefore considered “a dirty facet of our past” or even a “disaster”: “Some people don’t want money spent on a historic structure that is associated [in their minds] with a bad period of history” (Sarah Macready interview, 27/5/2010). Rebecca Stanley (interview, 4/10/2010) also highlights this point: “I could [if I had an ecocentric view] say that everything that we are wanting to protect is just ecological damage from the past and I could say ‘why are we looking after and glorifying damage from the past?’”

As outlined in Chapter 4, natural heritage is central to New Zealand’s identity and tourism image. To a great extent, nature is New Zealand’s cultural heritage, as Gavin McLean (interview, 19/9/2011), senior historian for the History Group of the MCH, explains:

“If you asked a Kiwi [New Zealander] for one cliché phrase about New Zealand it would not be the majesty of the first church in Dunedin, it will be about Mitre Peak [a spectacular mountain in Fiordland, south-west New Zealand]… Mitre Peak is just a great hunk of rock, but we have created all sorts of cultural and intellectual aesthetic associations with that.”

As a result of this strong nature conservation ethic in New Zealand, the recent history of New Zealand is perceived to be insignificant, or even trivial, compared to other areas of the world:

“I think it is because we are a young country… [some] people have the idea that we have very little history here in New Zealand. Because it is not as long a history as in other countries [people] tend to undervalue it” (Sarah Macready interview, 27/5/2010).

David Havell (interview, 26/5/2010) points out how this idea has even become an attitude in heritage management:

“I have definitely heard the opinion that recent colonial and you know nineteenth and twentieth century historic features are barely worth considering in terms of managing historic features.”

Interviewees also spoke of the cultural cringe factor in New Zealand society: the idea that New Zealanders are ashamed or embarrassed to acknowledge history because it does not appear to be as significant as other places, as Susan Yoffe (interview, 14/4/2010), of RIHCT, explains: “We have always had this cultural cringe: ‘New Zealand is so young and we do not have a cultural history and what is worth preserving is not all that extraordinary’. In addition, as explained earlier in this chapter, many of the cultural heritage features of the
islands, such as the earth works of Māori archaeological sites or the baches, were and are often still not considered as important as they are not “elite” heritage, such as grand old buildings or old ancient temples.

7.3.1.1. Nature conservation more worthy, interesting and easier to fund

As previously discussed in Chapter 3, as a result of the nature conservation ethic in society, the attractiveness of natural heritage conservation is much stronger than that for cultural heritage. Often the types of cultural heritage found in the conservation estate are “not a medieval castle by any stretch of the imagination” (Dave Veart interview, 2/6/2010). The cultural heritage features of places held in the conservation estate may therefore not appear interesting to visitors: “People can see a pile of shells [midden site] and think so what?” (Janet Davidson interview, 16/8/2010).

As a consequence, in the New Zealand social context, a dilapidated bach on Rangitoto or a midden site on Motutapu may not have the same kind of emotional appeal as a native forest with flourishing native birdlife. The ecological restoration of Motutapu literally brings natural history to life, making it more exciting and interesting to members of the public:

“Maybe biodiversity captures the imagination of people or people are more willing to go to do tree-planting. Or maybe it’s because it is more accessible to go tree-planting or a walk around Tiri [Tiritiri Matangi Island] to see all the birds than it is to traipse from fire command post to radio command post to pillbox [World War II features]” (Phillip Brown, interview, 4/6/2010).

Digging holes and planting trees, tending to seedlings in the plant nursery, or pulling out and spraying weeds are activities which are seen to be more interesting and rewarding for volunteers as they allow people to “do something for the environment” and “be one with nature”. They are also activities that people of all ages can get involved in and the results can be seen immediately. Much cultural heritage conservation work similarly requires little specialist skill, has immediate results and consists of activities that people of all ages can do, such as painting a building or sanding walls. However, these kinds of activities are undeniably not as popular: the nature conservation ethic is decidedly more popular than an ethic to go out and restore historic buildings. A large – and increasing – number of school, university, community and business groups are continuing to make tree-planting and weeding excursions to Motutapu as well as other islands in the Hauraki Gulf. This is in stark contrast to the numbers doing cultural heritage conservation activities. It is much easier to get volunteers for ecological restoration activities than building restoration work as explained by
Susan Yoffe (interview, 14/4/2010) of RIHCT: “anyone can get a spade, dig a hole and put a plant in but to get volunteers to actually do building work, which is what we do, is much more difficult.” Robert Brassey (interview, 13/4/2010), a former historic heritage employee of DOC, also describes this problem:

“Often people are more motivated by visible quick wins like planting trees. You can go out there and do that and have your sausage sizzle and then come back and see the trees growing up but it is much less attractive to go out and sand down a bach and paint it.”

Because ecological restoration activity is so attractive to the public, it is much more straightforward for community trusts, such as the MRT, to get sponsorship and funding for ecological restorations than projects to restore historic buildings or structures. The MRT has sponsors from a variety of businesses (MRT, n.d.). The businesses willing to invest are often ones wishing to gain an environmentally- or community-friendly image. In addition, there are also carbon credit incentives for businesses investing in environmental projects. Mary Flaws (interview, 14/9/2010) spoke of the difficulties in raising money for cultural heritage for the MRT:

“It seems effort and the supply for funding for ecological restoration is easier to come by than for the historic and heritage fundraising.” [“Why?”] “Well companies are going green and their employees are often asked what they want to do...They might spend a day over there or provide sponsorship. The Council’s funding for [cultural] heritage is not very big at all... Whereas their Coastal Initiative Fund, which can be for ecological purposes, was easier for ecological things... The Historic Places Trust is not well funded so I am not sure that we can go rushing off there to get money... So you have got to really look harder for funding for historic heritage.”

Michael Kelly (interview, 20/9/2011), a heritage consultant, also explains that natural heritage captures the interest of media more than built cultural heritage:

“Natural heritage sucks up a lot of the publicity and cultural heritage is a poor cousin because it does not generate the same kind of interest media-wise... So the argument is that unless there is enough interest, enough generation of support outside then how realistically can cultural heritage compete with natural heritage on the DOC estate.”

Interviewees repeatedly commented on the enormous costs involved in individual cultural heritage projects. For example, a member of DOC explains the impact these costs have on the management of cultural heritage items by DOC:

“The moment it [an aspect of cultural heritage such as a historic structure] comes into Crown land and the Crown owns it, the Crown either has to look after it or demolish it basically. There are very similar issues to lighthouses and we try really hard not to
inherit them because the moment we do inherit them we inherit $100,000 maintenance costs just to keep them standing up.”

There appears to be a feeling from those managing the conservation estate that cultural heritage is an extra cost and is not worth spending thousands of dollars on. This feeling is in complete contrast to natural heritage values which are often seen to be worthy of great expenditure. Individual natural heritage projects, such as the poison drop on Rangitoto and Motutapu, can be equally as expensive but are seen to have a wider, grand or more spectacular impact than the restoration of an old building or structure for instance, which can be considered to be small-scale and mundane. Sarah Macready (interview, 27/5/2010) commented that even the archway to the former men’s toilets (Figure 5.11) on Rangitoto is extremely expensive to maintain:

“It is a nice feature and you want to keep it. We were involved in trying to get some [funds] to keep it going. These things don’t come cheap. You don’t want it sitting there as an eyesore with supports all around it with ‘keep out’ signs. You don’t want to demolish it. Ideally you would want to keep it stable. So there are all those things that people who manage the island have to consider and none of them are easy decisions.”

Susan Yoffe (interview, 14/4/2010) explains that there are also extra costs involved in historic buildings when making them safe for visitors. Occupational Safety and Health (OSH) guidelines are very strict regarding the stability of sites for earthquakes and fire risks.

7.3.1.2. Establishment of community trusts

This nature conservation ethic and desire to restore and conserve New Zealand’s natural heritage has led to the establishment of community trusts which undertake and manage ecological restorations on islands throughout New Zealand. As explained earlier, these kinds of community trusts are often established by people passionate towards natural heritage, meaning the preservation and acknowledgement of cultural heritage can be of secondary importance. David Towns (interview, 26/5/2010), of DOC, commented on the establishment of the MRT: “I think they [the MRT] always intended the restoration to be naturally focussed. But they ended up having a place with high cultural and historic values at the same time.”

DOC is increasingly handing over management of ecological restorations in the conservation estate to community groups. DOC provides some funding support, guidance, and funding, but often community trusts manage most of the project. The main reason for devolving management to voluntary community trusts is because the trusts provide funding, labour and
expertise without cost to the Department. Community trusts are also often run by members of the public who are highly enthusiastic, making it quicker and easier for projects to get underway. Although this may be perceived as cost effective, there are concerns within DOC and from cultural heritage managers about the lack of specialist skills and expertise within community trusts as well as the trusts’ biases and reasons for setting up a trust. Many interviewees from DOC were uneasy about the way the trusts are often left to their own devices regarding the management of cultural heritage and ecological restorations; whilst cultural heritage managers have also expressed concern about both the reliance on and trust given to the community trusts in the management of natural and cultural heritage on the islands:

“They will do what they want to do and if you don’t keep enough control over those sorts of groups and organisations, especially at the start, you can end up with conflicts and not have them focus on historic heritage as well as natural heritage… Unless you keep tight control… a lot of inappropriate work [can be done]” (Robert Brassey interview, 13/4/2010).

A former employee of DOC explains that although there are many positives for having community trusts engaged in cultural heritage conservation, there should be more “best practice guidance provided to the community groups about how to implement [these projects].” By this they mean community trusts may focus on tree-planting or bird releases, and set aside or ignore the cultural heritage values of the place.

Some of this bias stems from the level of public interest in cultural heritage. Dave Veart (interview, 2/6/2010) notes, “people who are interested in trees and birds tend not to have enormous interest in military history [for example].” It appears as if New Zealand society in general knows the importance of saving a species, but not about saving cultural heritage such as a midden site: “People say why save that bunker? Why save that midden? A midden is a rubbish dump! Now why are we saving that?” (Byrdie Ayres interview, 12/8/2010). Vanessa Tanner (interview, 4/10/2010), cultural heritage employee of the ARC, explains difficulties conveying the importance of archaeology to visitors:

“It is really hard when you cannot see it and you are trying to explain the values of it [archaeological site]. It is not good for public interpretation because you cannot interpret it. There is a long way to go in terms of educating people.”

Embedded in these concerns is the emotional connection and the feeling of control that the discrete and bounded characteristics of islands accentuate; evoking spirited responses from stakeholders over how the island should appear and be managed (Bade, 2010; Baldacchino,
2012). As bounded landscapes, all-encompassing ideals for Rangitoto and Motutapu can be easily made and comprehended, thus eliciting a feeling of control and a wish to manage an island in a particular way:

“As you say there is something about islands that are initially attractive. Especially I think in Auckland where boundaries are incredibly amorphous, it is hard to know where the edge of anything is. And there is something quite attractive about something that has a very definite edge and I think it probably makes the whole process of planning a restoration programme easier to conceive of” (Dave Veart interview, 2/6/2010).

Jeremy Treadwell (interview, 14/7/2010) also expresses this point clearly: “Islands themselves, in my view, kind of foster or strengthen any tendencies to construct ideological positions because of their discrete nature.”

As a result, it can be difficult managing different ideas and perspectives on an island: “Managing people on islands is always hard because they end up thinking they own the place” (Graeme Campbell interview, 22/7/2010). Graham Murdoch (interview, 10/9/2010), a historian from the ARC, agrees: “An island is a very nice thing to deal with. It is a discrete place and you can get quite a bit of control over it. You feel like you have got control.” In this way, it is almost natural for different parties with vested interests in an island to propose different and often opposing interpretations of what an island should look like or how it should be managed (Bade, 2010).

To a great extent the concerns from cultural heritage managers about community trusts are justified. However, one must not be overly harsh with the community trusts. These trusts are run by volunteers and without their efforts to a large extent little conservation work of any sort would be happening on the islands. DOC does not have enough staff or funding to carry out the kind of work community trusts are doing. Ecological restoration trust groups emphasise that cultural and natural restorations are a work in progress and that everything cannot be done at once.

7.3.2. Islands as conducive to nature conservation

Islandness is also implicated in the bias towards natural heritage conservation on the islands. As explained in Chapter 1, islandness (the perceived physical characteristics of islands such as separateness, boundedness, isolation and smallness) is conducive for natural heritage conservation activities. In this way, conservation estate islands in New Zealand are considered to be more “natural” and free from major human activity than the mainland
(Atkinson, 1990; McLean & Sharp, 1990). As outlined in Chapter 4, New Zealand’s islands are central to the conservation of New Zealand’s biodiversity: islands are “like a life raft for biodiversity at the moment” (Ewen Cameron, interview, 11/6/2010).

Because of their boundedness, islands are places which can be – if only ideologically – completely pest-free. This notion of complete removal can also be extended to the modern idea of removing traces of past human activity in order for an island to appear natural: islandness accentuates the modern concept of “pureness.” To a great extent, the goal of complete removal of evidence of past human activities could only be performed on islands. Doing these activities on the mainland would not result in the same notion of complete removal due to the boundless and large scale of the mainland. The fact that Rangitoto and Motutapu have been declared pest free highlights the naturalness of the islands and importance of the islands as native habitats.

Thus, despite challenges of access, it is relatively easy to rally public support for island ecological restorations. In contrast, interviewees also commented on the difficulty of doing cultural heritage conservation work “out there” on the islands of Rangitoto and Motutapu compared to natural heritage conservation activities. Sarah Macready (interview, 27/5/2010) explains this point:

“I think being on an island can make it more difficult to restore cultural heritage but easier to preserve natural heritage... [With] any kind of building that needs to be preserved, such as the Mansion House on Kawau, you have got the extra costs of getting the material out there and keeping an eye on the place and running it.”

Elizabeth Andrew (interview, 8/6/2010) explained the difficulties RIHCT has with restoring baches in an island context:

“Time runs slow over there... We thought that we would be able to finish a bach a year and we can’t. Rangitoto runs to its own schedule. You can’t get material there. We are now down to having one working bee a month. It is too cold. When the ferry goes in at 9:30 it comes out again at 3:30 and you have got to travel to your worksite. So it is down to just three hours of work. You can only handle so many volunteers. So our progress is steady and slow in terms of restoring.”

7.3.3. DOC “culture” biasing natural heritage conservation

A third reason for the persisting natural heritage bias on the islands is an evident DOC “culture” which favours natural heritage conservation at the expense of cultural heritage conservation. As explained in Chapter 3 and 4, there have been many criticisms of the
management of cultural heritage by DOC, particularly from the early 2000s (Carrie, 2002; Clayworth, 2008; DOC, 1996a; 2002; 2008; Donaghey, 2001; Warren-Findley 2001; McLean 2002; Nightingale 2004) which are echoed by interviewees. These criticisms of DOC have parallels with similar critiques of protected area management in Australia (Ford, 2009; Lennon, 2000; Lennon et al., 1999); Canada (Malins, 2011); and the USA (Feldman, 2004; Hubbard et al., 2007; Somers, 2003; Toothman, 1987). Many DOC documents (e.g. Clayworth, 2008; DOC, 1996a; 2002; 2008) explicitly state that historic values do not have a high standing in the conservation estate. A briefing to the then new Minister of Conservation, Chris Carter, in 2002, DOC (2002: 16) clearly outlined the problem:

Due to competing demands on limited conservation funding, the maintenance of historic heritage on the public conservation estate has not received the highest priority since the department’s inception, with the bulk of its resources being directed to biodiversity management and visitor facilities. Baseline inspections of historic assets show that the one-off deferred maintenance costs are extremely high. This may not allow the department’s historic asset management plan to be fully implemented, and the condition of some historic heritage will continue to deteriorate.

In the Historic Resources Strategy: Auckland Conservancy it is acknowledged that within areas with primary natural values, there is important cultural heritage (DOC, 1996a). The result, DOC (1996a: 7) states, is that it has ‘fortuitously or intentionally, inherited responsibility for conserving hundreds of places of Māori or European cultural significance, including some virtually unmodified historic places and landscapes that are regionally or nationally rare.’

The primary criticism is that DOC, although having a mandate to protect both the natural and cultural heritage of the conservation estate, focusses primarily on natural heritage. As highlighted above, there is a general mentality, especially from DOC staff, that the conservation estate is primarily for natural heritage and not for cultural heritage. Graham Murdoch (interview, 10/9/2010), who was a former member of the Auckland Conservation Board, commented with dismay about the way DOC appears to have focused more on natural heritage than cultural heritage:

“One of the greatest disappointments for me with DOC. I don’t mean the people. I mean the way it has been implemented by successive governments and so on. Because I think the people in the Department have done a great job. The Department basically implements the Conservation Act and the purpose of the Conservation Act is to promote the conservation of New Zealand’s natural and historic heritage. Not natural heritage and when you feel like it historic. But they have chosen to largely ignore the Act. And they have chosen to focus on natural resources rather than historic. And in
New Zealand sadly we don’t have the equivalent department looking at historic heritage. NZHPT is not a full crown department. It is incredibly under resourced.”

As highlighted in the quote above, and as highlighted in Chapter 4, exacerbating this bias is the fact that DOC is the only governmental entity empowered to conserve threatened wildlife. Therefore, there is often an underlying attitude within DOC that more effort should be put into the conservation of New Zealand’s wildlife as there is no other governmental entity with the same biodiversity responsibilities. In contrast, DOC shares responsibility for cultural heritage management with the NZHPT, which is seen as the main cultural heritage agency (Stephenson, 2005). However, the NZHPT has been criticised for “lacking teeth”: it is an advocacy organisation without statutory powers, is under-resourced, and heavily relies on volunteers (Carrie, 2002; Warren-Findlay, 1998).

Increasingly, DOC’s role is one of providing a wilderness experience for the 100% Pure New Zealand tourism image. Tourists to New Zealand pay for, and expect, a wilderness experience. Bruce Petry (interview, 30/4/2010) explains this point:

“To think New Zealand is 100% Pure is a triumph of marketing over reality… They [DOC] want to simplify a lot of these stories down. And that comes back to tourism and the dumbing down of landscapes for tourist consumption”

This DOC culture of favouring natural heritage has led to continued distaste from cultural heritage managers. Many of the interviewees who were former employees of DOC in the 1990s left DOC because of this strong emphasis on natural heritage. There are three ways the DOC “culture” has manifested: staff backgrounds and associated attitudes, funding priorities, and the Department’s identity.

7.3.3.1. Staff with natural heritage backgrounds

Because DOC was formed from a merger of different departments with predominantly natural heritage focuses (land and wildlife management), interviewees commented that the Department appears to have always favoured natural heritage. As explained in Chapter 4, in the late 1990s, to a great extent because of this apparent bias, the NZHPT removed itself from DOC. Many interviewees with associations to DOC believe this division exacerbated the emphasis towards natural heritage conservation: “Most of the staff come from biodiversity backgrounds, which has a significant impact on how we resource conservation management” (Anonymous). Robert McClean (interview, 20/9/2011), the Senior Heritage Policy Adviser at NZHPT, similarly emphasises how DOC has strayed from its legislative mandate:
“When DOC took over, [there was] a greater emphasis on ecological, natural values. So despite the legislation still providing for recognition of cultural and natural values… in reality the values that have dominated have been ecological.”

One former member of DOC recalled that at one stage he called DOC “DONC” (“the Department of Nature Conservation”) because of the laying-off of historic heritage staff at the Department. Similarly, another anonymous interviewee commented:

“those who work in the heritage part [of DOC] jokingly say that you could find ten people randomly picked on Queen Street with more interest in historic stuff than you can get out of the management of the Department of Conservation, who are largely self-selecting in that their major interest is in the natural as opposed to the cultural. And that tends to colour decisions.”

Interviewees stated that the DOC “culture” has intensified over the years: like has attracted like and consequently, many people who take on DOC jobs are coming from an environmental (rather than historic) management background, resulting in an embedded bias within DOC towards natural heritage. Gavin McLean (interview, 19/9/2011) commented that the senior managers at DOC in the 1980s and 1990s grew up during the environmentalism protest movement of the 1960s and 1970s which greatly influenced their attitudes and values: “they were tree-huggers then and they became tree-huggers with suits.” Anecdotal evidence suggests that people with environmental management backgrounds now comprise much of the senior management of DOC. Cultural (historic) heritage therefore seems to have been outweighed by the number of natural heritage employees. As a result, many DOC staff can have a poor knowledge of cultural heritage management:

“You have got a structure where you have got field staff with no background usually in historic heritage and often they might have no training at all managing historic heritage and making decisions. You have got the conservancy office technical support staff (which is now down to one person) providing advice which would normally be appropriate advice but there is no compulsion for them [field staff] to listen to their advice. So often they simply ignore it or go ahead and do stuff without seeking advice” (Anonymous).

As with the literature highlighting the natural heritage bias of protected area departments detailed in Chapter 3, many interviewees commented that there was a perception that cultural heritage requires too much time and effort to maintain. DOC may feel that the management of cultural heritage is something which is “extra” to their main duty. Archaeologist Garry Law (interview, 9/9/2010) explains this point:
“A lot of their staff are strongly oriented towards their natural side and regard archaeology as a compliance thing rather than something which is a whole part of the DOC ethos.”

In fact, some interviewees from DOC found it difficult to understand why cultural heritage, such as archaeological sites and military structures, were left in situ and protected when they were not being used, were naturally eroding or deteriorating away, or “was just sitting there.” David Havell (interview, 26/5/2010), a natural heritage employee of DOC, illustrates this argument well:

Archaeologists “just lock it away. So you have got these kumara pits or Pā sites on some remote site that are never looked at, there is nothing about them or were never interpreted. That is almost as bad as just leaving them rot and decompose. So I get frustrated when I know that we have got this body of historic biodiversity features and we just lock them up like a stamp collection when they are more than that. So I guess I often have this black thought that it is all very well someone talking about a historic feature that is impacting on the biodiversity of the site. But it is not being used in any way by historians or is not explained in terms of its context. So I guess I am being a little bit biased. I am thinking that a historic feature or a cultural feature because it has that association with people definitely needs to have that involvement with people otherwise it dies.”

In the same interview he also expressed the opinion that archaeological sites are naturally deteriorating away, meaning that it is “natural” for them to disappear:

“I have seen examples [of people] researching plants that you can use on Pā sites, for example, so they don’t break down… It is tricky because part of me thinks that an archaeological site or historic site is breaking down over time. That is part of the natural or historic process…”

“Nature,” in other words, is naturally removing evidence of human activities and humans should therefore not interfere in this process. These quotes both highlight the attitude of POV 1 which considered cultural heritage to be insignificant, and how the significance of aspects of cultural heritage may not be communicated to staff members of DOC.

7.3.3.2. Bias in funding and expenditure

Another outcome of the DOC “culture” is the discrepancy between the level of expenditure on natural heritage projects compared to cultural heritage projects:

“I think it comes down to a matter of resourcing. There has always been competition between natural heritage and cultural heritage for funding. There is a fairly small percentage that actually goes towards historic heritage in DOC and it keeps on being
cut back further and further… It comes down to prioritisation, and natural heritage is prioritised” (Andy Dodd interview, 21/9/2011).

While this funding for natural heritage can have impacts on elements of cultural relationships with sites, the focus is not on preservation of historic sites or areas and cultural heritage interpretation. The emphasis of natural heritage over cultural (historic) heritage is explicitly seen in the Statement of Departmental Expense in the DOC Annual Reports. For example, in the year ended June 2012 expenditure on the management of natural heritage ($154,775,000) was nearly 30 times higher than expenditure on historic heritage ($5,188,000), which was less than 2% of total expenditure (Figure 7.2) (DOC, 2012: 73). This same pattern is seen in previous years’ annual reports (such as DOC, 2010; 2011c, 2012).

![Figure 7.2 Total DOC expenditure 2011/12 (using figures from DOC, 2012: 73). Note the difference between the expenditure on natural heritage (green) and cultural heritage (yellow).](image)

Whilst money is directed to large scale projects, such as a poison-drop, funding cultural heritage projects, such as the restoration of a homestead, is more difficult because the perceived benefits are not as spectacular. As mentioned in section 7.3.1., there is sentiment that community organisations or government agencies (such as DOC) do not want to pay or feel as if they ought not to pay to maintain cultural heritage, compared with the nature conservation ethic to conserve native nature. For example, some interviewees felt that money
could be better spent on controlling the spread of exotic weeds on Rangitoto than the restoration of run-down and illegal baches which were not being used. The benefits of maintaining cultural heritage structures on the conservation estate are often considered too small or insignificant to justify major expenditure. This point is especially the case with tourism; one interviewee noted that one bird (“Greg” the takehe on Tiritiri Matangi Island, which has since died) can attract more tourists than any restored building.

7.3.3.3. Identity

To a great extent when DOC is mentioned, people generally think of nature conservation rather than natural and cultural heritage conservation. There are many instances of DOC promoting itself as primarily a conservator of natural heritage. For example, the DOC Annual Reports’ cover pages from 2009 all have images strongly promoting the natural heritage management side of their duties. The 2009/10 cover page (Figure 7.3) has an image of two children planting a tree with their forms inlaid with a mosaic of photographs. The photos depict scenes of beaches, trees, birds, fish, and recreational activities. There are only two photos which have any association to cultural heritage – a small red building and a historic boat (the Earnslaw on Lake Wakatipu in the South Island) (circled). The message of the picture is to present the partnership between people (the community) and nature (restoration).

Figure 7.3 The image on the cover page of the DOC 2009/10 Annual Report (DOC, 2010).
Similarly, the image on the cover page of the DOC 2010/11 Annual Report is strongly dominated by natural heritage imagery (Figure 7.4). It shows the figure of a kiwi ornamented with smaller icons. Only a few images relating to cultural heritage can be spotted: a lighthouse on the breast, a structure to the right of the lighthouse (probably a wheel tower for a mine), a wheel and a barn on the leg, and two koru (Māori images of an unfurling fern, symbolising new life) on the upper leg. The rest of the kiwi is filled with native birds, lizards, insects and vegetation. A year later the story is the same. The cover page of the DOC 2011/12 Annual Report has birds, trees, someone planting a tree, a fish, and waves in the shape of a koru.

Figure 7.4 The image on the cover page of the DOC 2010/11 Annual Report (DOC, 2011c).
In addition, interviewees also commented that the annual speeches by the Director General of DOC seldom even referred to cultural heritage:

“Every year the Director General does a presentation on what DOC has achieved over the year and you are really really lucky to find any heritage or any historic stuff included in that at all. I think it is largely that they just didn’t have a great deal of interest in it. It is not something which rings their bells” (Anonymous).

“I remember that we have had a number of Director Generals who used to make a speech … For at least two Director Generals I had to go up to them after their speeches and point out that they hadn’t even referred to anything historic!... And that did tend to happen quite a lot in the Department and I’m sure it still does with even fewer historic staff than they did when I was there” (Sarah Macready interview, 27/5/2010).
DOC therefore largely identifies itself with natural heritage conservation (rather than cultural heritage conservation) in the way it promotes and represents itself.

7.3.4. Lack of Māori involvement in heritage management

The fourth factor perpetuating the bias towards natural heritage is the lack of Māori involvement in heritage management decisions. On both Rangitoto and Motutapu there have been concerns from not only Māori, but also DOC and the community trusts, about the lack of involvement of iwi in the management of the islands. As explained earlier, Ngai Tai have largely refused to work with DOC or the MRT regarding the islands until they are recognised as the tangata whenua. Emily Karaka (interview, 28/9/2010) explains that Ngai Tai want to be seen as a landlord of the islands, particularly Motutapu, where they wish to establish a marae (a complex of buildings used as a centre for traditional Māori customs):

“We can provide alternative education [to visitors] by being not a tenant but a landlord by running marae. We don’t have that presence and that is the missing factor in the restoration programme.”

However, DOC have retained control of the management of the islands. As one former staff member of DOC stated: “DOC is receptive towards what Māori would like to see… but falls short of handing over the reins.” This observation is backed up by Taiepa et al. (1997: 239) who explain that the contemporary nature conservationist stance is that ‘the only way to safeguard conservation is for management and ownership of the conservation estate to remain with the state through the DoC.’ The issue is one of control.

The deed to settle historical Treaty claims for the islands will provide Auckland iwi with a far greater say in the management of heritage on the islands, as Graham Murdoch (interview, 10/9/2010) explains:

“I think one of the biggest changes that people have not go their head around yet and it hasn’t happened in Auckland because the Treaty settlement hasn’t finished, is the role that iwi are going to play in the management of New Zealand’s conservation estate… It is going to be hugely different to what we do now. There are no properly complete Treaty settlements in the Auckland region. And as someone who is working in the middle of them I can see the role they are going to play… At the moment they are sort of bystanders and we put them on the conservation board in a token way and we put them in the CMS and that… So that will provide a whole different viewpoint to the process.”
Chapter 7 – Changes and Challenges on Rangitoto and Motutapu

If the deed of settlement is made into legislation, the Tamaki Collective will be re-established as the tangata whenua, and, through co-management provisions, will have a greater involvement in the decisions made regarding the island.

7.4. CONCLUSION

This chapter has discussed key findings and themes from the two case studies. The main conclusion to come out of this discussion is that although there has been a positive change regarding the retention and conservation of cultural heritage on the islands, challenges still remain from ingrained attitudes within DOC and in general society. Many of the findings and themes discussed in this chapter are symptomatic of not only cultural heritage management nationally, but also of islands and other protected areas around the world.

The progressive change in attitude since the 1990s regarding cultural heritage management on Rangitoto and Motutapu occurred at the same time as similar changes were made and concerns were voiced from cultural heritage specialists and academics in the protected areas of other New World countries discussed in Chapter 3. There appears, therefore, to have been a general transition, or evolution, from modern to postmodern thinking regarding the heritage management of protected areas during this period.

This change has been positive for the conservation of cultural heritage on the islands. There are increasingly positive outcomes for cultural heritage, side by side with natural heritage projects on the islands. For example, Rangitoto is being kept pest free and exotic weed species are being managed, while at the same time, no historic baches are being demolished. Instead, most are either gradually being restored by RIHCT or maintained by bach owners from RIBCA. There is now interpretive signage of vacant bach sites at Rangitoto Wharf and of the shipwrecks at Wreck Bay. Guided walks of the bach communities at Rangitoto Wharf and Islington Bay are offered during the Auckland heritage festival. Similarly, on Motutapu, the historic Reid homestead, red barn and bridge at Home Bay have all been restored. Archaeological sites are being preserved in the farmland and through carefully prepared tree-planting plans. Native trees are being planted on the island and native threatened species are being (re)introduced. Visitors going to Rangitoto to climb up to the summit or visitors to Motutapu volunteering to plant trees are able to experience and enjoy the natural heritage of Rangitoto, how parts of Motutapu are being ecologically restored, and the physical remnants from past uses of both the islands. In addition, as a result of the deed to settle historical
Treaty claims for the islands (signed on 8 September 2012), Māori iwi will have a greater role in the heritage management of the islands through the permanent ownership of three sites on the islands, and a number of co-governance provisions.

However, the nature conservation ethic, as outlined in Chapter 4, is a mainstay in the New Zealand psyche, affecting the structure of government organisations and general attitudes in society. This is clearly seen with the amount of money spent on natural heritage conservation projects on the islands compared to cultural heritage projects, and the number of volunteers planting trees on Motutapu compared to restoring baches on Rangitoto. It seems that although there has been a change in understanding by individuals, this change has not altered organisational structures or entrenched attitudes towards nature, islands or New Zealand’s history. Cultural heritage is still the “poor cousin” of natural heritage. Overcoming these obstacles will be a focus of the next chapter.
CHAPTER 8. Achieving a Co-existence

As illustrated in the preceding chapters, the conservation of cultural heritage in “natural” protected areas can be a difficult task. Not only can remnants of the past, such as old buildings, structures, archaeological sites or historic trees, be considered to be insignificant, but their preservation may also be seen to be in opposition to the natural values of the area. This chapter argues that a co-existence of all types of heritage – that is, allowing natural and cultural conservation to occur at the same time in the same place – should be the aim of heritage management in protected areas. As highlighted previously, although there has been a general movement to manage natural and cultural heritage in balance, there remain obstacles which hinder the co-existence of natural and cultural heritage in protected areas. Primary obstacles have been identified in this research:

1. Modern/environmentalist dualistic understandings which treat a protected area (especially islands) as natural, and, consequently, cultural heritage as a blot on the landscape
2. Lack of knowledge, or an unwillingness from protected area managers (or some sectors of the public) to learn about the significance of the cultural heritage of a protected area
3. Attitudes which undervalue New Zealand (or other New World) history
4. Ingrained attitudes biasing natural heritage conservation over cultural heritage conservation from groups or departments managing a protected area
5. Lack of discussion or compromise between those with different points of view about the place of cultural heritage in a protected area

All these obstacles centre on the attitude that cultural heritage does not belong in “natural” protected areas. This chapter argues that to overcome this attitude, a co-existence of all types of heritage should be achieved through 1) re-assessing the role of a protected area, 2) acknowledging the plurality of values in a protected area, 3) applying values-based management, 4) using interdisciplinary approaches, and 5) reaching a compromise between conflicting points of view. These five concepts and strategies have been derived from
interviews, case study findings, and literature on the management of heritage in protected areas.

8.1. A RE-ASSESSMENT OF PROTECTED AREAS

In order to achieve a co-existence of all types of heritage in a protected area, it is vital to re-assess the role and conceptualisation of a protected area (or conservation estate, reserve or sanctuary). In general, protected areas are viewed as areas which are “natural” or which should be “natural”, with the occasional cultural heritage feature. This understanding has stemmed from early settler attitudes towards the New World and nature which have been accepted by successive generations. In this section, it is argued that protected areas are zones which are both – or perhaps more accurately, *neither* – natural or cultural. Instead, the features of protected areas are simply “heritage” which need to be protected, conserved, or reserved, as their designation (as a *protected area, conservation estate* or *reserve*) demands.

To achieve this co-existence, protected areas need to be conceptualised in a non-modern holistic way, along the lines of indigenous understandings; that is, acknowledging the artificiality of the nature/culture dualism, recognising that no landscape can be completely natural (pure) and, likewise, that no landscape can be completely cultural. As explained in Chapter 3, a postmodern cultural landscape approach attempts to bridge the dualism by considering every area as having been influenced or modified by human action. However, this approach has been criticised by nature conservationists as it denies the existence of nature, which they, and the wider public, work to protect and conserve. There is seemingly no room for nature in this approach. In a way, as deep ecology philosopher George Sessions (2006: 146, emphasis in original) writes, postmodern theory has “up-ended” things to the point where it has ‘turned reality on its head - *it's all Culture!*’

Non-modern perspectives have come out of this kind of criticism. Non-modern thinkers maintain that social constructionism reinstalls the dualism. For example, Castree and MacMillan (2001: 210) argue that both social constructionism (postmodern thinking) and natural realists (modern thinking) in fact have something in common – the ‘inability to imagine human-natural relations in a non-dichotomous way.’ By proclaiming to “go beyond social construction”, these non-modern perspectives give both culture and nature agency, and emphasise that nature is not only a social construction (Braun, 2008; 2009; Cadman, 2009; Castree, 2011; Davison, 2005; Fullagar, 2009; Holland & Wearing, 2009; Latour, 1993). The
basic assertion from non-modern perspectives is that to recognise the culture of nature should not deny the importance of materiality and non-human agency (Plumwood, 2006; Schlosser, 2006).

Non-modern perspectives are on a separate tangent altogether from the modern dualistic and postmodern constructivist perspectives outlined in Chapter 3. As can be seen from the prefix “non”, this perspective separates itself from speaking about the pure entities of “nature” and “culture” towards thinking about notions of interrelatedness, inseparability, and hybridity, leaving the nature/culture dualism redundant (Castree, 2004; 2011; Farrier, 2011; Head & Regnell, 2012).

Indigenous understandings of the world are very much akin with non-modern thinking. Indigenous knowledge is considered to be more holistic than the dualistic knowledge entrenched in Western thought. Pannell (2006: 12) quotes an Australian Aborigine, who sums up the indigenous perspectives well: there is ‘no difference, they both together, nature and culture.’ Likewise, West and Brockington (2006) write that the Gimi-speaking peoples of Papua New Guinea have no notion of a dualism between nature and culture. Equally, Māori understandings tie ecological and human processes into one inter-related web (Allen, 1998), as Emily Karaka (interview 28/9/2010) explains: “Heritage is heritage and it is natural and it is cultural… I don’t see that difference. Our way of seeing things holistically means there is no separation.” Māori have intimate generational connections with landscapes expressed through concepts of whakapapa (genealogical association), mātauranga (knowledge of cultural meaning, value, and practice), mauri (life force of the natural environment), whanaungatanga (interaction with the environment as kin), manaakitanga (care and hospitality), taonga (treasured possessions), and kaitiakitanga (guardianship and responsibility for a place) (DeLoughrey, 2007; Kliskey, Alessa, & Robards, 2004; ICOMOS NZ, 2010). Tipa Compain (interview, 13/8/2010) explains how the Māori concept of kaitiakitanga allows nature and culture to be seen as inseparable:

“In terms of Māori thinking we have a relationship as tangata [people] to the whenua [land]. That is why we are called the tangata whenua [people of the land]. And we have a whakapapa, a genealogical link from Rangi [god of the sky] to Papatūanuku [mother earth]. There is an absolute link between the two. And how we interact as people with the land, and what we do on it, how we utilise it and how we look after it, are inextricably linked. There are a thousand or more years of learning and practice on the best way to do that and so the word we use, most iwi use, is kaitiakitanga. So
within kaitiakitanga are all those concepts and the links between what you might call ‘nature’ and ‘culture’.

As highlighted above, for Māori, to know something (mātauranga) is to locate it through a genealogical link (whakapapa) which connects everything (human and non-human) to the gods in a family tree kind of relationship (Murton, 2011). In this way, land and people are inextricably linked.

This link between non-modern thinking and indigenous world views has been noted by other authors, such as Cajete (2000), Johnson and Murton (2007), and Murton (2011). Through their work, they contend that a “dwelling approach” to place – that is, recognising the togetherness of everything and that both human and non-human actors have agency, along non-modern lines of thinking – resonates closely to indigenous, or specifically Māori, world views. Nature and culture therefore are not separate or purely a social construction, but live (or dwell) together in place, similar to Māori concepts of kaitiakitanga, to recognise the ‘rich, intimate, creative ongoing togetherness of beings and things’ (Jones, 2009: 272; Jones & Cloke, 2002).

The Māori concept of “taonga” can be loosely defined as heritage. Taonga is a treasured possession; anything which is considered to be of value (Baird, 2012; Tapsell, 1997). As with non-modern thinking, no distinction is made between tangible or intangible, or natural or cultural. In this way, all aspects of so-called natural and cultural heritage (or taonga) are simply heritage. A native tree therefore can be seen to have the same values attributed to it as that of an historic building; they are both aspects of the past (as a result of natural and cultural processes) cherished by present-day society to be passed on to future generations. By extension, the processes of natural or cultural heritage conservation are likewise no different; they both have an overwhelming common aim: the conservation of heritage values for future generations (Jones, 1998; 2003; Lowenthal, 2005; Thomas, Borjes & Fenton-Hathaway, 2004).

Thus, although protected areas can be seen as sanctuaries of nature, they can, and should, also be considered as sanctuaries of cultural heritage. For example, historical features, such as the Rangitoto baches and Motutapu’s archaeological landscape, are unique to the islands, or at least rare on the mainland, just like the native flora and fauna of the islands. The North and South Islands of New Zealand have undergone considerable change through settlement and economic development, resulting in the removal of structures and other elements in the name
of progress and economic growth: incremental and unnoticed until nearly gone. Clearly, like native trees and birds, cultural heritage can be just as rare, vulnerable and important. For example, Garry Law (interview, 9/9/2010) commented:

“Well they [heritage managers] need to think about how the original habitat of the species was lost. It was lost unthinkingly and surely it would be equally wrong to go ahead unthinkingly and destroy cultural heritage on the same basis.”

Natural and cultural heritage thus face similar pressures and threats and increasingly ‘enlist similar arguments, similar needs, [and] similar sponsors’ (Lowenthal, 2005: 85).

Likewise, both natural and cultural heritage have analogous appeals and reasons to be saved. For example, forests or historic buildings are conserved largely for the same reasons: for (a) intrinsic value, and for (b) research and scientific reasons. The destruction of cultural heritage can, in this way, be likened to the extinction of species because it can be destroyed forever (Guruswamy, Roberts & Drywater, 1999). Furthermore, as noted in Figure 2.1 and in section 2.2.2, there is common terminology used in all types of heritage management, such as rareness, representativeness, aesthetic value, restoration, conservation, preservation, and protection. A former employee at DOC explains that there is much similarity in the management of natural and cultural heritage:

“The way we prioritise and manage things is very similar. We are just dealing with different values. Species biodiversity [or] species conservation is similar [to cultural heritage] conservation. You identify which are the species that are of highest priority. They are generally those which are most threatened or unique to New Zealand. And it is very similar for cultural heritage – we identify and prioritise sites, and then develop strategies to protect and conserve them.”

The value we place on all types of heritage and the processes by which we conserve this heritage is therefore essentially the same.

By re-assessing the role of protected areas as sanctuaries for all types of heritage, common ground between natural and cultural heritage can be emphasised. For example, natural heritage and cultural heritage conservation can have symbiotic relationships; the presence of people does not necessarily mean less biodiversity (Fojut, 2004; Phillips, 1998). Castree (2005: 228) eloquently explains that many wildlife habitats are a result of human activity:

The silts dumped over former fields and marshes, the disused buildings and equipment, the tracks and trails created by playing children and bikers: these and other interventions have inadvertently created opportunities for a uniquely diverse array of wildlife to not merely co-exist but co-depend… in reality it is arbitrary to group them [nature and culture] into two major categories.
In the main, these commonalities and relationships appear to have not been entirely recognised, as governance structures continue to separate natural and cultural heritage management, and protected areas continue to be considered, and managed, as places which are, or should be, natural. By viewing a protected area using non-modern and indigenous thinking, the features, activities and goals of natural and cultural heritage conservation can be thought of in the same way and made complementary.

8.2. ACKNOWLEDGING MULTIPLE HERITAGE VALUES

In order to achieve a co-existence of natural and cultural heritage values, it is critical to acknowledge the multiple heritage values of a protected area (Hague Consulting Ltd & Kelly, 2001; Lennon, 2000; Skoglund & Svensson, 2010; Waterton, 2005). As already highlighted, many staff of protected areas internationally, including DOC staff in New Zealand, often lack knowledge about the significance of cultural heritage in the protected areas they manage. In order to overcome this situation, a protected area needs to be acknowledged by managers, and even the general public, as having a plurality of heritage values, as opposed to having only natural values.

To do this, three steps are required. Firstly, sound research and investigation should be undertaken into the heritage values of an area. This can be done through such methods as on-ground identification, archival and historical research, systematic surveys and data collection (Lennon et al., 1999; Malins, 2011; Toothman, 1987). As Jane Lennon (interview, 31/3/2011), a Brisbane-based cultural heritage manager with expertise in managing cultural heritage in Australia’s forests, explains: “You should not manage a piece of land until you know everything that has happened to it.” An extensive knowledge about a protected area is therefore of foremost importance. Secondly, the findings of this research and investigation need to be communicated to protected area department staff and the wider public through such means as meetings, heritage assessments, lectures, advertising campaigns, and published books. Thirdly, this communication must lead to the staff and public acknowledging or appreciating the heritage values of the protected area. The protected area would then become known as a place which has a variety of values.

8.3. VALUES-BASED MANAGEMENT

By acknowledging all natural and cultural heritage features as simply heritage, and by identifying the plurality of heritage values in protected areas, values-based management
becomes highly important in achieving a co-existence. A values-based approach to heritage management bases judgment calls and priorities on the significance of types of heritage, rather than on what should, or should not, be on a particular landscape. The approach ensures, therefore, that all values (including both natural and cultural heritage values) are considered in all decisions. It is widely heralded as the best practice to manage heritage (Kerr, 2007; Malins, 2011; Mason, 2006; Pearson & Sullivan, 1995). However, as illustrated in the case studies and the examples from Chapter 3, protected areas are often managed for ideological reasons (the area as natural) rather than for the plurality of values of the area.

As highlighted in Chapter 2, a hierarchy of significance (as opposed to all heritage being of equal value) is applied (either consciously or unknowingly) in practice in order to make easier decisions. Rachel de Lambert (interview, 13/7/2010), a former member of DLS and now with the Boffa Miskell consultancy, explains the need for a hierarchy well: “I think inevitably there are times where you do have to weigh one more than the other. You do have to make choices.” What is considered as most significant is given more prominence. However, it should be emphasised that hierarchies, judgement calls or priorities should not replicate dualistic or purest understandings: other values of lesser significance should not be ignored or not conserved at all. Giving priority to an aspect of heritage means that other heritage aspects are able to be conserved as long as the most significant value is not adversely compromised to a large degree. Protected areas should therefore be managed very much on a case by case basis, based on the heritage values identified:

“So there is no one rule or not even ten rules for ten different circumstances. You have to look at each reserve on its merits and say what have we got archaeologically? What have we got naturally? … It is very hard to give any kind of general rule… You have to look at the area and not the individual bird or the individual site. And somehow try to develop rating that balances priorities in some useful way” (Janet Davidson interview, 16/8/2010).

With values-based management, common sense decisions can be made: if something is more significant than something else then it will be prioritised. For example, those supporting the retention of historical trees on Rangitoto and Motutapu do understand that in some cases the trees would have to be removed if they are too invasive. Dave Veart (interview, 2/6/2010) explains that sensible decisions have to be made:

“If it is a weed species and it has some sort of invasive property then probably the best thing to do would be to remove it. But largely these things aren’t. I don’t see jungles of Morton Bay Figs on Rangitoto yet... So I think it is an area where you have a bit of give and take really. I mean the wholesale removal of every non-native
species just really destroys part of the story really. It is removing yet another page from the book. But if it is causing problems and the argument can be made then it is probably best if it is removed.”

Many heritage managers, however, consider it difficult to compare the significance of different periods and types of heritage. For example, the significance of a pohutukawa forest and the significance of an 80-year-old bach can be considered incomparable as they are not the same entity and have been produced by different means. However, by viewing heritage in a non-modern/indigenous way, all aspects of the past are heritage. Thus, although aspects of the past may be considered distinctive, they all have heritage values which can be conserved.

8.4. INTERDISCIPLINARY APPROACHES

A third strategy to achieve a co-existence is that of having interdisciplinary approaches to heritage management. This means integrating the generally enclosed silos of the natural and human sciences, and focussing on what can happen when there is collaboration and a sharing of knowledge between disciplines. Currently, disciplines sustaining natural heritage and cultural heritage conservation have proceeded with little interaction in heritage agencies in New Zealand, and Western societies more generally. A common problem is that both natural and cultural heritage managers can be constrained by their particular specialisation and, as a result, may not appreciate the perspectives of other disciplines (Somers, 2003). A way to resolve this problem is through interdisciplinary approaches.

Interdisciplinary approaches require going beyond simply bringing people or disciplines together (multidisciplinary approaches) towards having a common conceptual framework (Conrad, 2001; Malins, 2011; Max-Neef, 2005). A major component of interdisciplinary approaches therefore is having a good working relationship between staff members from different disciplines who have other responsibilities or perspectives (Toothman, 1987). Managers of protected areas need to be prepared to step outside their specialised silos to learn, acknowledge, appreciate and respect others’ points of view towards heritage (Harmon, 2007; Howell, 1994; Malins, 2011; Russell & Jambrecina, 2002; Thomas, Borjes & Fenton-Hathaway, 2004). With interdisciplinary approaches there is a willingness to listen to all sides of a particular issue, and a willingness to work inclusively and seek compromises (Fry, 2001; Longstreth, 2008). In this way, approaches, such as communication, co-operation, sharing, pooling, collaboration, and finding compromise, similarities, and commonalities can be brought to the forefront of heritage management. These approaches contrast with separate,
mutually exclusive departments or disciplines which characterise contemporary heritage management of protected areas.

8.5. COMPROMISE

As brought to attention in Chapter 2, there are always conflicting perspectives relating to different aspects of heritage. Consequently, to achieve a co-existence of all types of heritage in a protected area, a compromise – that is, a settlement of differences by mutual concessions and reciprocal adjustment of demands – between different points of view is of central importance. Making compromises can be a very delicate task as those managing protected areas can face tough dilemmas, as illustrated by a DOC biodiversity manager:

“Part of me says any exotic plant on Rangitoto is fair game and it should be exterminated without mercy. The other part of me says there are heritage values associated with some of these plants.”

There can also be a very fine line in making decisions: “You do not want to be too hard-line either way because you are excluding the possibility of other values being incorporated into that landscape” (Michael Kelly interview, 20/9/2011). A heritage manager therefore requires many important qualities, including, as Toothman (1996: 76) writes, ‘the skills of a diplomat, evangelist, educator, and philosopher.’ Thinking in a dualistic way can typically result in competition and conflict over the conservation of heritage values. However, by finding a compromise, a co-existence of all types of heritage can occur which is fair and reasonable to those with different perspectives towards a particular heritage feature.

Compromise, by definition, does not mean that one particular side or perspective will get all they want (van den Hove, 2006). For example, those advocating for natural heritage or cultural heritage on Rangitoto or Motutapu have had to come to terms with the fact that in many cases (because of compromise) their own specific priority, concerns or aspirations may not be realised: not all baches can be demolished on Rangitoto; the entire Motutapu archaeological landscape will not be left unplanted; and not all exotic trees can be removed from the islands. Instead, with give-or-take, a middle ground has been found for the overall benefit of all parties.

Some commentators do not support the idea of compromise, such as Harmon (2003: 15), who criticises the ‘abdication of all professional judgement’ in favour of a consensus or compromise which is ‘likely to be spurious.’ Is it better to have no compromise at all, meaning the objective of one value, such as natural heritage conservation, can happen
without being disadvantaged by another value, such as cultural heritage conservation? If that
were to happen, one side (or stakeholder) could wholly attain their goals. It would also be
much more convenient, simpler, and easier to manage than a number of conflicting values
(Lennon, 2006; Somers, 2003). However, this question, and the point of view it reflects,
disregards the plurality of perspectives and values of a landscape. Compromises are win-win
scenarios in which both sides can be content that their perspectives have been heard and
accounted for. Further, compromise can lead to good outcomes when they are agreed upon in
a way in which stakeholders understand the points of views of others and recognise that
compromise or negotiation is necessary. This way, natural and cultural heritage values can be
accommodated on the same landscape in a way that is complementary, co-operative and
without conflict: a co-existence.

The central method to achieve a compromise is through a two-way discussion between those
holding different or conflicting views. Uncompromising and conflicting views can be reduced
or even eliminated with sufficient communication which takes stakeholders’ views into
account. Confrontations – as long as they are respectful – can in fact be more useful than
silences. Debate should therefore not be stifled, but in fact be encouraged (van den Hove,
2006). This way, all views are able to be heard in an emotionally-charged way, giving people
first-hand accounts of the feeling behind points of view. There are six key requirements for
successful discussions which are fair to all stakeholders, based on the work of Dorochoff
(2005):

- all stakeholders should be involved early on in the discussion
- everyone should be aware of what heritage features and values there are, and what the
  significance of these are so everyone is aware of the whole management issue
- all participants should be able to hear other perspectives and be heard
- justifications and reasoning should be behind all that is argued
- each participant’s values and standing points should be transparent
- participants should have a positive attitude towards mitigating conflict and
  harmonising conflicting opinions

The last point is highly important, and perhaps the most difficult to achieve – to make a
compromise there needs to be a willingness of all parties to reach a compromise. Respect and
empathy for both the history of a landscape and the different opinions, values and attitudes
relating to aspects of heritage is therefore crucial if discussions are to successfully lead to compromise. However, as illustrated in the case study chapters, this respect and empathy can be extremely hard to come by when there are value clashes: “Even if we do tell each other about it we have different value constructions. So we definitely have values clashes” (David Havell interview, 26/5/2010).

Quite often those who take part in discussions can be stubborn and unwilling to modify their own opinion, especially if other views seem to be opposed to their own point of view. For example, Sarah Macready (interview, 27/5/2010) speaks of the problems with unsympathetic views:

“You get people who just feel it is wrong to have historic things in places you think of as natural. And on the other side people who cannot understand what the problem is because they are not really doing any harm.”

Similarly, Byrdie Ayres (interview, 12/8/2010) also recalls times when archaeologists’ views were not listened to, or accounted for, regarding the plans for tree-planting on Motutapu in the 1990s:

“Particularly when it came to re-vegetating the areas the historians and archaeologists often found that it was difficult for their voices to be heard and for the ecologists to understand that when they plant their trees you are going to be losing, or ultimately destroying archaeological sites.”

To overcome these attitudes and value clashes, as stated earlier, there needs to be an acknowledgement of the plurality of values in every protected area, and especially the significance of cultural heritage in “natural” areas, as Jane Lennon (interview, 31/3/2011) explains:

“It is about having some environmental humility. It is about honouring those who went before us, even if they have different motives... It is in a way honouring their manual labour and efforts. Why should we censor them out of our history just to create a new green, pristine, back-to-nature environment?”

In the case of both Rangitoto and Motutapu, over time and through discussion, individuals with extreme points of view moderated their attitudes. As advocates for natural heritage and cultural heritage have acknowledged that they have been heard and that there has been an effort to find a compromise, then, generally, there have been resolutions for the issues discussed in Chapters 5 and 6. To a great extent, the heated debates of the 1990s over natural heritage or cultural heritage on the islands needed to take place in order for both main points of view to be aired and consequently understood. These discussions allowed views to be
heard, and importantly, led to more knowledge and awareness from decision makers, which in turn led to compromises and consensus regarding the preservation of the Rangitoto baches and the planting of Motutapu.

8.6. ATTITUDINAL CHANGES

It is evident that in order to achieve a co-existence of natural and cultural heritage, a dramatic change in attitude from the general public and – in particular – from departments or organisations managing protected areas is required. As illustrated with examples from the National Park Service in the USA, the NSW National Parks and Wildlife Service in Australia, the Department of Conservation in New Zealand, and ecological restoration trusts on islands in the Hauraki Gulf, departments or organisations managing protected areas can have a strong bias towards natural heritage conservation to the detriment of cultural heritage conservation. This bias is not generated from their enacting or governing legislation, or guiding policies, but rather from the way they have been applied (Feldman & MacKreth, 2004; Malins, 2011; Somers, 2003; Tranel & Hall, 2003). In the legislation which established each of these departments and in the guiding policies of the ecological restoration trusts, there is an equal weighting given to the management of cultural heritage and natural heritage. In New Zealand, for example, the Conservation Act 1987 (Section 6) directs DOC to manage and advocate for the conservation of all natural and historic resources in the conservation estate. Likewise, the Reserves Act 1977 (Sections 17-22), which governs all Crown reserves, allows the management and protection of ‘historic, archaeological, geological, biological, or other scientific features’ in the reserve, to the extent that it is ‘compatible with the principal or primary purpose of the reserve.’ The legislation does therefore promote a co-existence of all types of heritage. However, as illustrated in Chapter 7, in terms of the staffing, funding and work achieved by these departments and trusts, there is not an equal weighting between natural and cultural heritage.

By re-assessing the purpose and understanding of a protected area as having a plurality of heritage values which deserve to be protected, a change in attitude among those managing protected areas – and among the general public – can be generated, leading to a co-existence of all types of heritage. Cultural heritage values can be seen to belong in “natural” protected areas. Consequently, the cultural heritage of protected areas, which have in the past been seen to be ‘old, often difficult-to-maintain structures that … [are] a continuing drain on park resources’ (Toothman, 1987: 68), or a ‘management problem’ (Ashley, Gojak & Liston,
1991: 5), can become valuable features which are a ‘complement rather than a competitor to wilderness’ (Feldman, 2011: 229).

With regard to Rangitoto and Motutapu, the outcome of the deed of settlement between the Tāmaki Collective and the Crown could be a catalyst for this change – by having a greater involvement by Māori in making decisions, a more holistic non-modern/indigenous understanding could be applied in the heritage management of the islands. What are seen to be natural and cultural heritage features, could all be seen as taonga/heritage which deserve to be conserved.

There have been calls to integrate indigenous knowledge (such as Beeton et al., 2006; Goodall, 2008; Malins, 2011), and, in the New Zealand context, Māori understandings (such as Allen, 1998; Stephenson, 2005), into heritage conservation practices. However, as Tipa Compain (interview, 13/8/2010) explains, there are concerns about the extent to which Māori understandings can be put into policy:

“There are plenty of documents by Māori academics that try to pin our values into policy. And that is step in the right direction… Do the DOC officers who work on the islands practice those? Can they if they are not Māori? There need to be two approaches: Māori values infused in policy and a practical application of those in the ground. The problem we have with DOC and any other local agencies is that they might employ staff but they don’t have those values. They are not taught them. They are not part of the whakapapa so therefore how can they practice it? So we get points of tension between the tribes and the various departments because they might not practice it because they do not understand it. Nor do they have the political or the drive to actually do that… sometimes it is difficult for us to explain it in a way they understand. Sometimes they just don’t want to know!”

What is apparent from this quote is an apparent unwillingness from “on the ground” DOC staff to integrate Māori understandings into their own practices as they may not have the experience or an interest in Māori philosophies. However, the co-management provisions of the deed of settlement are a positive step towards the integration of Māori understandings into the heritage management of the islands. Further training for DOC staff members relating to Māori thinking is likely to be associated with this co-management arrangement.

It is important to note also that the attitudes which bias natural heritage over cultural heritage do not only relate to protected areas, but are society-wide. In general, New World countries, especially New Zealand, attribute more significance to natural features than to cultural heritage, particularly recent twentieth century European heritage, which is often considered to
be trivial or minor compared to other types of heritage. As explained in previous chapters, it is much easier to conserve natural heritage in this attitudinal climate, than cultural heritage. A shift is required to transform the profile of New Zealand’s cultural heritage away from being the “poor cousin” of natural heritage (Donaghey, 2001). By having a co-existence of all types of heritage through the re-assessment of the role and conceptualisation of protected areas, there could be a diminution of the notion that New Zealand’s history is insignificant. The value of cultural heritage in the conservation estate in New Zealand, and outside the conservation estate, can be identified, appreciated and conserved. A sense of pride can be instilled in conserving all heritage values of protected areas.

An associated general attitude relates to the terms “conservation” and “heritage.” By definition, both terms relate equally to both nature and culture. However, it is common for “conservation” to relate to natural heritage, and “heritage” to mean cultural heritage. A clear example of this is the draft Bill to replace the HPA 1993 in New Zealand. In the draft Bill the “New Zealand Historic Places Trust” is changed to “Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga” (Heritage NZ) (Parliamentary Counsel Office, 2012). Consequently, historic buildings and archaeological sites are considered to be “heritage,” but seemingly not forests or fauna. Instead, natural heritage is associated with “conservation,” as Graham Murdoch (interview, 10/9/2010) explains:

“Conservation sadly in recent times has become associated with ecology. You have conservation and then you have historic. Well it is not all like that. I have worked all my life to conserve history and to conserve memories and to conserve historic structures, as well as things natural. And so people have got to get that in their mind.”

By thinking in an indigenous/non-modern way, these two terms can regain their original meaning, and natural and cultural heritage can both be conserved as heritage.

8.7. CONCLUSION

This chapter has argued that a co-existence of all types of heritage should be the aim of heritage management in protected areas. It has put forward strategies and concepts to achieve a co-existence based around a new protected area management philosophy which views all protected areas as having a variety of heritage values which should be conserved. With this thinking, conservation estate islands in New Zealand (and other protected areas around the world) would not be considered as purely natural, but as landscapes with a plurality of heritage values resulting from the interaction of a variety of natural and cultural processes.
By aiming to achieve a co-existence, the enthusiasm to protect or restore islands as natural is not stifled, but is built upon to accommodate cultural heritage values within natural heritage conservation programmes. Islands can therefore become not only be conducive to natural heritage conservation, but also to cultural heritage conservation.

It is clear that a shift in thinking is required away from dualistic understandings towards inclusive co-existence thinking – based on indigenous/non-modern conceptualisations – in society, as well as in protected area departments. By constructing nature as without the presence of people or culture, the nature/culture dualism will increasingly be seen as unbridgeable. However, by allowing natural and cultural heritage to co-exist in protected areas, human histories such as logging, farming, and tourism can be seen as potentially equally as important as ecological processes. By managing protected areas in an indigenous/non-modern way, history will no-longer be insignificant in so-called natural areas, but instead be a vital component of a heritage landscape.

A major point to emerge from this chapter is that despite perceived differences and conflicts between natural and cultural heritage, the idea and associated values of heritage remain constant and common. Heritage is an inclusive concept which recognises every aspect of the world’s past (Meadows & Ramutsindela, 2004). Thus, with a co-existence, natural and cultural heritage can be cherished as simply “heritage”. In this way, better decisions can be made by heritage managers which do not exclude cultural heritage values for ideological reasons, do not treat cultural heritage as insignificant, and do not consider landscapes to be purely natural. Rather, heritage management decisions can be based on acknowledging the multiple heritage values of a protected area, values-based management, interdisciplinary approaches, compromise and working together – instead of in opposition – so that heritage can be conserved in protected areas in the collective sense.
CHAPTER 9.

Conclusion

The stimulus for this thesis was a general concern about detrimental outcomes for cultural heritage in protected areas in New Zealand and around the world. To investigate why cultural heritage is often ignored or even removed in “natural” places, I explored the history of cultural heritage management on Rangitoto and Motutapu islands and undertook a substantial review of New Zealand and international academic literature. My aims were to identify the factors contributing to difficulties and conflicts between stakeholders and heritage managers over the retention of cultural heritage in protected areas; to explore how these tensions were resolved on Rangitoto and Motutapu; and to put forward a way in which natural heritage and cultural heritage conservation can co-exist in protected areas in general.

The findings generated from this research have both confirmed the conclusions of existing literature, and made new contributions to heritage management discourse. This concluding chapter is organised into three sections. In the first section, the major findings and contributions of the research are discussed. The second section outlines limitations to the research and future research opportunities. In the third section, the chapter concludes with an account of a return trip to the two islands as a way to underline and personalise the themes of this research.

9.1. MAIN FINDINGS

It is evident from both case studies that historically, cultural heritage was perceived as not belonging in a natural area, as seen with the demolition of the Rangitoto baches, the planned and partial planting of the archaeological landscape of Motutapu, and the removal of historic exotic vegetation on both islands. It is also evident in the lack of Maori involvement in the management of the islands, and the DOC bias towards natural heritage conservation. These correspond directly to themes derived from other local and overseas examples outlined in Chapter 3.

This research has added to this body of literature by specifically highlighting contextual factors which accentuate the bias towards natural heritage. As explained in Chapter 1, the New World and islands have been common contexts for conflicts and difficulties in
managing heritage in protected areas, but have not received substantial critical attention from academic literature. By using two adjacent islands in New Zealand’s conservation estate as case studies, this research has been able to critically explore the influence of the New Zealand (New World) context and the concept of islandness on the management of cultural heritage in protected areas.

It is evident that particular attitudes which bestow more significance on natural heritage than cultural heritage are highly apparent in the New Zealand context. Because of the perceived recentness of New Zealand’s human settlement and the remoteness of the country in general, New Zealand’s history and cultural heritage often do not have a high standing in popular perception compared to New Zealand’s “ancient” natural heritage and the “grand” cultural heritage found in other parts of the world. Rather, cultural heritage in New Zealand is undervalued and is considered a luxury item, something to be dealt with once other more pressing issues are resolved.

A strong and active nature conservation ethic has developed since the mid-nineteenth century in New Zealand as nostalgia towards New Zealand’s forests and fauna grew in response to dramatic landscape transformations from forest to pasture and concern about shrinking native biodiversity and landscapes under threat. Because of New Zealand’s comparatively recent history (Māori settling only 800 or so years ago, and the dominant Pākehā population settling less than 200 years, compared to the thousands of years of human history of the Old World), New Zealand became internationally renowned for having spectacular and significant natural heritage features. As a result, there has been an increasing desire in New Zealand to protect nature (through the designation of reserves) and to “restore” landscapes (particularly islands) back to their “original” state. Islandness can be conducive to notions of naturalness. By being bounded, isolated and separate, islands can be conceived of as being insulated from development, can be managed as entirely free of exotic pests, and therefore be deemed “natural.” To a great extent, islands in the conservation estate accentuate the attitudes regarding nature in New Zealand: by being seen as more natural than the mainland, islands are potentially less likely to be regarded as places where cultural heritage should be found and conserved. Hence, an island in the New Zealand context compounds these perceptions further. As Chapter 4 highlighted, islands – both as physical landscapes and the concept of an island – have been, and are, considered to be central to the safeguarding of New Zealand’s natural heritage. In this way, it can be, and has been, difficult to manage cultural heritage on
conservation estate islands in New Zealand as natural heritage is, in the main, privileged over cultural heritage.

The conflicts between stakeholders and heritage managers regarding the place of cultural heritage in “natural” protected areas has been depicted in this research as a conflict between modern and postmodern perspectives. This theoretical representation of the conflict is unique to this research. As Chapter 7 highlighted, a primary reason behind the controversy over the demolition of the historic baches on Rangitoto and the heated debates concerning the planting of trees over Motutapu’s significant archaeological landscape was the conflict between two different points of view: one, a modern dualistic perspective – with environmentalist undertones – which views nature as pure and, consequently, argues for natural heritage values to take precedence over cultural heritage values; and the other a postmodern constructivist perspective, which views every landscape as cultural, and promotes greater recognition and conservation of cultural heritage values in protected areas.

The identification of these two points of view backs up and illustrates not only the differences between the modern and postmodern conceptualisations of “nature” and “culture”, examined in Chapter 3, but also the dissonance of heritage, highlighted in the heritage management literature discussed in Chapter 2. People can simultaneously have a number of (often conflicting) perspectives regarding an aspect of the past (Howard, 2003; Smith, 2006; Tunbridge & Ashworth, 1996). To some, one aspect of the past may not be considered heritage at all (Kearns, Joseph & Moon, 2010), yet to others, it may be considered highly significant. As a result, there are always different perceptions and attitudes towards aspects of the past.

Another significant finding has been the notable change in thinking regarding the place of cultural heritage on both Rangitoto and Motutapu. Over the past two decades stakeholders and heritage managers with modern or environmentalist understandings have gradually altered or moderated their thinking towards postmodern thinking: cultural heritage is increasingly able to belong (and be conserved) on the islands. This observed change appears to be part of a growing general acknowledgement from those who manage protected areas around the world that every place has been, and always will be, influenced by human activity. For example, Fojut (2004: 29) observes that ‘the “bad old days” of single-focus conservation of only nature or only the built heritage are rapidly becoming a thing of the past – and for
once, something we are happy not to conserve!’ As a result, there have been increasingly positive outcomes for cultural heritage on the islands.

However, this research has also identified obstacles which hinder these outcomes. Although there has been this evolution in thinking, ingrained attitudes which view cultural heritage as out of place in protected areas still persist in the general, especially Pākehā, New Zealand psyche, influencing the composition and priorities of organisations governing heritage in protected areas. There is an evident bias in staffing, funding and effort towards natural heritage conservation (over cultural heritage conservation) in DOC, which mirrors that of other protected area departments described in Chapter 3. Because of general attitudes whereby the conservation estate is “natural”, islands are “natural” showpieces or sanctuaries, and New Zealand’s history is insignificant, DOC, although having a mandate to manage and advocate for natural and cultural heritage values in the conservation estate, is predominantly focussing on natural heritage conservation. To a great extent, DOC has also found itself upholding the 100% Pure New Zealand image expected by tourists. As a result, there is a strong attitude that cultural heritage does not deserve to be conserved, or at least should be considered as a much lower priority, in the face of natural heritage conservation on islands in New Zealand’s conservation estate.

As a result of these main findings, the thesis suggested that managers of protected areas should aim to achieve a co-existence of natural and cultural heritage conservation. The major contribution of this thesis is, therefore, the call for a re-assessment of protected areas – as areas with a plurality of values which are neither natural nor cultural, but are important aspects of heritage which can be conserved. In this way, a middle ground between the two conflicting points of view can be found – the cultural heritage of protected areas can be acknowledged and conserved while the natural heritage values are also conserved and cherished. This view follows the calls from theorists under the umbrella of non-modern thinking to ‘adequately recognize the unique interwoven pattern of nature and culture which makes up the story of a place’ while not involving ‘a complete denial of the influence of nature’ (Plumwood, 2006: 132 & 141); and also relates closely to holistic indigenous understandings. All natural and cultural heritage can, for instance, be conceptualised using the Māori concept of taonga: a treasure to be conserved.

In the main, heritage management literature promotes a cultural landscape approach for protected areas. However, as highlighted from interviews with those managing Rangitoto and
Motutapu, these approaches are not well supported by natural heritage specialists or the
general public as they are seen to discredit “nature” which is highly cherished and
passionately protected. As an alternative, it may be easier and more effective to integrate the
conservation of cultural heritage into the fervent conservation of “natural” protected areas.

Chapter 8 suggested five strategies which could be followed to achieve such an aim: re-
assessing protected areas as being places where all kinds of heritage should be protected;
acknowledging the multiple heritage values of protected areas; using values-based
management; using interdisciplinary approaches to heritage management; and making
compromises between different points of view through discussions, negotiations, and sound
judgement calls. These principles are not new – they have been written about and
recommended in both academic literature and in heritage guidelines (e.g. Australia ICOMOS,
1999; ICOMOS NZ, 2010), notably in cultural landscape approaches (Blair, 1997; Brown,
2010; Phillips, 1998; Rössler, 2000; Titchen, 1996). However, due to contextual and
attitudinal reasons outlined above, these principles have not been able to be satisfactorily
upheld.

A major change in attitude is required from New Zealand society in general, and especially in
protected area organisations to acknowledge that protected areas have a history evident in
built heritage, archaeological sites and historical plantings for example, and that conserving
some or all of this history should not take away from the natural values of the area. By
achieving a co-existence of all types of heritage, cultural heritage values can be seen to
belong in so-called “natural” protected areas. In this way, in contrast to a cultural
landscape approach, both kinds of heritage are seen to have equal weighting.

The main idea to be taken from this thesis is that, ultimately, it is possible for cultural
heritage and natural heritage conservation to co-exist in protected areas. Protected area
departments, policy makers and the general public can take from this that the conservation of
cultural heritage need not take away from the conservation of natural heritage, and vice versa.
Instead, heritage (in the collective sense) can be conserved in all protected areas. All so-
called natural and cultural heritage can be considered as simply “heritage” or taonga. This
way, cultural heritage can be acknowledged and conserved while also conserving the natural
heritage cherished on conservation estate islands in New Zealand and protected areas around
the world.
9.2. LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH OPPORTUNITIES

As with all research, there are limitations which must be acknowledged. Here, I explain four such limitations. First of all, a general concern with a case study approach, and one which I encountered in this research, is the inability for case study findings and conclusions to be representative of the general phenomenon being studied (Stake, 1995; Yin, 2009). Case studies are essentially examples of a general phenomenon and not a complete study into the phenomenon itself. Likewise, there are problems associated with generalising from a limited number of case studies as there are always differences between examples and in different contexts. However, interviews with a variety of New Zealand managers of heritage in the conservation estate in general (not just on Rangitoto or Motutapu) and the study of substantial international literature have helped to validate that the examples of Rangitoto and Motutapu are indeed also similar to issues in protected areas around New Zealand and around the world. Nevertheless, not studying a greater selection of case studies is a limitation to this research. Future research could use examples from other New Zealand islands in the conservation estate, or from the hundreds of other examples around the world. A comparison could be made between the Old World and the New World which could demonstrate the differences in the way “nature” and “culture” are understood in places with different cultures and different lengths of human and European settlement.

Secondly, it must be acknowledged that there are limitations to which the influence of islandness can be studied by using only two island case studies without a comparison to the mainland. Although the influence of islandness on heritage management can be investigated through the consideration of islandness in heritage management literature, comments from interviewees, and findings from case studies, this limitation should be considered when taking into account findings of this research. In order to better ascertain the impact islandness has on heritage management, future research could compare an island case study to a contiguous or adjacent mainland example. For example, the cultural heritage management of Tiritiri Matangi Island (in the Hauraki Gulf) could be compared with that of close-by Shakespear Regional Park.

Third, despite highlighting the difficulties with – and even arguing against – the nature/culture dualism in heritage management, I have used the dualistic terms of “natural” and “cultural” heritage throughout this thesis. As explained, the nature/culture dualism is heavily embedded in Western thinking. Thus, like others with a similar background and
education, I, as a Westerner, find that the nature/culture dualism is embedded in my own thinking. To not write in a dualistic way would be to ignore the entrenched-ness of the dualism in heritage management and in my own thinking. Thus, in order to criticise the nature/culture dualism in heritage management, I have felt it necessary to use dualistic terminology. I do, nevertheless, acknowledge that by writing in these terms, the nature/culture dualism is perpetuated in this research. As Sundberg and Dempsey (2009: 458) state, ‘to write about nature/culture constructions is to presume the existence of a divide.’ Similar problems have been encountered by other researchers. For example, Argent (2009: 308) writes of the ‘almost inescapable problem of how to write about society and nature in a nondualistic fashion without starting with the two as separate entities which then have to be rethought as interpenetrated by each other.’

Fourthly, research was conducted at the time when Treaty of Waitangi negotiations involving Rangitoto and Motutapu were being undertaken. This research was therefore limited in the extent to which analysis could be done on the outcomes of these negotiations. However, as this deed of settlement has now been signed, and is now in the process of being passed in legislation (Finlayson, 2012), there is a good opportunity for future research on the outcomes of this settlement, and on the issues surrounding Māori and heritage management.

9.3. CLOSING NARRATIVE

To bring this thesis to a close I offer a personal narrative account of my trip to Rangitoto and Motutapu on the Motutapu Restoration Trust’s (MRT) “Big Weekender” programme, an overnight trip in which a group of up to 35 is taken on a guided walk over Rangitoto and Motutapu by an MRT volunteer on a Saturday before tree-planting on Motutapu the next day. This form of writing – along the same lines as Lorimer (2003) and Wylie (2005; 2009) – is used to experientially illuminate the themes of the thesis.

I went on this trip on Saturday 14 July 2012 with other students from the University of Auckland (UoA) Rotaract Club (a club of students who volunteer for various community events). Much of what I, and the others of the group, experienced on the trip was in stark contrast to what was described at the very beginning of this thesis: the demolition of the baches of Rangitoto in the 1970s and 1980s and the plans to plant over the archaeological landscape of Motutapu in the 1990s. My experience on the Motutapu “Big Weekender” highlights and illustrates some of the key themes of this research.
Experiences and observation on the MRT’s “Big Weekender”

Heading out into the harbour on the ferry, the symbols of civilisation – the Sky Tower and high-rise buildings of the Auckland central business district – gradually receded into the distance as we approached the iconic volcanic dark green island of Rangitoto. Before we set foot on the wharf we were reminded by the ferry staff that Rangitoto (and connected Motutapu) are pest-free islands and that we had to check for any rodents or other pests in any baggage being brought on to the island. Once we got off the ferry we waited at the toilet block for the MRT volunteer tour guide, John, to meet us. While we were waiting, excited tourists passed us, eager to walk up the track to the summit.

As we followed and made our way up the track, we could experience at close-hand the reasons why botanists and other natural scientists had become so fascinated by the island from the nineteenth century onwards: large pohutukawa trees were seen to be growing out of loose scoria, which seemed to resemble a Martian landscape. We – like the other tourists from the boat and the thousands of visitors each year – marvelled at the scenic beauty of the island: something not seen anywhere but in New Zealand (Figure 9.1).

Figure 9.1 Photo from the track towards the summit showing New Zealand’s largest pohutukawa forest growing out of the loose volcanic scoria.
As we began the track, we walked past the restored Bach 38 (a house museum), the tidal swimming pool, and the flat area once used as tennis courts by the Rangitoto wharf bach community during the middle decades of the twentieth century. As we passed, I found myself thinking of the comments of nature conservationists: Why should we preserve these deteriorating buildings or structures? They detract from the natural appeal of Rangitoto and are less than a hundred years old. Why keep them at the expense of a native ecosystem hundreds of years old? What is wrong with having places of nature where human history is not seen?

As we continued to walk up the ever-steepening track I also began to think about those who managed to climb up to the summit when there was no track in the 1870s, and the prison-workers who actually constructed the track in late 1920s. We passed tourists taking photos of the natural scenery, and passed interpretation signs explaining the volcanic eruption. Fifty minutes after we began the walk, we were at the summit. From the boardwalk at the top we could see a stunning 360-degree view of Auckland City and the Hauraki Gulf. We could fathom the enormous volcanic eruption that generated the island around 550 years ago. Looking south-west we could see the central city and the wide expanse of Auckland’s suburbs in the distance – a stark contrast to the volcanic and forested environment in which we were in (Figure 9.2). I was reminded why Rangitoto has been treasured as such a natural place. Looking east we could see the neighbouring islands of Motutapu and Motuihe – both islands undergoing ecological restoration, attracting hundreds of volunteers to do tree-planting and/or weeding of exotic pest species every weekend during the winter (Figure 9.3). Looking north, we could see Tiritiri Matangi, the first island in the Hauraki Gulf to be ecologically restored, and in the far distance we could see the outline of Little Barrier Island, one of New Zealand’s four islands reserved in the 1890s to preserve native fauna (Figure 9.4).
Figure 9.2 A view south-west from the summit of Rangitoto towards Auckland city (photo: Marc Magerkorth).

Figure 9.3 The view east towards Motutapu (left arrow) and Motuihe (right arrow), with Waiheke Island in the background (middle arrow) (photo: Marc Magerkorth).
After morning tea at the summit we continued our walk towards Motutapu Island. At one point three members of the group went off down a side track to see the historic shipwrecks at Wreck Bay and Boulder Bay which had been designated as significant heritage for the Auckland region by the ARC and DOC in the mid-1990s. The rest of us kept walking towards Islington Bay (the bay between Rangitoto and Motutapu), where we were invited into Bach 114, restored by RIHCT in 2011. Inside we were treated to a tour of the bach by a mother and a daughter, the former owners of the bach (Figure 9.5). They proudly showed off their small kitchen (including an outdoor fridge – cooled by the air), the original wallpaper, their fireplace, and the two small bedrooms. We learnt a history of the bach and were told a few stories about community activities in the bay – fishing competitions, tennis days and dances. The daughter remarked that she was a product of the baches – her parents had met while their families holidayed on the island. They took us outside to show their “sleepout” (a small building with beds for extra people) and the “long drop” (toilet). Some of our group had not seen a “long drop” before and took photos of it.
Figure 9.5 Inside Bach 114 where the UoA Rotaract group was invited into so former owners could share stories about their time at the bach. Their original wallpaper is on the right.

Our group then were led to Islington Bay wharf where we had our lunch. As I faced the bay, there was an old bach (Bach 78) being restored by a few RIHCT volunteers, and to its right, a gap where a bach had once been. It had been demolished sometime in the 1970s or 1980s; lost as part of the bach clearances (Figure 9.6).

Figure 9.6 The scene at Islington Bay today. Bach 114 on the left being restored (note the planks of wood) right next to a former site of a bach which had been demolished just a few decades ago.
As I looked at the bach being restored and the gap where a bach once was, I thought about the activities the women had just described to us which the holiday bach communities on Rangitoto had taken part in during the mid-twentieth century, and about how sorry they would be to see their baches being demolished. I thought about the reasons for demolishing the baches – they were illegal and were seen to detract from the natural values of the island – and about the architectural significance now attributed to the baches. I also thought about the struggles bach owners went through to retain the baches, and about the current plans to restore the remaining baches. Encapsulated in that scene were all the layers of thinking regarding the place or significance of the baches on Rangitoto. I thought how amazing it is that the baches have indeed been allowed to be restored given our strong nature conservation ethic and the conduciveness of islands to be seen as natural. From once being eyesores on the landscape, they are now protected, with some being actively restored by a small number of hard-working volunteers. By being restored they have become acceptable historic buildings, as opposed to unsightly ruins.

After our lunch we continued towards Motutapu. Former bach sites were marked by gaps in the forest, with the odd chimney still standing. The few remaining baches we saw displayed a RIBCA sticker on their front window – representing those whose bach leases have expired but who have been allowed to continue to use their baches until the Minister of Conservation decides what options to take in response to the 2006 court case. Eventually we then reached the causeway, a 141-metre land bridge and a short bridge linking the islands, built during World War II by American soldiers. Crossing the bridge, which John called “the shortest bridge over the Pacific Ocean” (Figure 9.7), we stepped on to the ancient, farmed island of Motutapu.

As we walked on to Motutapu we could see on our left terrace formations on a hill overlooking the bay which relate to Māori settlement on the island centuries ago (Figure 9.8). This reminded me of the significance of the island for archaeology. We walked for 15 minutes inland to the centre of farming operations on the island, and where the plant nursery is located for the revegetation of the island. John showed us the new developments of the nursery (Figure 9.9), funded by the Air New Zealand Environment Trust – a way, I thought, for the airline to feel more sustainable and show they are doing something for the environment.
Figure 9.7 The UoA Rotaract group walking from Rangitoto to Motutapu over the bridge onto the causeway.

Figure 9.8 Terrace formations (archaeological features) on a hill overlooking Islington Bay.
Figure 9.9 The new developments of the plant nursery, funded by the Air New Zealand Environment Trust.

John then gave us a tour of the current nursery: from the little seedlings partially enclosed in netting to the larger seedlings that are placed outside the netting so they can “harden up” before they are planted by volunteers (Figure 9.10). John explained the names of the plants and that the seeds had been eco-sourced from trees either on the island or within a five-kilometre radius of the island – to make the plantings as “natural” as possible.

Figure 9.10 Tour guide John showing some members of the UoA Rotaract club the small seedlings in the nursery.
As we left I saw a plaque and a tree marking the site where Prince Philip, the International President of the World Wide Fund for Nature at the time, had planted a pohutukawa on 1 March 1992 to mark the beginning of the ecological restoration of the island (Figure 9.11). For me, it was symbolic also of the beginning of heated conflict between ecologists and archaeologists in the 1990s.

Walking over Motutapu, we negotiated farm fences, cows, World War II storage pits (which had been embedded into the side of the hills so they could not be seen from the air), and doubtless walked over archaeological sites whose surface features had become invisible through damage by animals or tractors, to the Sunde archaeological site on the western coast of the island (Figure 9.12). John explained that this was the site where the famous footprints in the ash were found, evidence that Māori had settled on Motutapu before the Rangitoto eruption. I thought about the significance of Motutapu’s archaeology and asked myself why people would want to plant over such a historical place. No archaeological landscape as large and intact as this one exists in the Auckland region. It is able to provide information on
Māori settlement in the region unable to be gained from oral or written records. But, archaeology does not have a high standing compared to the strong desire in New Zealand to revegetate islands to their natural appearance.

Figure 9.12 Members of the UoA Rotaract group walking towards the bay where the Sunde site is located. Note a storage pit on the right, associated with the World War II infrastructure on the island.

We continued on to Pig Bay, where archaeological excavations had been undertaken in the mid-twentieth century. We then came around a final corner of the coast to arrive (after four hours of walking) at Administration Bay – a collection of historical buildings relating to the former headquarters for World War II soldiers on the island, and now used as an outdoor education camp for school children by MOEC. After stowing our possessions in our bunk rooms at the former Officers’ Quarters building, we visited the museum located in one of the former barracks which had been used to accommodate around 100 soldiers on the island. The museum had display boards showing the various periods of the island’s history – Māori settlement, European purchase and farming, and the World War II period. We then watched a 20-minute DVD documentary, The Guns of Motutapu (2006), which went through the history of the island, directed and produced by Chris Kennan, a volunteer of the MRT. The film included a 3D computer-generated re-enactment of the firing of the three large gun cannons at Motutapu. The film and the museum highlighted to the group the many layers of history Motutapu has, spanning the first human settlement in the area, the first European settlement in Auckland, to the present day. After the video, John took us up to explore the
three large gun emplacements and associated underground bunkers and tunnels which were to defend Auckland from attack by the Japanese (Figure 9.13; 9.14).

Figure 9.13 Members of the UoA Rotaract group walking up from Administration Bay (the old barrack buildings are in the centre of the photo) towards the World War II gun emplacements. The top of Rangitoto can be seen on the background in the left.

Figure 9.14 John explaining to students about the gun emplacement before heading down the stairs to the underground bunkers (photo: Harry Yoon).
The next morning we woke to rain. John took us for another walk over to the eastern side of the island to Home Bay where we met other volunteers arriving for a Sunday of tree-planting. On our walk we went through a forest which was the first area planted by the volunteers. I was once again stunned at the expanse of the forest – covering basically the whole of the valley towards Home Bay (Figure 9.15). From a distance the forest seemed “natural” enough, but from walking through it we could see how the trees were spaced evenly apart – the literal social construction of nature.

![Forest inland from Home Bay](image.png)

**Figure 9.15** The forest inland from Home Bay which was completely planted by volunteers in the 1990s.

We stopped at a former World War II pillbox which had been installed to guard the island from a commando attack from the coast. We could stand on the top of it to see the coast, but because of the surrounding (planted) trees we can no longer look from its window to the coast (Figure 9.16). At 9.30am the ferry arrived with about 100 volunteers ready and eager to plant trees; fewer than usual because of the poor weather. Even so, it seemed remarkable to me that so many people would turn out on such a poor day to plant trees. But this highlighted the strong nature conservation ethic evident in New Zealand. The volunteers consisted of us from the UoA Rotaract Club, the UoA Tramping Club (who had hoped to plant trees on close-by Motuihe, but had to come to Motutapu as Motuihe’s day had been
cancelled due to the weather), school students visiting from Boston, MRT committee members, and other members of the public.

Figure 9.16 The top of the pillbox in amongst the volunteer forest close to Home Bay. The top of the structure is the only place where one can see the coast – the reason for its establishment.

Everyone gathered in the recently-restored Red Barn (purportedly over 100 years old according to research done by the MRT) for a briefing from MRT committee members. We were told about the ecological restoration plan for the island and were divided into three groups – two groups to do tree-planting in different areas, and one group to weed and transfer plants in the plant nursery. The MRT members spoke as if war had been declared on the exotic weeds.

At our respective planting areas, we were given instructions on how to plant (Figure 9.17). The MRT instructors picked up the trees and cradled them like babies. They explained that we should plant a mixture of trees: “how nature would do it.” As we planted the trees, anxious instructors walked around checking to see whether we had dug each hole the correct depth (so that the tree roots would not dry out), whether we had remembered to place a fertiliser tablet near the roots (which helps to ensure its survival), and if we planted a natural (in their eyes) mixture of plants.
In two hours or so we had managed to plant over 300 trees. As I stared back at the newly created forest, I wondered whether there had ever been any archaeological sites on the area we had planted. I thought about what the Māori and Europeans who originally cleared the forest would think of us spending a day planting and undoing their work. Just as I had marvelled at the scenic beauty of Rangitoto, I marvelled at the way the volunteers so energetically and enthusiastically planted trees on Motutapu. I could see first-hand the way people can take pride in doing something for the environment.

Returning to Home Bay, the groups gathered at the Reid Homestead to enjoy a sausage sizzle and some tea. At 3pm all the volunteers were called in to hear about how each group had fared. Each MRT leader of each group proudly explained their achievements: the number of trees planted, the number of moth plant (pest) bulbs taken off vines, and the number of volunteers on such a poor day. We then waited at the restored Reid Homestead until being collected by the ferry at 4pm (Figure 9.18).
I, and my group, had experienced first-hand key themes of my research: the outcomes of the past desire to make the islands as natural as possible; the increasing acknowledgement of the importance of cultural heritage on the islands, the strong New Zealand desire to “do something for nature” through planting trees and to keep places as “pristine” as possible, the conduciveness of islands for natural heritage conservation, and the ingrained bias towards natural heritage conservation in the management of the islands. However, by being able to see the (natural and cultural) heritage features of both Rangitoto and Motutapu, we were able to view both islands as sanctuaries for both natural and cultural heritage, and recognise that cultural heritage can be conserved while natural heritage is also cherished.
Appendix

A. 1 Participant information sheet (read and signed by all interviewees).

**Consent Form**

THIS CONSENT FORM WILL BE HELD FOR A PERIOD OF SIX YEARS

**Project title:** Heritage Management and the Nature/Culture dualism: managing cultural heritage on conservation islands in New Zealand

**Researcher:** David Bade

I have been given and have understood an explanation of this research project. I have had an opportunity to ask questions and have them answered.

I understand that I may withdraw myself or any information traceable to me at any time up to 3 months after our interview/s without giving a reason.

- I agree to take part in this research
- I agree that the interview will be audio recorded
- I wish to/ do not wish to (delete one) remain anonymous

Signed: __________________________________________

Name:
(please print clearly) __________________________________________

Date: __________________________________________
A. 2 Consent form for the interviews (read by all interviewees).

Participant Information Sheet

**Project Title:** Heritage Management and the Nature/Culture dualism: managing cultural heritage on conservation islands in New Zealand

**Place and time of interview:**

My name is David Bade. I am a geography PhD student in the School of Environment at the University of Auckland conducting research for my Doctoral thesis. I am conducting this interview as part of my thesis research into the management of cultural heritage on conservation islands. The thesis will be based on three case studies in New Zealand (Rangitoto, Motutapu and Matiu/Somes Island) and points of comparison overseas.

You are invited to participate in my research as an interviewee. I am interested in your experiences and perceptions of tensions between natural and cultural heritage. The interview will last up to two hours, but I will interview you for a duration that suits you best. I would prefer to digitally record the interview to facilitate note-taking, but this would only be done with your consent and could be turned off at any time. The recording of the interview will be stored on my laptop and my computer at the University of Auckland. After six years, the data will be deleted.

You are under no obligation to be interviewed. You also have the right to withdraw from the research at any time without giving a reason. If you do participate, I would like to name you in the thesis and any subsequent publication of the thesis. However, you have the option to remain anonymous. Should you be interested in the results of this research, a copy of the thesis will be made available to you.

Thank you very much for your time and help in making this study possible. If you have any queries or wish to know more please phone me at 0211807017. You can also email me at dbad008@aucklanduni.ac.nz.

My main supervisor is: Dr Gretel Boswijk  
School of Environment  
The University of Auckland  
Private Bag 92019  
Auckland.  
Tel. 373 7599 extn. 83886

The Head of School is: Professor Glenn McGregor  
School of Environment  
The University of Auckland  
Private Bag 92019  
Auckland.  
Tel. 373 7599 extn. 85284

For any queries regarding ethical concerns please contact:  

The Chair, The University of Auckland Human Participants Ethics Committee, The University of Auckland, Office of the Vice Chancellor, Private Bag 92019, Auckland. Tel. 373-7999 extn 87830.
A. 3 The list of potential questions asked at the interviews.

**Background:**

1. Can you please tell me about your background and position here at this organisation?
2. How have you been associated with Rangitoto and/or Motutapu either personally or through your research?

**Natural/Cultural Heritage Issues and Tensions:**

3. Are there, in your opinion, tensions or issues between natural and cultural heritage in the management of your island? If so, what are some examples and how have they become issues? If not, why does there not seem to be this issue?
4. Do you think cultural heritage has a good standing in natural contexts? In other words, is cultural heritage being acknowledged and managed effectively in these contexts?
5. Do you think cultural heritage is being adequately accounted for? Why/why not?
6. What is your understanding of natural and cultural heritage?
7. Should there be a division between natural and cultural heritage?
8. Do you think there is too much of an emphasis on natural heritage on the island? Why or why not?
9. Should or can the cultural heritage of the island be retained? Why or why not?
10. Is the cultural heritage of the island too insignificant to be acknowledged in the face of natural heritage? Why or why not?
11. Do you think there is a difference between natural and cultural heritage management? If so, what differences? If not, why not?
12. What is specifically managed on the island? What aspects and sites?
13. Why is it important to preserve and protect such things as an abandoned mine control base?
14. Are the actively managed areas being actively managed?
15. Why do you think it is important to acknowledge/preserve/protect the cultural heritage of the island?

**Origins of the issue:**

16. Why is there this issue? What factors contribute to this issue?

- **New Zealand/country context**
17. Do you think the identity of this country has had an effect on what is emphasised in heritage management? In what way?
18. To what extent does the New Zealand identity of being “clean and green” or “100% Pure” contribute to this issue?
19. Has this context made natural heritage easier to restore or conserve? Or has it made cultural heritage harder to conserve?
20. Has the perception of New Zealand as a young country meant that New Zealand’s cultural heritage is seen to be less significant than our natural heritage and cultural heritage in other countries?
• Department of Conservation
21. In your opinion is DOC doing a good job looking after the heritage of the islands?
22. Do you think there is a bias within DOC towards natural heritage? If so, why?
23. Is there a lack of training and awareness for (DOC) natural heritage managers regarding cultural heritage management?

• Island context
24. Does being an island make any difference to how heritage is managed and what is being managed?
25. Does being an island make it easier to promote/encourage natural heritage conservation? What about for cultural heritage?
26. What has to change in society in order for cultural heritage to gain wider appeal/balance this apparent imbalance?

Solutions to this issue:

27. Is natural and cultural heritage compatible? Why, why not?
28. How can cultural and natural heritage co-exist? How can they be managed?
29. What are the best ways to preserve cultural heritage in these contexts (natural conservation islands)? How can you acknowledge cultural heritage (especially intangible heritage)?
30. How can you best increase the awareness of cultural heritage in these “natural” contexts?
31. What is the best way to manage cultural heritage? Interpretation? Restoration?
32. Can there ever be an ideal balance between natural and cultural heritage? What is an ideal balance?
33. In your opinion, what are the best methods to manage the natural/cultural heritage issue?
34. What do you think is the best way to conceptualize/think about natural and cultural heritage? (nature and culture as separate; as a cultural landscape; somewhere between the two)
35. What, if any, mechanisms have been put in place to increase the acknowledgement of cultural heritage in natural areas?
36. Do we even need a balance?
37. Would you say that the formation of places of nature for the conservation of natural heritage outweighs any under-acknowledgement of cultural heritage in these places?

More information:

38. Can you recommend any literature or sources that may be useful for me?
39. Do you know of any other contacts I should get in touch with regarding my research?
40. Are there any other islands or places with similar/well-known issues?
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