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Abstract

Auckland city is built upon over 50 volcanoes. This research explores key selected meanings of these, with an eye to the role of physicality in meaning creation. The methodology includes landscape phenomenology and autoethnography placed in conversation with textual analysis of the New Zealand Herald newspaper. Representational and non-representational accounts are addressed, including 'nonhuman charisma'. I develop a perspective that combines materialist insight with discourse theory to situate the meanings of the volcanoes in a more-than-human context.

The thesis is structured around different methodological moments and actors. Analysis is backgrounded by a history of the reciprocal relationship between volcanoes and Auckland city. This suggests an augmentation of nonhuman charisma over time, as smaller and more distant volcanoes were quarried away and already-prominent cones gained physical, and later visual, protection. My own experiences are used to engage with the contemporary form of one volcano, Maungawhau/Mount Eden. This highlights the centrality of afforded vision and demonstrates intersections with concepts of “nature”. These themes are echoed in the visual presence of volcanic cones when moving through the city. Charismatic volcanoes are also prominent semiotically and tied to local and city identity. This uneven familiarity and affective identification is shown to have formed an integral part of a recent media campaign to “save” certain volcanoes from damage. Other conservation tactics included selective mobilisation of “heritage” discourse, and obscure legislation that was itself granted efficacy through repeated media coverage. The physical and semiotic prominence of Maungakiekie/One Tree Hill can be similarly seen to underlie its persistent and emotive use as symbolic focus for race relation discussion. I note a shift in the presentation of the volcanoes following plans to return many volcanic cones to the iwi collective, Ngā Mana Whenua o Tāmaki Makaurau, embodied in local media by use of “maunga”, articulating volcanic cones as a group with contemporary Maori interests. The importance of a re-articulation with Maori is underscored by the volcanoes' persistent and affective association with “nature” through geology and imagined disaster. This analysis draws on a bodily "sublime" aesthetic, the celebration of which paradoxically haunts even recent drives towards risk mitigation.
For Andrew.
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1. Situations: introducing Molten Territories

“Auckland is a thriving city, nurtured on a nest of volcanoes” (Searle 1981, viii)

My city is peppered with pastorally pleasant, often-vulnerable volcanoes. While numerous practices and narratives furnish these with a range of articulated identities, the physical volcanoes are also markedly disparate in form and setting. The Auckland Volcanic Field, an area of previous and estimated future volcanic activity, is around 360km² and centred approximately on the city’s central business district. It stretches in an oval northwards to Lake Pupuke in suburban North Shore, east to the suburb of Howick, south to the emerging “Manukau City Centre”, and west most of the way across the city’s central isthmus. In total, it encompasses an area in which over a million people live (Murray, McDonald, and Cronin 2014). The current bounds of this area are estimated from existing volcanic locations, of which there are over fifty. Some are noticeable from a distance, particularly the dark mass of Te Rangi-i-Totonga-a-Tamatekapua/Ngā Tuaitara-a-Taikehu, commonly called Rangitoto¹, which dominates the Waitematā harbour. Over a dozen grass-and-tree-clad hills emerge from amongst suburban houses, never more a couple of hundred metres high but dispersed throughout the isthmus and its surrounds. Other volcanoes are low and hidden in the landscape. Some are blasted craters now filled with swampland or reclaimed for sports fields, others lagoons tens of metres deep. Several have been quarried to obscurity, some built over entirely with no indication left to hint at the volcano that was. As a collective, then, these volcanoes are simultaneously a continued presence and invisible. Some are obscure and barely visited, some are hidden, some are over-loved and increasingly trampled by over a million visitors a year (New Zealand Tourism Research Institute 2001, 2005). The numbers of these volcanoes fluctuate wildly in the telling. I have heard accounts from 20 to over 100, a figure geologists sometimes clarify with a marginally less ambiguous “around 50” (Hayward and Kermode 1994).

These diverse and dispersed volcanic forms can be gathered together in the space of two words, “Auckland’s volcanoes”. This conceptual entity, so swiftly referenced, incorporates the familiar and the imagined: like the imagined community of the city itself, parts of the field

1 The recent Ngā Mana Whenua o Tāmaki Makaurau Collective Redress Act 2014, passed July 2014 and discussed in more detail chapter 7, returned the ownership of many volcanoes to Mana Whenua and brought about a change in the official names of many volcanic sites. For some, such as Rangitoto, multiple Māori names were noted but the official name remained unchanged as dual names allowed only one designation from each language.
are intimately known while others are characterised through association. Also like the city itself, “Auckland’s volcanoes” are spanned by the *New Zealand Herald* ("the Herald"), a daily broadsheet written in and centred on New Zealand’s biggest city. This offers mediated information on volcanoes and city alike. Parisi and Holcomb describe similar newspapers as primarily engaged with the production of place, creating an “Auckland” even as disparate elements of this are reported, its properties and future of this at times discussed overtly. The same is the case with Auckland’s volcanoes. Throughout my period of study – 2000-2012 inclusive – this gathered whole was implicitly and explicitly invested with properties, moral weight, concern, fear. It was aligned with political causes, opposed to others, celebrated, and even gifted.

I grew up next to Maungawhau/Mount Eden, gazing at it from my bedroom window and watching its cattle and visitors over my neighbour’s trees. I visited it frequently, seeking it out as a perceived piece of local wilderness that, I felt, was mine to explore and imagine. Its bubbly basalt surrounded my house in dry-stone walls and it stood, seemingly a guardian, over the nearby “village” and the areas I routinely walked. It also was, and still is, one of the city’s most visited and officially considered volcanoes. In the mid-2000s my imagination was captured by a sign towards its base that requested input into its management plan and future. To my sociologically-trained eyes this seemed a hint at the swirling, molten currents behind the solid and familiar. Such currents included passion, heat as well as movement. This promise of multiplicity was fascinating, yet theoretical discussion was moving beyond an emphasis on such things and towards questions of the physical. This, too, was also relevant to my experience, particularly in moments of surprise: the repeatedly unexpected beauty of the city’s weather from its summit, suburbs swept by bands of rain or buried beneath morning fog; the burn of its ascent always a little more than anticipated; an attempt to bury a much-loved cat in his favourite spot thwarted by a submerged hunk of basalt.

As my ontical question, I am interested in the articulated meanings offered for the volcanoes within relatively confined but influential set of spheres. My focus is chiefly the city-wide (and national) newspaper, *The New Zealand Herald*, between 2000 and 2012. I conceptualise this as a space of meaning *negotiation* through articulation. This can be contrasted with mimetic representation, as discussed below, or unidirectional discursive construction. I accordingly put this text in conversation with the physicality of the volcanoes. As a sociologist I am interested in how these meanings change and intersect with wider societal narratives and operate within a wider societal context. But, at a theoretical level, I am also interested in the presence of the physical volcanoes within this text; the ways that these are not only implied by what is said but influence it more directly. This is explored inductively, but I gained a
useful theoretical tool in the concept of “nonhuman charisma”, discussed below. I argue that the physicality of the volcanoes provides energy to their portrayal that is utilised by the attempted “construction” of them as types of entities: as places to visit, as needing protection, signifiers of threat necessitating particular action, inherently tied to Mana Whenua, the indigenous Māori peoples. In doing this I draw on understandings of “affect”, understood as both the ability of a relationship to literally affect its participants and as something akin to human emotion. This offers a hint as to how the volcanoes continue to exert agency and provide a vitality, presence and importance to the discursive relationships offered within the Herald. As such, the volcanoes' physicality is not only present within these sites as an implication, but carries agency, here, understood as the ability to influence a given situation gained through a particular constellation of relationality.

The situation of research in scholarly context

This study can be understood within the increasing body of sociology interested in place (Gieryn 2000, Bell and Matthewman 2004, Carter, Craig, and Matthewman 2005, Duncan and Ross 2010). However, it is part of a wider interdisciplinary conversation, and I reference a number of texts from cultural geography and landscape anthropology, archaeology, history, heritage studies, studies of science and technology (SST), etc., many of which themselves cross disciplinary boundaries in multiple directions. I also draw repeatedly on broader engagements between social scientists and the nonhuman. While division or even opposition between the human and nonhuman is increasingly recognised as untenable, as Castree argues (2004), concepts of “nature” itself remain important. I refer to the volcanoes broadly through the lens of “landscape” due to their diverse and scattered presence within daily life. This is a concept that has been drastically transformed over recent decades, in particular the dissociation of its primarily visual and aesthetic connotations to more multifaceted understandings of human-world interaction (Macphearson 2010, Wylie 2007, Hirsch and O’Hanlon 1995, Rössler 2009, Hinchliffe 2003, Bender 1993, Tilley 1994, Bender 2006, Carolan 2008, Bender and Winer 2001). It has included small, meaningful locations that may just as readily be spoken of as “places” (e.g. Bender and Winer 2001, Bender 1993, Casella 2001), and my language throughout this thesis may shift accordingly.

More broadly, this project takes place within the context of a decades-long theoretical conversation to do with the relationship of representation and meaning to the physical world, taking place across disciplines and sub-disciplinary interests within sociology, anthropology, geography, and others. Although presented in a number of locations, a brief contextual reiteration of this is relevant in explaining my particular interest in physical influences upon
newspaper text. An early point of reference is the so-called “cultural turn” of the late 1980s onwards, the defining feature of which was the primacy of human meaning (Adams 2009a). For those interested in landscape, the “new cultural geography” blurred the physical with other symbolic systems (Cosgrove and Daniels 1988, 1). The ideational and the discursive was seen to shape the environment (Duncan 1990, Barnes and Duncan 1992) and landscape could be read as a “text” replete with symbolic meaning (Cosgrove 1989, Cosgrove and Daniels 1988, see Anderson and Harrison 2010). Particular attention was paid to discourse and written text, as well as visual representation. To scholars interested in the nonhuman, the “social construction of nature” placed the social at the heart of that which seemed defined by it absence. The excitement of social constructivism was that it revealed the foundational as fragile, the obvious as contested and riddled with politics and power (Wetherell 2012). To me, it seemed to offer a magic trick, a sleight of hand where all that was solid melted into meaning, destabilising the very ground beneath one’s feet.

Yet a number of concerns developed in relation to this. In particular, these related to the excessive elevation of human meaning-making, language, and representation. Many expressed this in terms of an impoverishing “Cartesian” (Carolan 2008) prioritisation of an artificially separated mind over body, human over the wider world. Particularly with regard to prior focus on social construction, there was concern that the agency, complexity and richness of the physical world was glossed over. At its (perhaps caricatured) worst these were discounted entirely, the world a “terra nullis” in wait of meaning imposed by human interpretation (Carolan 2008, 410).

A number of tactics developed to address these concerns and bridge this rift. Many converged in and were exemplified by “non-representational theory” (NRT) ² (e.g. Thrift and Dewsbury 2000, Thrift 2004a, 2008, 2004c): an ‘umbrella term for diverse work that seeks better to cope with our self-evidently more-than-human, more-than-textual, multisensual worlds’ (Lorimer 2005, 84). Some scholars paid increased attention to embodiment (Csordas 1994), inspired particularly by Merleau-Ponty (1962) and earlier phenomenological work. A special issue of Theory, Culture and Society (Macnaghten and Urry 2001a) investigated “Bodies of Nature”. This was not an argument for naïve experience, but manifested in ongoing attention to practice and performance (Szerszynski, Heim, and Waterton 2003). Part of the emphasis was on the generation of meaning through channels

---

² The confrontational name is intentionally ironic, and other scholars utilise Hayden Lorimer’s “softened” “more-than-representational” (Lorimer 2005). Although most frequently discussed in the context of geography, this spans the social sciences: Thrift’s (2008) compilation was published as part of the International Library of Sociology series (see also Macnaghten and Urry 2001a, Thrift and Dewsbury 2000).
other than conscious thought. Indeed the agentic world, and humans within it, were underscored as not entirely comprehensible to conscious thought or, by extension, language and representation. Non-Representational Theory was itself not opposed to representation but posited as a correction to previous myopia (Dewsbury et al. 2002). Hinchliffe, for example, underscored the importance of representations as performative “presentations”, contrasting these with a focus on mimesis (Hinchliffe 2003). A more recent edited collection (Anderson and Harrison 2010) contains a number of chapters within a section on representation, broadly united in their reiteration of Hinchliffe’s assertion. However, in practice NRT has often operated dialectically with the interests of the “cultural turn”. The multisensual, vital “richness” of embodied human experience is frequently contrasted with the limitations of representation and language, particularly their inability to capture this complexity and excess.

The artificial distinction between human and world has been also criticised. Early attention was paid to Ingold’s (Ingold 1992, 2000, 1993) “dwelling perspective”, which emphasised people as always-already formed by and part of an inhabited, meaningful, and propertied world. Deleuzo-Guattarian emphasis added a characteristic “vitality” to these accounts, underscoring excess, movement, and ethical attention to the could-be-otherwise. Scholars interested in “nature” paid increasing attention to human-nature “hybrids” (Swyngedouw 1996, Ferrier 2011, Whatmore 2002), cyborgs (Haraway 1991), “nature-cultures”, postnatures (see Castree 2005), and co-constitution (Castree 2004). This frequently drew on Actor-Network Theory as tool for conceptualising the relational agency of living and non-living actants (Curtis 2002). This was often fused with Deleuzo-Guattarian concepts into ‘generalised accounts of collaborative and emergent agency’ (Clark 2011, 32). For many social scientists interested in the nonhuman, focus moved away from the meanings of “nature” and towards components of a “more-than-human” social, or even the ontological without humanity at all. More broadly, recent scholars have referred variously to the “material turn” (Shove 2010) and “ontological turn” (Roberts 2012) within social theory.

This beyond-representational, more-than-human attention has undoubtedly filled scholarly lacunae and enriched discussion of the social. Yet this shift in emphasis also explains the anxiety I felt about my continued desire to examine the play of meaning that surrounds the volcanoes, even in what is arguably the largest of meaning-making forums in the country. Roberts recently notes, ‘with the ontological turn and its focus on material cultures and performance, studying ‘representations’ has become less fashionable’ (Roberts 2012, 387). Castree and Macmillan were moved, in 2004, to write an editorial arguing for the continued significance of what they characterised as the “old news” of representation (Castree and
Macmillan 2004). Almost a decade later, writing about affect, Wetherell claims, ‘For many people working within cultural studies…it sometimes seems that what is most exciting about affect is that it is not discourse’ (Wetherell 2012, 19). The argument she makes could equally apply to a more general focus on the bodily and the physical. She notes that this ‘seems to index a realm beyond talk, words and texts, beyond epistemic regimes, and beyond conscious representation and cognition. In short, it is something unfamiliar in social science communities bored with at least 20-30 years of the "discursive turn"...' (Wetherell 2012, 19).

Both Wetherell and Castree and Macmillan’s article make a claim for the pursuit of novelty. Yet with 8 years between them, what they seem to be arguing against is the emphatic distancing from what was rather than the actual content of new research. Both argue for a continued re-working of old interests, with new insights brought to mind. For Castree and Macmillan, this was expressed as a desire for a “new” focus on representation ‘that is intensely alert to its ineluctable possibilities and perils’ (Castree and Macmillan 2004, 470). Notably, explicit responses to this article’s call have tended to focus on the sensually striking and visually evocative: op art, utilising optical illusion (Rycroft 2005); mbira music (Hancock-Barnett 2012); interpretative dance (Somdahl-Sands 2011); cinematic portrayals of stalking (Campbell 2012); and argument for the “haunting” nature of visual images (Roberts 2012)³.

My own interest in representation within newspaper text may seem reminiscent of the interests of an earlier, drier, “cultural” prioritisation of the linguistic. In doing so it practically engages with the situation of all representation within the complex, embodied, and lively context illuminated by NRT and other recent scholarly material.

This thesis

I agree that representation and meaning still remains important for humans as meaning-making animals. The mobility of representation, in particular, allows for continued sense-making long after, or away from, an object/event. It allows for new information to be entered into experience that, contrary to the rhetoric of “deadening”, can enrich and enliven a sense of place. This facilitates the imagination and recognition of that which has gone before, for example, turning the factory-ring rugby field of Gloucester Park into the secret remainder of mind-blowing geological forces (Clement 2011b). I am interested in the presence of the physical within the representational; I want to explore the charge that this “renders mute” the world in the construction of meaning. I do not want to deny many of the insights gained in

³ Although see Hacgüzeller (2012), who challenges a prevailing critique of GIS that contrasts it with “embodied” landscape engagement, and Mohony’s (2014) detailed attention to the IPCC’s “burning embers” climate change graph.
more recent scholarship. However, my focus has returned to meaning because, despite the importance of other insights relating to the ontological nature of the world (and beyond), to humans, meaning remains important.

In chapter two, “Foundations and tools”, I outline the theoretical assumptions underpinning analysis. I argue for media representation as a specific sphere of meaning-making, which seldom aim to represent experience as such. With regard to the volcanoes, in particular, many of these are familiar locations or background forms to everyday dwelling within the city. Herald articles convey events and issues relating to what is often familiar and, particularly within more explicitly subjective opinion columns, attempt to negotiate their meaning. Critical discourse analysis emphasises the “three dimensional” nature of discursive text, in particular drawing attention to political-economic influences on form and content. I underscore the Herald and its “ideal audience” as emplaced, assuming uneven spatial and visual connection to individual volcanoes. Laclau and Mouffe (1985) then point towards articulation - the establishment and dissolving of relational identities – as a key mechanism of discourse. This kinaesthetic metaphor remains useful throughout my thesis. I note the attempted articulation of volcanoes, the city and the Herald’s readers with specific actions, entities and experiences, the affective and the moral.

I utilise Jamie Lorimer’s (2007) concept of “nonhuman charisma”; a typology of the contributions of the physical to the formation of, in his case, animal charisma, theoretically grounded in a more-than-human relational ontology. This provides a useful way in which to conceptualise differences in people’s apparent relationships with volcanic sites. It also engages with affective agency of these volcanoes. Although Lorimer notes the potential for his theory to be used in regard to place, it thus-far has not been systematically explored as such. My thesis embodies a modification of this that will, I hope, be useful for others interested in the physicality of the nonhuman in more diverse forms, and its relationship to human meaning-making and political endeavour. I also consider the relationship of this typology to the mediasphere, noting how this physicality and mediation should not be understood in a uni-directional way but in a reciprocal relationship that challenges a supposed separation between representation and the physical. In this I draw particularly on Wetherell’s (2012) understanding of media as a way that affect can travel and be transformed; a processes that need not lessen or “capture” the impact of the nonhuman but draw it into the human realm of meaningful practice.

Following this, in chapter three I outline my methods and the rationales behind them. This includes the selection of articles and textual analysis, influenced by the correlations Altheide
(e.g. 1987) draws between the latter and ethnography. It also includes “landscape phenomenology” and autoethnography. The first of these uses deliberately sought experience as a resource; the latter, broader experience, identity, and subjective responses to the process of scholarly work. These are held in conversation with textual analysis, an ongoing process of thinking through encounters with volcanoes and text. In chapter four I offer a detailed history of the physical volcanoes, including an account of the cultural “landscape tectonics” (Hinchliffe 2003) that have continued post-eruption. In addition to simply providing a background to the volcanoes, this underscores the complexity of their continual shaping as relational entities. I highlight how their present forms can be read as an augmentation of particular valued properties that correspond with the charismatic, in particular the privileging of the central, large, and highly visible.

Chapter five, “Not so empty signifiers”, concentrates phenomenological and autoethnographic endeavour. I begin with the specific: Maungawhau/Mount Eden. This account includes experiences fostered by growing up next to this mountain, alongside a more generalised narrative of ascent. I illustrate how the volcano presents as separate from the surrounding city in a number of ways, including through its physical differentiation from the wider city and coherence with discourses of “nature”. I then illustrate the uneven visual presence of volcanoes within the city, and how their continued presence extends to mediated form; a further compounding of the already-charismatic, facilitated by their jizz (ready recognisability) and visibility.

Within chapter six, “Volcanoes under threat”, I look at the volcanoes as objects at-risk and in need of protection from human influence. Within official forums this combination of vulnerability and value is usually presented as “heritage”, potentially defined as “that which we want to keep” but incorporating a system of practices and narratives that incorporate sites into a greater understanding; what Smith calls the “Authorised Heritage Discourse”. Despite its presence within official documents relating to the volcanoes, it not this discourse but a mobilisation of the intimate and the charismatic that enabled the partial protection of one volcano – Puketāpapa/ Pukewīwī/Mount Roskill – from the encroachment of State Highway 20. I argue that coverage within the Herald itself played a significant role in this protection.

In chapter seven, “Raising maunga”, I examine emerging representation of the volcanoes’ future as Māori entities, particularly as concreted in the Treaty of Waitangi agreement with Ngā Mana Whenua o Tāmaki Makaurau. This is seen within the Herald through the increasing utilisation of “maunga”, a term that breaks with the primacy of volcanic origin and
enters these entities into a completely different set of relationships, as well as increasing use of names in te reo Māori. Though the volcanoes have long been acknowledged as having Māori history, this portrayal offers a change of identity, the potential for them to be understood as inherently “Māori places”.

This is particularly important as the volcanoes have been persistently haunted by the memory, and promise, of fire and destruction. Chapter eight, “Volcanoes that threaten” explores the portrayal of the volcanoes as explicitly volcanic. This is present within two forms, as geological risk narrative, and a more playful engagement with the excitement of imagined eruption. The second form is, I argue, dependent on and fuelled by bodily relations with the volcanic. This is in part the charismatic spectacle of fire, but also the recognition of human vulnerability and the limitations of perception in the face of a threat, which I interpret through the Burkean concept of the “sublime”. It is also seen in a narrative of geological risk. This is linked to powerful international discourse and practice of risk management, with its presence within the Herald fuelled by contemporary projects of geological risk assessment and the attempted mitigation of damage. Yet, as I illustrate, the endeavours associated with this continue to draw on the charisma, fascination and thrill of fiery danger even in practices overtly intended to constrain and minimise this. Throughout, analysis draws extensively both from history and autoethnographic biography. As with the representations of the volcanoes themselves, it is informed by bodily interaction as well as wide-ranging debates and concepts of nature and culture, colonial and “other”, risk and pleasure.
2. Foundations and tools

This exploration is situated within a broader theoretical conversation, but has itself often operated inductively. The standard “theory” chapter is accordingly presented here as “foundations”, or assumptions, and “tools” that have emerged as useful throughout analysis.

I begin by noting assumptions as to what sites such as the New Zealand Herald (the Herald) are. Going beyond critiques of representation that focus on its limited capacity for mimesis (see also Castree and Macmillan 2004) I argue instead that the Herald is presented as a specific site of meaning negotiation. Discursive text within this site is produced and received by embodied, meaning-making animals operating within a broadly identifiable physical and social environment. This resonates with Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), which points towards the “three dimensionality” of discourse, highlighting the physical and social circumstances of textual production and reception. Attention to the political economy of newspaper production underscores the physical emplacement of the newspaper and its intended audience, facilitating differences in the representation of the city as well as the volcanoes within it.

Laclau and Mouffe’s emphasis on “articulation” offers a useful way of understanding the mechanisms of meaning-negotiation within this. Although my analysis is informed by a number of specific linguistic techniques, I have found it useful to pay attention to the establishment and dissolving of relationships of connection and distinction. This offers a way to coherently explore a large degree of the “work” performed within the Herald. I draw on Wetherell in including multiple levels of within these connections, including the affective and repeated experience of the physical. I finish by exploring in detail Lorimer’s “nonhuman charisma” and its application to the volcanoes. In doing this I explicitly shift its focus from nonhuman animals to detailed application to place, discussing potential consequences of its intersection with media.

Foundations and context: situated discourse

I begin by taking on board a number of insights generated within recent decades with regard to the place of representation. The influences behind this are explained in the introduction. My focus on linguistic representation within the Herald is done with the assumption that this one of many ways to engage with Auckland’s volcanoes; none of them exclusive, all with the tendency to interact and inform each other. I conceptualise humans as embodied, meaning-making social animals (e.g. Ingold 1992) negotiating a complex world where human projects and systems can take on an exteriority and relational agency of their own (e.g. Law and
Mediated sense-making, and cognition itself, is exceeded by this world (Thrift 2008, Castree and Macmillan 2004). It can never adequately represent experience, nor can it come to terms with the myriad and continually changing possibilities of the landscape itself. Yet the role of spaces such as Herald is seldom to capture experience. Instead, it is a performative site of meaning negotiation (Hinchliffe 2003, Anderson and Harrison 2010, Dewsbury 2010, Doel 2010, Laurier 2010, Harrison 2010, Castree and Macmillan 2004).

My acknowledgement of the Herald as a situated and specific forum is influenced by Critical Discourse Analysis, particularly Fairclough (e.g. Fairclough 2003, Chouliaraki and Fairclough 1999, Fairclough 1989, 1995). This utilises linguistic analysis as part of a wider critical concern with social structure and the operation of power (Van Dijk 1998). In an early and influential text, Fairclough (1989) argues that analysis should be "three dimensional". This acknowledges text as generated within a social context and though particular processes of production. It is similarly interpreted through specific processes by social beings. Power inequality inevitably influences all elements of this process.

Drawing from this, I highlight the influence of political-economic pressure upon media content. I particularly note this as shaping the focus and spatiality of the volcanoes’ representation. It is now commonplace to note that journalists and writers operate within structural conditions that demand continued reader interest to generate advertising revenue (Bagdikian 2000, Rankine et al. 2007). This is especially significant where there are few powerful media owners, as in New Zealand. Here, national print media is currently dominated by the Herald’s APN and Fairfax, the latter with publications including Auckland’s local “Suburban Newspapers” (Rosenberg 2008, Rankine et al. 2007).

Journalists can be expected to utilise a range of professional understandings of what will fit within editorial policy and possess “news value”, appealing to and resonating with their intended audience (Hall et al. 1978, Allan 2010, Manning 2001). As such, “news” often carries a series of characteristics that include a prioritisation of the recent, the spectacular, and particularly the “local”, issues related to readers and that which is familiar to them. Spatial components of this are illustrated by Avraham’s (2000) meta-analysis of city images in news media. This analysis demonstrates a widespread preference for, and more sympathetic and multidimensional portrayal of, areas perceived as close to the target audience. Parisi and Holcomb claim that the city itself remains ‘an essential symbolic centre of the journalistic narrative’ (1994, 377). They argue for a spatiality to news stories that privileges the inner suburbs and central city. In addition to affluent metropolitan areas being
generally often privileged over poorer suburban locations, the central city serves as a symbolically unifier of potentially disparate suburban areas. Indeed, the diverse developments within these suburbs may be passed over due to their wide dispersal and frequently unspectacular nature.

This model is applicable to Auckland. Its arterial transport routes heavily converge upon the central city area (see figures 4.5-4.8), and central areas demonstrably gain a higher population during business hours. There is similarly a rough spatiality to comparative affluence within urban and suburban Auckland, with higher property values and incomes in the central and northern suburbs (Crampton, Salmond, and Kirkpatrick 2004, White 2008). The economic heart of the city remains in the Central Business District. This gains in relevance when considering structural pressures to make content likely to appeal to audiences of interest to the newspapers’ advertisers, often targeting those with disposable income (e.g. Manning 2001, Bagdikian 2000). Avraham (2000) further highlights the predominance of significant institutions, and the location of journalists, as contributing factors towards prioritisation and multifaceted coverage of central areas (e.g. Rosenberg 2008, Parisi and Holcomb 1994).

These factors converge within the Heraldscape as an overdetermined focus on Auckland’s central city and surrounding suburbs. As Allan notes, ‘journalists construct news account against a backdrop of assumptions about the social world which they expect the readers to share’ (Allan 2010, 103). Allan is particularly interested in the supposition and construction of “common sense”. He draws on Hall et al (1978) to note deployment of commonsensical “maps of meaning”, the “common idiom”, and common knowledge. Of this assumed knowledge, I am more interested in “common senses”: working assumptions as to the sensory experiences and familiarity of volcanoes, including visual interaction with prominent volcanic cones. I particularly note the distribution of this in relation to the central suburbs.

Assumptions of familiarity are at times made explicit within content. This can be seen in discussion of volcanoes such as Rangitoto, Maungawhau, Maungakiekie (and Maungakiekie’s euthanized tree - see chapter seven) as “iconic”. Other volcanoes are presented explicitly as likely to be unfamiliar, as in Clement’s tour of “less well known volcanoes” (Clement 2011b). This distribution of assumed knowledge mirrors a poll including Herald readers’ “favourite volcanoes”, and is illustrated further in chapter five. The assumed “common stock of [volcanic] knowledge” (Hall et al. 1978, 55) may also include intimacy with well-visited spaces such as the summit and “famous crater” (Wright 2012a) of Maungawhau/Mount Eden (New Zealand Tourism Research Institute 2005, 2001). Certain
practices, such as enjoying summit-top views, are also referenced. Cumming (2005a) rhetorically asks of descent into said crater, ‘If it's a crime it hardly seems a hanging offence. What next - ban children sliding into the cones on cardboard’? Such allusion to the familiar serves an affective purpose: having grown up in one of these middle-class central suburbs, its invocation briefly triggered in me the anticipated feelings of nostalgia and familiarity, swift reminiscence of the volcano as playground.

Such assumptions of experience illustrate journalists' often-tacit understanding of what Fairclough terms “member's resources”. These are 'what people [including analysts] have in their heads and draw upon when they produce or interpret texts – including their knowledge of language, representations of the natural and social world they inhabit, values, beliefs, assumptions and so on' (Fairclough 1989, 24). I am cautious about Fairclough's use of the word "representations". Its associated implications of visuality, coherence and stasis sit uncomfortably with me, particularly given the intellectual history of analysis of place and landscape as interchangeable with landscape paintings (e.g. Cosgrove and Daniels 1988, see for example Thomas 1993, see also Ingold 2000, 161 regarding "stable conceptual schemata"). While it is outside the scope of this thesis to posit the exact nature of these resources, there is little to suggest that the subtotal of any person’s memories, understandings of and associations with a place can be encompassed by anything so bounded or deliberate (Jones and Garde-Hansen 2012, 13). These resources are, of course, further inaccessible directly to writers save through their own experiences living in Auckland, and others' accounts. Journalists' understandings of the “ideal reader” and their resources may be inaccurate (Hall et al. 1978). Reference to members' resources does highlight, however, that within a given space the signifier "Auckland's volcanoes" is not empty and waiting to be filled. Be they landscapes ‘of the heart’ (Mason in Ross 2010, 164, Stewart and Strathern 2003), background to the daily grind, or orientation points in a new city, many volcanoes within the Herald are representations of what many Aucklanders work, play, and in the language of contemporary phenomenology, dwell amongst.

4 Heidegger similarly (1971) claims, ‘We do not represent distant things merely in our mind-as the textbooks have it-so that only mental representations of distant things run through our minds and heads as substitutes for the things. If all of us now think, from where we are right here, of the old bridge in Heidelberg, this thinking toward that location is not a mere experience inside the persons present here; rather, it belongs to the nature of our thinking of that bridge that in itself thinking gets through, persists through, the distance to that location. From this spot right here, we are there at the bridge—we are by no means at some representational content in our consciousness.'
Tools for analysing the negotiation of meaning

Fairclough et al provide a wealth of resources for the examination of discursive text: numerous empirical examples, and discussion of specific linguistic techniques, some particularly common to news media (Fairclough 1995). I have also found Laclau and Mouffe’s discourse theory more broadly useful in conceiving of the actual attempted “work” done in any discursive event (see also Howarth 2000). This is particularly the concept of “articulation”. This has been more broadly useful within social sciences (Slack 1996) and is also taken up in later CDA (Chouliaraki and Fairclough 1999). Laclau and Mouffe define articulation as ‘any practice establishing a relation among elements such that their identity is modified as a result of the articulatory practice’ (Laclau and Mouffe 1985, 15). This is founded on a broader poststructuralist understanding of meaning as relational but not fixed or inevitable. Similarly, Stuart Hall’s explanation of articulation parallels the dual meanings of “articulate” as to speak, and the sense of an articulated lorry: its components connected to each other, but ‘through a specific linkage, that can be broken’ (Hall 1996, 141). Like Laclau and Mouffe, Hall emphasises the contingency of articulations; the joining of components whose connection is not necessary.

Laclau and Mouffe’s model itself seeks to eliminate boundaries between the “discursive” and the physical entirely (Howarth 2000, 8, Laclau and Mouffe 1990, 100). While this seems a promising recognition of the interconnectedness of linguistic and nonlinguistic arenas, the examples given highlight the discursive construction of the physical (Laclau and Mouffe 1985, 108, see also Laclau and Mouffe 1990, 84). This is seen in Geras’ question regarding the role of “realities of nature, both external and human, which are not merely “given outside “every discourse… but the material condition of them all” (Geras in Howarth 2000, 113). Howarth’s response points to the theory’s intended political purpose, elsewhere characterised as the “macro-structuring of political identities’ (Phlean and Shearer 2009, 225). Wetherell similarly notes the limitation of this “macro” focus with regard to subject positions. She observes that this does not deal well with the swift, multiple and often conflicting positioning that occurs within even brief conversation (Wetherell 1998), or similarly, a single newspaper article.

Despite these limitations, Laclau and Mouffe’s broader emphasis on relational identity, negotiated through articulation, points towards what is being attempted through linguistic work regarding Auckland’s volcanoes. This has been adapted by other scholars, such as Chouliaraki and Fairclough’s extension of articulation ‘to specify the particular, local form it
takes in a particular practice’ (Chouliaraki and Fairclough 1999, 21). A more situated and flexible approach to this concept provides a useful framework for examining the relational textual meaning-making in relation to the volcanoes. Laclau and Mouffe’s attention to “logics of difference” and “equivalence” further rely upon and point towards long-established post-structural insight regarding relational meaning-making through moves of differentiation and connection. This is illustrated by Williamson’s (1978) analysis of advertising images. She notes how the establishment of relationships of equivalence and difference influence the perceived identity of products and those who consume them. This uses viewers’ intertextual knowledge, as well as mechanisms like image placement. Interestingly, these relationships are argued to potentially override the advertisement’s textual arguments. Mechanisms further need not operate through logic, for example, the dubious “freshness” of a cigarette is assured by the dewiness of an accompanying cucumber (Williamson 1978, 38).

I found “articulation”, and reference to mechanisms of “equivalence” and “difference” useful as spatial and kinaesthetic metaphors. They provide a helpful framework for considering the work attempted in any given specific discursive event. I do not argue these as the only forms of relationship posited within discourse. Metaphor, particularly, facilitates particular logics of relation through equating the intuitively grasped properties of one system to another (e.g. Pile 2010). However, the apparent pervasiveness of binary logic (e.g. Tuan 2013, Tilley and Bennett 2004) highlights the importance of such very basic mechanisms of distinction. Such visceral simplicity facilitates broad application without further explanation.

As Williamson’s analysis demonstrates, the proposed relationships established and broken need not operate within bounded tiers. Instead, they routinely dance between argument and proposed action, object and emotion, colour and morality, political system and personal consequence. This crossing of categories is illustrated in Wetherell’s discussion of the relationship of discourse to affect. Wetherell defines the latter as “embodied meaning-

---

5 Similarly, they argue, ‘as fixation/dislocation of a system of differences, [articulation] cannot consist of purely linguistic phenomena; but must instead pierce the entire material density of the multifarious institutions, rituals and practices through which a discursive formation is structured’. Yet at the same time, they note that, as fixation is always necessarily partial and the discursive field inherently unstable, overflowing and overdetermined, so ‘every social practice is therefore – in one of its dimensions – articulatory’ (Laclau and Mouffe 1985, 113). Their definition seems to focus on “successful” articulation with subsequent material consequences, although does not explain the mechanisms of this piercing.

6 In the context of political antagonism “equivalence” links diverse components in contrast to a negative identity, while “difference” dissolves linkages through highlighting dissimilitude.

7 Tilley and Bennett (2004) make an argument for this pervasiveness as founded upon universal bodily binaries, particularly up/down, left/right and front/centre (see also Casey 2009, ch 2). Although speculative, I note the kinaesthetic familiarity of distinguishing between this/not this, equivalent/different. This is echoed in the deep, well-practiced affective force of divisions between mine/not mine, us/not us.
making’ that is ‘mostly…the same as what can be understood as “human emotion”’ (Wetherell 2012, 4). She argues against a tendency for affect to be explicitly or implicitly contrasted with discourse in particular and language in general. This can range from Thrift’s assertion that affect can never be completely captured by language, to Massumi’s understanding of the two as operating on incompatible levels. Within these contrasts, bodily activities are often ‘seen as generative, potentially creative and radical’ while discourse is ‘thought to add just the usual scripts, conforming narratives, and the subjectifications of social power’ (Wetherell 2012, 19).

Wetherell, conversely, highlights discourse as one of many “affective practices” that performs, transforms and conveys affective relationships. This includes the identification of ‘spiralling affective discursive loops’ (2012, 53), where affect is intensified through discursive practice. An illustration is based on her fieldwork that explores racism among England’s working and middle classes. Here, ‘rhetoric and narratives of unfairness, loss and infringement create and intensify the emotion. Bile rises and this then reinforces the rhetorical and narrative trajectory. It goes round and round’ (Wetherell 2012, 7).

Through emphasis on practice and performance (Bourdieu 1977), Wetherell is able to agree with Thrift and Massumi that affective responses are often pre-conscious without relegating them to a completely separate mode of being. She particularly notes the wearing of “affective ruts” through repetition. Yet performance also highlights potential for renegotiation. Consciously articulated iterations of affect, then, can remain vital as they change. I draw on this understanding in the following chapters, arguing that particular

---

8 Her own characterisation of “poststructuralist discourse”, including in the sources she quotes as illustrating critiques of this, is reliant on relational but static dyads. This is a specific reading that does not fit with the emphasis on the impossibility of closure, the importance of dynamism and continued articulation found elsewhere, including this thesis (e.g. Howarth 2000).

9 Massumi is worth discussing further due to his influence in affective engagements with the nonhuman, particularly in geography (Pile 2010, Thrift 2004a). He holds “affect” as possessing a particular ontological status, a force affecting “bodies” in the widest sense (including physical structures, ideas), enhancing or dulling their capacity. This exists on an inherently separate level to emotion, possessing the multitudinous characteristics of the virtual and therefore always prior to and inherently separate from consciousness (Pile 2010). Consequently, it is unable to be communicated, even to be detected save in fleeting hints and pressures, in particular a peripheral hint as to the virtuality within life itself that Massumi identifies with “confidence”. “Emotion” is a limited actualisation of affective force.

Wetherell challenges this approach through offering alternative readings to the select neuroscience experiments Massumi uses to justify his approach, in particular the “missing half-second” between autonomic response and conscious recognition also noted by Thrift (2004a) as seeming proof that the body is affected prior to consciousness. Perhaps more pertinently, she notes how much must be discarded by this seeming insurmountable barrier between affect and emotion, consciousness, and communication (see also Pile 2010). I agree with her assessment that while theoretically intriguing, Massumi’s ontological foundations do not seem convincing enough to completely abandon a conceptualisation of affect more aligned with recognisable emotion.
linguistic articulations of Auckland’s volcanoes draw energy and efficacy from the use of certain affective relationships, particularly those associated with charisma, detailed below, but also others including a Burkean idea of the “sublime”. The point of these articulations is not to portray but to use the affective relationships, potentially to perform them in ways that, if successful, create practiced ways of thinking about the volcanoes that elicit empathy, concern, excitement, thrill.

**Theoretical tools: nonhuman charisma**

I found Jamie Lorimer’s (2007) consideration of “nonhuman charisma” to be useful in thinking about the ways the affective and physical elements of the volcanoes are distributed and recruited within the *Herald*. This allows embodied human-volcano relationships to viscerally influence linguistic content. This model is fleshed out in relation to nonhuman animals, and although Lorimer notes the possibility its application to place (Lorimer 2007, 916; 2009) this has not been systematically explored by others at the time of writing\(^\text{10}\). This model is particularly useful in that it examines “charisma” from within a relational ontology that focuses on nonhuman agency. It also, usefully, provides a language to talk about differences between the physical specificity of different volcanoes in a theoretically informed context.

“Charisma” usually refers to some seemingly inherent attractiveness or appeal (Hall, James, and Baird 2011). To sociologists, it is most familiar through Weberian “charismatic authority”, the appeal of extraordinary individuals able to inspire others to action. Smith bemoans its “indiscriminate” application to ‘things and people that are attractive and/or powerful’ (Smith 2000, 102). The etymology of the term is useful in underscoring its agentic properties. Once ‘a theological concept referring to the divine gift of grace Christians receive through their faith in God’ (Terlouw 2010, 337), its source appears mysterious, a gift bestowed from elsewhere. Charismatic powers ‘are not accessible to the ordinary person but are regarded as of divine origin or as exemplary’ (Weber 1978, 241). Pure charisma is spoken of in terms of presence ‘contact through inspiration, embodiment or perception, with the vital force which underlies man’s existence’ (Shils 1965, 201)\(^\text{11}\). As Lorimer (2007) notes, Weber’s interest is not in detailing the specific properties of charisma\(^\text{12}\) but how it is used and the effects of this. In particular, institutions that follow from their charismatic founders attempt to draw on past charisma to generate legitimacy and continue interest

\(^{10}\) See below for other recent applications of “charisma” to place more generally.

\(^{11}\) Shils’ own extension of charisma into positions that reinforce or operate within established systems can be contrasted with Weber’s idea that charisma is inherently revolutionary.

\(^{12}\) See Smith (2000) for a brief summary of subsequent attempts.
Lorimer’s analysis notes “flagship species”, a strategy that has been deliberately used within conservation since at least the 1980s (Leader-Williams and Dublin 2000). These species are used to generate interest in other species or ventures, acting as a “catalyst” for more broad concern (Lorimer 2007) and fostering sympathy and revenue for a cause. Here, too, charisma is utilised in an attempted contagion of concern.

Other studies have used “charisma” more broadly in relation to place, and it has variously been applied to ecosystems (Duarte et al. 2008), cities, built structures (Terlouw 2010), trees (Hall, James, and Baird 2011), and even comets (Olson and Pasachoff 2009). Frequently, however, this is simply done in a descriptive capacity – to express a popularity or “magical presence” perceived by the researcher (e.g. Olson and Pasachoff 2009, Duarte et al. 2008). An exception to this is Terlouw’s (2010) detailed account of the charismatic Zeche Zollverein, an obsolete but recently memorialised German coal mine. He notes its history, myth, the mining tower’s previous role, imposing size and commonality with church spires, and the deliberate investment in it by a regime intent on looking towards a brighter, service-oriented future contrasting with its industrial past. This could be a classic account of the accumulation of, and change within, symbolic meaning around the tower (e.g. Cosgrove 1985). Terlouw argues that a Weberian-inspired understanding “charisma” helps underscore the ways this affective meaning is used to legitimate orders of authority, particularly through charismatic values of “heritage” or development as a “futuristic” complex (2010).

Hall et al. argue “charisma” as marked by unusualness, ‘fundamentally based on being out of the ordinary’ (Hall, James, and Baird 2011, 311). Their typology of the charismatic properties of trees and forests notes the “physical extremes” of size, height, age, and rarity of individual trees often used to justify their conservation. Cultural, religious and historical associations of forests are also used to identify them as exceptional. This is echoed elsewhere, such as the unusual beauty of comets once considered miraculous, ‘errant stars that violated what was perceived as the order of the heavens’ (Olson and Pasachoff 2009, 41). Their extra-ordinary appearance is often further articulated as proof of the exceptional nature of persons and events. Similarly, Duarte et al. (2008) contrast the fascinating array of colourful fauna populating a charismatic coral reef with the mundane familiarity of seagrass ecosystems (Duarte et al. 2008). Yet while this holds intuitive appeal, particularly when referencing an unusual phenomenon or exceptional landmark, not all that is statistically unusual can be understood as charismatic. Similarly, not all that is charismatic need be unusual or rare, as evidenced by domestic cats and dogs. “Unusual” also carries a slipperiness to it that reduces its analytical purchase: it is relatively easy to find an “unusual” element to anything already identified as “charismatic”, be it distinctiveness, location, or
otherwise. Lorimer (2007) examines what may lie at the source of nonhuman charisma in a more nuanced way, engaging the physical presence and agency of the nonhuman in an explicitly relational context.

The affective agency of nonhumans via charisma is understood, following ANT and other more-than-human ontologies, as a specific and temporary achievement emerging ‘through interaction within a heterogeneous assemblage of other nonhumans, all of which have agency potentials’ (Lorimer 2007, 913). Charisma, and the nonhuman agency that the concept encompasses, is relational. Its examination pays close attention, but does not attribute sole causation, to humans as biological entities tending towards particular characteristics, operating in an inherently-immersive ecological context (Ingold 2000). Following others within sociologies of nature and SST (e.g. Macnaghten and Urry 2001a, Hutchby 2001), these characteristics are articulated with “affordances”. These are actions allowed, but not dictated (Hutchby 2001), by an object or surface: ‘what it offers the animal, what it provides or furnishes, either for good or ill’ (Gibson 1979, 127). Such capacities exist regardless of whether and how they are perceived (Gibson 1979, 138-9). They are relational, formed between body and object and so varying between bodies and potentially altered through technology.

Such physical factors are not held to be wholly determinate but influence and facilitate cultural meanings. Lorimer uses the language of ease, noting ‘the ecological affordances of different organisms currently intersect more or less easily with those of humans’ (Lorimer 2007, 916-7). Affordances are further connected with affect (see also De Landa 2003). While the two terms can in some circumstances be considered interchangeable, Lorimer argues that affect extends ‘to encompass the psychological and the emotional responses triggered by these embodied encounters’ (Lorimer 2007, 914). This equation with affordance both underscores the situational nature of charisma, and highlights that, like affordances, one is able to speak in reference to the relationship itself rather than any particular experience of it. This is underscored by a distinction between affect and subjective “emotion”. Drawing on Anderson (2006a), who broadly follows Massumi, affect to Lorimer is then ‘a collection of shared and interconnecting forces operating between bodies’, as compared to the subjective instance of the experience of these forces.

Interestingly, Lorimer further distinguishes between “affect” and “affordance” by arguing that “affect” exhibits an enhanced concern with process and “becomings” in contrast with the association of “affordance” which, he suggests, ‘argues strongly for inherent properties’ of
‘fixed and transcendental ecological beings’. He similarly distinguishes between “beings” and “becomings” elsewhere, noting a discomfort that attention to “whole-bodied organisms” and “able-bodied humans” ‘smacks of a romantic scale of analysis redolent of the traditional phenomenology of interactions between atomised body-subjects: of beings rather than becomings’ (Lorimer 2007, 916).

I suggest that both preference for “affect” over “affordance”, and a distrust of phenomenology operating at an ecological level, is based on use and connotation rather than capacity. I acknowledge the different relational “bodies” formed through technology, intent and situation, different ways of moving, learned and practiced capacity, and relational extensions (e.g. Latour 2004). Yet my interest is not in highlighting the contingency of any given interaction. Instead it is on the broad, rough commonalities that nonetheless allow meaningful if bounded assumptions to be made within analysis within a specific time and place. This is particularly important given my interest in news media. As noted above, journalists themselves rely on a professional sense of audience (Allan 2010). This incorporates broad assumptions of able-bodied capacity as well as of movement that focuses upon the city centre. Many of these commonalities are socially and historically emplaced. They are connected to technology and ways of life as well as the changing specificity of city and volcanoes. This is illustrated in detail within chapter four. My “landscape phenomenology” takes into account the importance and form of vehicular transport within Auckland City, and mediation itself as a technology that form daily, taken-for-granted ways of being within Auckland and interacting with the volcanoes. This is not about “natural”, a-historic Aucklanders or volcanoes but common relationships that are formed within this historical moment.

As Michael’s “cascade of [technologically mediated] affordances” indicates (2001), affordances need not indicate stasis, although Gibson’s (1979) ethological interest in non-human “organisms” may disincline attention towards technological manipulation. I further note the connotation of “ecology” itself: while tending in popular culture to reference balanced “ecosystems”, this concept has been increasingly challenged by revelations as to the normalcy of often-erratic change within the “natural” world (Davis 1998, Clark 2011), particularly when viewed on a long enough timescale.

McFarlane’s (2011) conceptualisation of the city, similarly, contrasts the “earthy”, romantic and bounded connotations of dwelling with the “mobility”, openness and change of “assemblage”. This identification of “connotation” is a useful one in distinguishing frequent use from possibility. McFarlane highlights the difference between the two theories in terms of focus, “dwelling” tuned to the human individual while “assemblage” considers the wider process. Yet both share ‘an emphasis on the processual composition of the world through sociomaterial practices’ (McFarlane 2011, 667). Indeed, “dwelling” is argued to offer “assemblage” a ‘focus on its verb’ in this context, an every-day assembling through life (McFarlane 2011, 651). As with “ecology”, the timescale of analysis is similarly relevant in this context.
Media “mobilisation” is acknowledged within Lorimer’s model, as seen in the deliberate use of flagship species. He similarly notes charismas as ‘reticulate... and... subject to anthropogenic manipulation’ (2007, 915). Despite this, his use of affect heavily privileges the physical in ways that shies away from other mediated engagements. Most strikingly, affective responses to an animal are either “aesthetic”, immediate visual responses, or “corporeal”, ‘triggered in practical, corporeal interactions with an organism in the field’ (Lorimer 2007, 918). This emphasis on non-mediated engagement is resonant with Wetherell’s (2012) criticism of engagement with affect, noted above. In applying “non-human charisma” to representations of Auckland’s volcanoes, I want to further explore how mediation enters into ecologies of charisma, in some cases providing a feedback loop that enhances the ecological charisma of the already-charismatic.

**Three kinds of charisma**

Lorimer’s model posits three nonexclusive kinds of nonhuman charisma - ecological, aesthetic, and corporeal. “Ecological charisma” concerns afforded correspondences between human perception and non-human entities, particularly those possessing characteristics that increase the likeliness of consciousness and familiarity. This is seen in the increased importance attributed to animals that are “big like us”, existing within human scale of reference. Familiarity is also facilitated towards those animals that primarily communicate through our preferred media of visuality, such as butterflies, and a limited range of audio frequency. Animals privileging other mechanisms, such as scent or ultraviolet light (Thrift 2005), attract less attention. We notice those animals and objects that possess interrelating “worlds-for” or umwelten (Uexküll 1957): put simply, ‘ecological charisma would be very different if we had gills or night vision’ (Lorimer 2007, 917). Because these affordances remain regardless of perception (Gibson 1979, Hutchby 2001), ecological charisma is described as the foundation for other types of charisma.

“Ecological charisma” can be applied unevenly to Auckland’s volcanoes, dependent on spatial location and form. Even large explosion craters such as Lake Pupuke are seldom as visually accessible from a distance as are elevated, convex volcanic cones. Larger and more prominent volcanoes are not only more visually imposing at close range, dominating more of the perceived environment, but also more readily visible from afar. Recessed volcanoes are further more easily obscured by changes in their surroundings. This likelihood of encounter nevertheless can be further applied to their spatiality in relation to population distribution, heavily frequented areas and transport routes. This spatiality indicates a charisma-for; in the words of heritage management, a volcano may be “locally significant” but less immediately
accessible to the region as a whole (Auckland Regional Authority Planning Division 1976). In the specific context of the Herald, as noted above, population, transport routes and the wealthier readers likely to be of interest to advertisers converge in the suburbs, and volcanoes, surrounding Auckland’s CBD.

All of these elements of volcanic ecological charisma are relational “becomings” that are subject to change with surroundings, human behaviour, and alteration of the volcanoes themselves. I elaborate upon this in chapter four, charting the spatial distribution of the growing city and how the form, size and location of some volcanoes have correlated with uneven visual and physical protection. I note further compounding of ecological charisma in chapter six. Here, the already-charismatic Maungawhau is enhanced as a tourist destination through the construction of its summit road, over a century later garnering political attention and funding in part due to this international visibility. Mediated extension may also be a ready facilitator for these encounters, news media gravitating towards the already-familiar and charismatic and subsequently enhancing mediated ecological charisma. As noted in chapter five, the familiarity of raised volcanoes such as Maungawhau, Maungakiekie and Rangitoto is further augmented through the frequency of their visual representation, including in photographs and establishing shots of the city, art, and in stylised form within logos. Their presence is multiplied, colonising new spaces and further enhancing their “ecological rhythms” of temporal accessibility.

Media representation also interacts with the second, complimentary component of ecological charisma: “jizz”. This is ‘the unique combination of properties of an organism or other object’\(^\text{14}\) that allows its ready identification and differentiation from others’ (Lorimer 2007, 217). Lorimer argues, ‘taken together, the “jizz” of an organism and the concurrence of its ecological rhythms with those of humans constitute a species’ ecological charisma’. To have distinctive jizz is to not only possess a charismatic advantage through speedy recognition. It also, I argue, confers an advantage in the ability to be visually represented. This is seen in Lorimer’s example of a cartoon stag beetle as a flagship animal. Much of the beetle is altered from its original form, with a smiling humanoid face, its antler-like jaws placed atop its head to further resemble its cervine namesake. However, the presence of these “antlers” combined with a six-legged body enables the subject of the image to remain instantly recognisable. Relevant to both their swift identification and representation, raised cones have an advantage over tuff rings and explosion craters in that they have a form readily visually engaged with from ground level. In contrast, while they may have distinctive shapes

\(^{14}\) Although usually applied to animals, the term is possibly derived from a WWII reference to “General Impression of Shape and Size” (GISS), used when identifying aeroplanes.
by satellite, all bodies of water have flat surfaces from the ground. The broad slopes of
Rangitoto, and Maungakiekie’s distinctive obelisk, are instantly recognisable Auckland-wide.
The unusual, “tell-tale” circularity of volcanic craters similarly makes them particularly valued
landscape features, as discussed chapter eight.

It is interesting that references to charismatic buildings and spaces often use the term
interchangeably with “iconic”, a term also associated with Auckland’s volcanoes\textsuperscript{15}. Numerous
scholars have noted the prolific and often indiscriminate application of this term (Parker
2012, Tomaselli and Scott 2009, Kearns and Collins 2000). There are apparent overlaps
between the “charismatic” and “iconic” in that both indicate a focus of attention, an
impressive or otherwise captivating quality that implies an object stands apart from, or draws
attention to its surroundings. Both can be traced to religious concepts, a connection with
something transcending the mundane. However, “icon” holds distinctly visual and
communicative connotations. Its earlier reference to religious imagery (Ashworth 2006)
inspired “iconography”, a contextual study of art, and later studies of landscape as a ‘way of
seeing’, tied to culture as image and symbol (Cosgrove and Daniels 1988, 2). Tomaselli and
Scott (2009) situate their Cultural Icons within studies of visual culture. Parker (2012) argues
that all “cultural icons”, including “iconic” music or sounds, have a necessary visual
component that enables their persistence and dissemination through ocular means. He
emphasises the importance of visual reproducibility in the categorisation of an object or
place as an “icon” (Parker 2007). Defining icons as ‘highly significant retained images’
(Parker 2012, 12), his four criteria of iconicity are: a) distinctness of image, b) durability of
image, c) reproducibility of image and d) the ‘tragic-dramatic narrative inherent in the image’.

I am not arguing for a necessary correlation between a place or landscape’s charisma and
the ease at which it can be visually represented. Striking “sublime” landscapes such as
mountain ranges, for example, may be too vast for a single reproducible image (Schama
1995). Nor do I posit a simple equation of “more exposure = more charisma”. I do not wish
to unduly dilute Lorimer’s ecological understanding with an excessive focus on
representation and attributed or accumulated meaning, as remains predominant in Tomaselli
and Scott (2009). However, the close tie between “charismatic” and “iconic”, their potential to
be used interchangeably with regard to objects such as the volcanoes, suggests a

\textsuperscript{15} Most frequently in relation to the raised cones, although Hayward (cited in Rudman 2007i)
describes Ōrākei basin as an “iconic” tuff crater. Its distinctive circular form, adjoining the more
amorphous Hobson Bay, can be seen from raised locations such as nearby Kepa Road, a source of
viewshafts to other volcanoes (Auckland Regional Authority Planning Division 1976). Still, I felt
surprise at the reference to this crater as “iconic” and note its use in the context of protesting further
development on its tuff ring. This can be contrasted to the general celebratory references to Rangitoto
as Auckland “icons”, suggesting a potential stretching in this use for argumentative purposes.
correlation that could be explained, not as an inherent equivalence but as a feedback loop. Here, the ecological charisma of a landscape feature is enhanced through its ability to be represented, visually replicated, and encountered through the extended senses of the media. The positing of charisma as tied to the “unusual” could be understood in conjunction with both “jizz” and Parker’s criterion for the iconic in “distinctness of image”. “Distinctive” may offer a preferable alternative to “unusual” in describing this element of charismatic objects.

The second of Lorimer’s categories, “aesthetic charisma”, refers to immediate judgments as to the appeal of the nonhuman. Particular attention is paid to facilitating circumstances for these reactions rather than the subjective responses themselves. Both aesthetic and corporeal charisma are described as “affective charisma”, referring here to the trans-body capacity through which these responses are made possible (Lorimer 2007, 914). Lorimer suggests that humans may be predisposed towards some reactions to animals, notably the “cute factor” response to child-like facial features, demonstrated across cultures (Milton 2011). He also explores this on the basis of perceived similarity of bodily form to humans. In doing this he draws on Hillman and Deleuze and Guattari (1987) to suggest that swarming insects may often generate revulsion because of their extreme otherness, their teeming masses threatening Western myths of bounded individuality. He also cites Milton (2002) in emphasising the importance of perceived affinity with humans. She argues that for people to come to care about a thing, and it be granted moral status, it must be attributed “personhood”. Again, media representation can augment or influence the “personhood” of animals or, indeed, volcanoes. This mirrors the successful use of representation and metaphor to dehumanise and remove the “personhood” of humans, facilitating the violence that can then be enacted upon them (Hansen and Verkaaik 2009, Edholm 1993). Such augmentation of personhood can be seen in the humanoid smile of Lorimer’s (2007) cartoon beetle, argued to increase its “cuddly charisma”.

Within this thesis references to “personhood” and human-like appeal is of especial relevance to the anthropomorphism of the volcanoes. This could be simply described as a rhetorical strategy; and a powerful one, in Einarsson’s words, ‘changing what people in Western culture ordinarily classify as non-human and without self-evident rights into moral objects of sympathy and concern’ (1993, 78). The language used to protest potential damage to the volcanoes is frequently anthropomorphic, as discussed chapter six, while damage to volcanic slopes, particularly by quarrying, is frequently characterised as “scars”. Intriguingly, a number of historical sources also reference the “healing” of these scars (e.g. Fowlds

16 Or lack thereof, as seen in negative affectations associated with revulsion.
In taking seriously the proposition that humans may be predisposed to look kindly on those that resemble us, I would argue that elements of the volcanoes' physicality, and particularly that of the cones, facilitate personification especially to those operating within predominantly “Western” cultures. Like trees (Macnaghten and Urry 2001a, 168, Bloch 1998), they bear easy similarities to the human form. This includes a definite moment of “birth” and continued life story (Fairfield 1992), and the salience of their potential volcanic agency, discussed chapter eight. Their grassy surfaces change with the seasons like living things, “healing” over red scoria beneath. Their distribution as individual points or small groups – as contrasted with swarming insects, or continuous landscape features such as the Waitākere ranges - affirms ‘the modern understanding of the bounded subject’ (Lorimer 2007, 920). They echo Western ideas of the nuclear family, or small named groups, as seen in the renaming of Te Tātua-a-Riukiuta to the Biblical-anthropomorphic “Three Kings” volcano.

This modification of association through metaphor, potentially building upon that which was already present, relates to the third type of charisma: corporeal charisma, referring to associations that are developed over a period of time. Two subtypes are described that are specific to conservationists working with stag beetles and corncrakes: “epiphanies”, a frequently-reported experience of being strongly moved and "reterritorialized" by nonhuman encounters; and “jouissance”, used in Kristeva’s sense of ‘pleasure in the presence of meaning’ (Lorimer 2007, 922), in this case, by scientists engaging with the objects of their study. This group-specificity highlights the role of practice and interaction in shaping non-human charisma, which may be discursively organised (Macnaghten and Urry 2001a) and specific to smaller groups. Lorimer’s terminology emphasises the physical, the ‘visceral becomings involved in tuning in to an organism over a longer period of time’ (Lorimer 2007, 918). Following Wetherell (2012), I would argue that discursive articulation and reiteration, too, can be understood as a practice of sense-making that may develop specific charismas of the volcanoes over time. An example would be the appeal of “heritage” (Terlouw 2010), and the potential pleasure taken through engagement with places understood in this way (Holtorf 2010). Another may be prolonged consideration in a new light, such as concern fostered with the recategorisation of a once taken-for-granted site as part of “Auckland’s volcanic heritage” (see chapter six).

Finally, the use of charismatic “flagship animals”, or links between charismatic volcanoes and their more neglected counterparts, hints at the potentially associative nature of this affective relationship. “Charisma” to Terlouw (2010) similarly functions as an energy-like property that can be moved, transferred and transformed. The highly visible tower can be a
"focus" of charisma already attached to the mining industry (Terlouw 2010, 343); the magic of a charismatic leader can be appropriated by a conservative regime; and (he argues) the charisma of the past can be, through developments, transformed into that of the future. Similarly, Hansen and Verkaaik describe the charismatic properties of cities as ‘contagious’ and able to be bestowed: ‘in its original Greek kharisma means a gift and thus something unique, non-trivial and powerful. But a gift can also be shared, transferred and exchanged’ (2009, 8). This transference is not simply inclusion into an intellectual concept, but an attempt to bestow the positive affective properties of the charismatic onto others, the relational affective force of one site practiced as belonging to another (Wetherell 2012). I illustrate this through association between volcanoes of varying charisma in chapter six, and discuss the utilisation of the excitement of the volcanic chapter eight. Through association, both overt and implied, “Auckland’s volcanoes” as a whole are invested with emotional weight and morality.

**Inventory**

Throughout this chapter I begin with an assumption of a relational ontology of humans as embodied, meaning-making animals, and work to situate representation within the Herald in particular in relation to this. Using Fairclough’s injunction to treat discourse “three dimensionally”, I note the specificities of this site as socially and spatially situated within Auckland, centred upon the central (and to a lesser extent, North Shore) suburbs. With this as the site, and drawing inspiration from Laclau and Mouffe, I underscore discursive representation as articulatory practice, the attempted negotiation of meaning through the establishment and dissolution of relationships. I further emphasise that this is not dry or purely cognitive, but between registers often thought to be separate: cognition and emotion, memory, practice, morality. This occurs as part of communication between embodied beings in a spatial context interspersed with many physical volcanoes. It takes place in a context of at least some familiarity.

Lorimer’s typology of “nonhuman charisma” emerges as a useful tool with which to understand the affective differences between volcanoes. This enables the differences between individual cones and craters to be referenced in the context of a relational, more-than-human ontology, linking the physicality of the volcanoes more concretely to theory. Although this has not been used explicitly in relation to place previously, it seems particularly suited to the number, forms, and distribution of the volcanoes in relation to Auckland. I use this throughout this text, particularly in the context of discursive articulation to note how the
affective properties of some volcanoes, or some contexts, are linked with others in an attempt to enrich or enliven these.
3. Methods and methodology

This research is underlain by an understanding of Herald representation of volcanoes as articulatory rather than mimetic. Meaning is negotiated through establishing relationships between entities, places, concepts and emotions that are frequently already within the readers' worlds. I use a number of methods to inductively explore the presence of these within the Herald presentation of the volcanoes. The techniques do not “triangulate”, a surveying technique aimed towards precision: I am less interested in pinpoint verification than in research as a process to generate insight. Instead, the methods are held in conversation with each other, presented here in linear progression, but in practice an ongoing dialogue where insights that may not normally intersect feed off each other. In analysing the Herald, I draw on Altheide’s Ethnographic Content Analysis (ECA) (Altheide et al. 2008, Altheide 1987, 2004, Altheide and Shneider 2013), particularly its metaphor of textual space as “culture” that can be learned through “ethnographic” immersion and constant comparison. This is accompanied by landscape phenomenology and autoethnography, which work together in thinking through engagement with the volcanoes (Knappett 2005), using the researcher’s experiences as starting points for consideration. Landscape phenomenology is based on embodied interaction, while autoethnography engages the researcher in a continued process of reflexive consideration, drawing on and casting a critical eye upon experiences the subject of research and the research process itself. All are geared towards continual discovery, comparison and reflexivity, the cumulative exploration of meaning through practice in dialogue with secondary sources and theory.

Textual analysis

Although its title implies a nation-wide readership, and it is the largest newspaper in the country, the New Zealand Herald is based in and focused upon Auckland. The Herald is therefore uniquely positioned to present Auckland’s volcanoes across the entire 360 km² of field, encompassing the full range of locations and volcanic forms. While I note the potential relevance of local bi-weekly newspapers, such as those published by Suburban Newspapers, the already vast quantity of material to be analysed from the Herald prohibits in-depth analysis of such other fora, especially as these publications are designed to be read by bounded audiences in disparate geographic contexts, each with its own unique nearby volcanoes. Material from these is nonetheless noted as context and referenced where relevant within this thesis, as discussed below. The 12 year period chosen for intensive study is an extension of “now”, relevant to contemporary issues but also of particular significance and change for the volcanoes. This includes the induction of a campaign within
the *Herald* for their preservation; the conglomeration of previous city and district councils into a “super city” in 2010; the Ruamoko and DEVORA programs, focused on volcanic risk; and important changes in the context of the Treaty of Waitangi, culminating in a Treaty settlement returning many cones to Māori ownership. This period also corresponds to the full coverage of the *Herald* online archives, greatly facilitating the collection of information and analysis.

The selection of articles for close attention is itself part of analysis (Fairclough 1989, 27). Articles were initially sourced through the *Herald*’s digital archive, the coverage of this verified through a trial physical search encompassing 2008/2007 and several months of 2000, and articles gathered in hardcopy format. Digital searching holds several benefits over the exploration of physical archives. To be manageable over the period studied, physical searching would be primarily reliant on article titles, whereas a digital search covers all text and is not impeded by a lack of obvious correlation between article body and heading. Search results included two lines from the text, enabling the relevance of each article be quickly established. This was useful as the volcanoes share names with suburbs, streets, schools and sportsclubs named for them, as well as other locations in New Zealand, a concordance that both frustratingly extended search time and offered an illustration of the ubiquity of volcanic presence. Search terms included the names of all volcanoes in Māori and English, including contractions and popular alternatives, with Hayward et al. (2011) used as a primary source for these. Additional search terms included variations of “volcano/ic” combined with “Auckland”, and “maunga” and “volcanic heritage”. These last two were identified during analysis, illustrating a further benefit to digital archives in the comparative ease with which they can be revisited as analysis progresses. Their relative infrequency meant they could be meaningfully “tracked” (Altheide 2004) beyond their reference to Auckland’s volcanoes, offering important context for their use within the primary articles.

Newspapers have increasingly incorporated digital activity in addition to hardcopy product (e.g. Rafeeq 2006, Hermida and Thurman 2008). The *Herald*’s website included multiple internet-only features over the period studied. This includes “your views”: spaces for reader commentary on specific issues, one containing 95 responses to an illegal staged “eruption” of Rangitoto (NZH 2007). Opinion columns also invite digital feedback, although news articles currently do not. I do not formally analyse comments within these online features,

---

17 A handful of relevant articles were available online but not through hardcopy. These are occasionally included in discussion, particularly when they reflect part of a broader identified tendency, but I acknowledge their potential to possess a smaller, and possibly different, reader demographic.
which are from a small proportion of readers and cannot be taken as representative of the reader population (Hermida and Thurman 2008). However, their uneven presence is itself notable: reinforcing the difference between “news” and opinion, highlighting the latter as open to contention, as are those issues selected for “your views”.

From these searches I formed a collection of articles about or containing over 150 words regarding Auckland’s volcanoes, as a group and individually, resulting in over 400 articles for primary analysis. However, as I am interested in meaning rather than gaining quantitative information (Altheide and Shneider 2013, Altheide et al. 2008) other articles were drawn upon to make sense of these. Digital format also meant that brief allusions and shorter blocks of text could be easily collected as background information, stored in an electronic file for each volcano alongside links to the full article. Some articles were noted but not systematically collected or analysed: those focused on the volcanoes as sites for sporting activities, such as waterskiing at Ōrākei Basin, and social events at Auckland Domain and Cornwall Park. While I noted the practices afforded and how these can be related to volcanic form, the articles themselves focused overwhelmingly on the practices rather than their locations.

I found ECA (Altheide et al. 2008, Altheide and Shneider 2013, Altheide 2004, 1987) a useful resource for dealing with this quantity of text, particularly its metaphor of “ethnography”. Altheide et al. note textual analysis can ‘involve… immersion, exploration, contextual understanding, and emergent insights into social meanings, relationships, and activities’ (2008, 134). The metaphor of “culture” similarly resonates with a body of text within one forum, which holds a “personality” that can be identified through tropes, idiom, and common knowledge posited (Hall et al. 1978), building a continued relationship with an imagined community of readers (Anderson 2006b). This ethnographic metaphor suggests the application of a range of methods to elicit and evaluate meaning. While it is commonly stated that there is no set method of discourse analysis (e.g. Howarth 2000, 134; Philips and Hardy 2002), an assortment of techniques and knowledges can be added to the analyst’s toolbox. Fairclough (2003, 1989, 1995) provides a useful array of these, including attention to metaphors and processes such as nominalization that attribute or obscure agency. As noted previously, the kinaesthetic or spatial metaphor of connection and disconnection, difference and equivalence (Laclau and Mouffe 1985, 1990) was also useful in examining the work done by a variety of different modes of text. This includes metaphor, simile, juxtaposition and the use of “our” and “Auckland’s” to gather readers together and implicate ownership.
Of the articles selected for primary analysis, I quickly found that almost all could be categorised into broad subjects with similar presentation and language. A number of these became the basis for subsequent chapters, and their features and subcategories are discussed in detail within. Each contributory article was considered individually, then comparisons made between articles within the emerging categories, usually more than once. For example, a single article may be compared to others by the same author, to others discussing the incursion of SH20 on Mount Roskill, and to those within a broader “preservation” category. Articles concerning topics specific to particular volcanoes – ecological restoration of Rangitoto and debate surrounding its baches, the extensive military archaeology of Maungauika/Takapuna/North Head, and debate surrounding quarry water at Three Kings – were collected and critically read, but primarily used to background analysis of issues that resonate between multiple volcanoes. Although NVivo was used, I found it more useful to perform analysis manually through Excel tables. This repeated engagement contributed to increased familiarity with the “culture” of this text, echoing ECA’s emphasis on ‘constant discovery and constant comparison of relevant situations, settings, styles, images, meanings and nuances’ (Altheide 1987, 68). Comparison enabled features established in analysis of some articles to be more swiftly recognised in others, a process is facilitated by commonalities typical of news media. As Hall et al. (1978) note, newspapers engage in the portrayal of the new as familiar, translating new occurrences into recognisable formats and presenting these through relatively persistent “personality”. Trope, stylistic characterisations and even text are sometimes repeated within “hard news” articles, as demonstrated in subsequent chapters.

This process is repeated in miniature within opinion columns. Further, while regular news articles must wear a veneer of objectivity (eg. Fairclough 1995, 2003, Van Dijk 1998), authors of opinion columns are able explicitly to write in their own idiosyncratic “voice” (Wahl-jorgensen 2004), including rhetorical techniques considered inappropriate within news stories. This is significant to this project as many articles discussing the volcanoes, particularly concerning their preservation, were written by Brian Rudman. From mid-2001 Rudman adopted their protection as a topic upon which to “campaign” (Rudman 2009a). Over the period of this study, 70 articles about, or with over 150 words concerning, the volcanoes’ protection or management can be attributed to him, with many more columns referencing them briefly. The representational tactics used in these were often repeated between texts. This included characterisations of the volcanoes themselves as well as people and actions that impacted upon their welfare.
Considerable background research using secondary sources was enlisted where wider “discourses” were drawn upon. A significant amount of research with regard to Auckland and the volcanoes themselves further provided necessary context. This included interviews with key informants, many lasting several hours and entailing continued contact. I also attended walks, events and lectures regarding the volcanoes, notably during the Auckland Heritage Festivals 2010-2013 inclusive; several Love Your Mountain Day events held annually by Friends of Maungawhau; other Friends of Maungawhau events such as Arbour Day tree planting; the 2010 Artists In Eden, an annual art event themed around the volcano; and the 2013 “Breath of the Volcano” pyrotechnic event at the Auckland Domain. Other sources of information include geological lectures held at the Auckland War Memorial Museum; a special Winter Lecture Series at the University of Auckland in 2012; and the joint DEVORA/Auckland Civil Defence and Emergency Management Group forum in 2013.

I inspected a number of other presentations about the volcanoes, such as Council brochures and articles concerning the volcanoes in local newspapers, with particular attention paid to the Central Leader from 2000 to 2002 and 2009 to 2012. As noted above, these articles were not analysed in detail, but they provided useful background. In particular they highlighted the agenda-setting influence of the Herald coverage of the incursion of State Highway 20 onto Mount Roskill (see chapter six), and are noted within this text where relevant. In chapter eight, I also draw on Gee’s classic fiction Under The Mountain, including a 2010 movie adaption, as well as the popular “Volcanoes!” exhibition at the Auckland War Memorial Museum. The tropes present in these exemplify and work intertextually with tendencies illustrated within the Herald.

**Landscape phenomenology**

The process of textual interpretation is held in conversation with landscape phenomenology and autoethnography. The bulk of this material is centred in the early chapter five, but also echoes throughout and informs the wider thesis. Landscape phenomenology draws on insights from a number of 20th century phenomenological texts to explore and portray experiences of landscape (see especially Wylie 2007, Bender 2006, Tilley and Bennett 2004, Tilley 1994). In doing so it offers an indication of the features and affordances of a landscape (Gibson 1979), but also facilitates a re-experiencing of that deliberately attempts to de-stablise common academic assumptions about “landscape” and interaction with place.

---

18 “Determining Volcanic Risk in Auckland”, discussed chapter eight.
The researcher uses their body as a tool (Thomas 2006) to develop an understanding of, for example, what areas are easy or difficult to move upon, shelter from bad weather, whether a vista is apparent or obscured and how this changes with movement. This is founded upon a rough commonality between the sensory and ambulatory capacities of human bodies (Tilley 1994) allowing some insight into the resources available across cultures or even millennia, as in Tilley’s archaeological work (Tilley and Bennett 2008, 2004, Tilley 1994). Exploration is often informed by phenomenological work that encourages sensitisation to facets of experience that, it is suggested, are overlooked or de-valued in conventional Western approaches. This includes a focus on the more-than-visual, including synaesthesia19 (Bender 1998, 81, Ingold 2000, Tilley and Bennett 2004). Attention is also paid to landscape as moved through (Bender 1998, Tilley 1994, Ingold 2000, Tilley and Bennett 2004), offering a variety of changing experiences. Features and vistas come in and out of perception, ‘loom and shrink’ (Wylie 2002, 447); they may suddenly appear or exist as a constant and familiar backdrop. Elements of place may force movement to become careful or belaboured, perhaps painting arrival with the glow and strain of previous effort (Wylie 2002). The researcher is underscored as always embodied and immersed, involved, engaged (Wylie 2009).

Deliberately challenging “commonsensical” or intuitive understandings of the world (Thomas 2006) landscape phenomenology texts may also present space shaped by the gravity of human perception rather than the expected Cartesian regularity of space. They may de-centre human will from experience, noting how an eye is drawn into a space - consciousness impacted upon - rather than situating these in terms of actions that are chosen by a rational or cognitive subject. This opening up entertains and perhaps magnifies the impacts that a site may have on its human inhabitants and visitors. Similarly, both attention to the beyond-the-visual, and awareness of movement and change, exist in evident dialogue with a “landscape picture” approach to environment (Bender 1993, Thomas 1993). This is characterised by an over-emphasis on place as viewed from one optimal point as the peak or summation of experience (Bell and Lyall 2002). Other scholars have extended philosophical influence, notably Wylie’s “post-phomenologies”, engaging variously with Derrida’s “haunting” (Wylie 2009), Merleau-Ponty’s later visual work, and less subject-centred, ontological understandings of vision (Wylie 2002, Wylie 2005, 2006).

Such philosophical sensitivity threatens to encourage grandiose generalisations of experience (Wylie 2009). The presentation of subjective experience can slide to seemingly

19 ‘One sees the hardness and brittleness of glass, and when, with a tinkling sound, it breaks, this sound is conveyed by the visible glass’ (Merleau-Ponty 1962, 266-267).
objective assertions such as ‘One senses tranquillity and repose in a setting of vast marine space’ (Violich 2000 [1985], 120); paradoxically abstract products of a method founded on specificity (Tilley 1994, Ingold 2011). I would suggest that a significant benefit of this is processual, opening to possibilities of interaction in a process of theorising through interaction with places (Knappett 2005). Landscape phenomenology therefore both mines and destabilises experience of place, drawing on perceived similarities of experience while opening the researcher up to other experience. As Thomas notes with regard to Violich’s work, despite a questionable universalism in his portrayal, ‘[n]onetheless, Violich’s account produces a series of insights that could not have been extracted from maps or plans alone’ (Thomas 2006, 50). In doing so it recalls a number of other walking and moving philosophies, such as Benjamin’s excursions through Paris, fostering possibilities of thought in conversation with landscape that inform engagement with other arenas. The place of subjectivity within my encounters is further explored through autoethnography, as discussed below.

Over the course of this study I visited all volcanoes open to the public, many on multiple occasions, as well as parts of privately owned Te Motu a Hiaroa, known as Puketutu Island, and Hampton Park during the 2012 Heritage Festival. I also paid attention to volcanic presence when moving through Auckland, on the way to and from volcanoes and through living within the wider city. The relative inaccessibility of Rangitoto and Motukorea Islands was a feature of these volcanoes. Rangitoto can be visited through a regular ferry service, its fixed hours adding a temporal urgency to these trips. Motukorea, in contrast, has no chartered ferry services and must be accessed by private boat, kayak, or hired water taxi. The lack of shelter on the island, and unreliability of weather when booking transport in advance, made visits during winter months less feasible, a limitation illustrated as my first booked water taxi was cancelled due to high winds.

I recounted my experiences in a diary following each visit, occasionally also using a digital voice recorder to capture ideas and impressions at a site. I also utilised digital photography, potentially for inclusion in publication, but primarily as a personal memory aid. Accordingly, each visit typically generated many photographs that would not impress aesthetically (cf Pink 2007) but useful in re-invoking a sense of place when revisiting fieldwork, recalling a more complex experience or thought, as well as collecting any textual or interpretative information for later consideration. I attempted to incorporate common practices within visits, travelling what appeared to be the major paths upon these sites at least once but not confining myself to them. More than an hour was typically spent in each visit, much more in the case of Rangitoto and Motukorea, and most volcanoes were revisited a number of times. When
vehicular access to volcanoes was available I endeavoured to visit both by foot and as a passenger²⁰.

I visited some volcanoes alone, others with company: friends who lived near Tuff Crater and Onepoto; occasionally my husband or mother; my young niece; while my location near Maungawhau at the beginning of this project facilitated frequent visits, often with a friend with whom I frequently discussed the project. I also visited a number of locations as part of small groups during guided walking tours, such as for Auckland Heritage Festival or Love Your Mountain Day. This is not unusual in landscape phenomenology: Wylie’s summer with Glastonbury Tor was a combination of walking alone and with friends (2002), Hockley’s (2011) doctoral thesis involved taking students on tours of an area as well as solitary walking, while Bender (1998) includes several conversations with scholars and other interested people that occurred while walking around Stonehenge. Contrary to the valorisation of lone walking (Solnit 2001), which Wylie critiques as the ‘solitary romantic inheritance’ (2005, 237), both yielded useful, different insights. When walking alone I felt freer to spend time exploring, when travelling with others their comments or interactions with place were held in conversation with my own experience. Travelling in a group also highlighted differences in the bodily abilities of those within the tours, including elderly participants and parents with toddlers or negotiating prams, particularly evident when scrambling up or down steep slopes.

Having lived alongside Maungawhau/Mount Eden for a number of years, visiting this volcano in all weathers and seasons, I was conscious of the subtle changes in the mountain with each expedition, facilitated by weather, season, mood itself. The presence and behaviour of other people and animals could also significantly colour experience (see chapter five). While I was not able to visit each volcano in a wide range of conditions, overall I visited different sites in a variety of circumstances, weather, time of day and year. All formal expeditions to the volcanoes occurred during daylight, but I have also visited some volcanoes at night, and draw on observations from these visits in analysis and writing.

**Autoethnography**

Autoethnography within this thesis is often intertwined with phenomenological accounts. It is both technique and “sensibility” (Butz 2010) using the researcher’s own subjectivity as data, treated with a continual reflexivity and held in relation to wider society and scholarly material.

²⁰ Towards the end of this thesis I also drove the summit roads of a number of cones, but this was in the process of learning to drive, and I am conscious of the nervous specificity of these endeavours.
This is facilitated through diary-keeping throughout the research process, but is also drawn upon in research presentation. The result, as Spry explains, is ‘a self-narrative that critiques the situatedness of self with others in social contexts’ (2006, 187). As Ellis and Bochner (2000, 739) argue, the researcher’s story and wider society circle back upon each other: personal troubles tied to public issues (Mills 1959), private insights held up to public expressions and behaviours. This acts as a beneficial accompaniment to a variety of methods, recognising the researcher as a multidimensional person with whom research is always-already entangled. Fairclough’s (1989) observation that researchers’ ‘members’ resources’ contributes to analysis connects with the more broadly noted impossibility of "objective" research (e.g. Clifford and Marcus 1986), but also highlights the broad range of resources brought to analysis that exceed academic material. The aim of continued reflexivity is therefore not objectivity, nor is its presentation simply for the purposes of transparency (Dewsbury et al. 2002, 439). Rather than treating humanness as bias to be overcome, tensions and periods of complication are analysed to potentially generate insight: moments of discomfort or reluctance are tied to desires or fears, perhaps relating to tensions in research practice or the analyst’s status as a particular kind of “insider”.

Here, my decades-long experience with Auckland and the volcanoes is available to be explored in depth, but also interrogated and challenged. My voice is presented as that of an “insider” of a particular sort: Pākehā21, middle-class, female, and of a particular history with Maungawhau especially, discussed further chapter five. I note that Auckland is not uniform, and my Auckland is inherently an Auckland of the central isthmus. I also recognise the relative privilege of my former suburb, its centrality and comparative affluence (Crampton, Salmond, and Kirkpatrick 2004). Similarly, “my” volcano is one of the more valued cones, both in imagery and in allocated funding, as is discussed in more detail chapter five. Throughout the process of researching and writing this thesis I became increasingly aware of the specificity of these features, and these changes are at a number of points detailed within.

Coupled with this uncomfortable awareness of privilege is a concern about my self-perceived oddness: a tension that may be brought to bear on my retelling of my engagement with Maungawhau in particular lies in my spiritual identity, since 14, as a “Neopagan Witch”22. This carries with it a particular relationship to “natural” places: Neopagan Witchcraft is at its core about a perception of, and attempt to connect with, the “natural” world and nature itself,

21 A New Zealander of European descent.
22 See King (2006).
with a capital “N” (Williams 1980). Undeniably, then, this created an added emphasis, an additional *morality* to engaging with the mountain as an item of Nature, a place where these connections to the tangible pulse of the seasons, the capricious wind itself, seemed more easily afforded. Yet at the same time, such involvement may deviate from, but also runs parallel to trends within wider society: as illustrated chapter five, the concept of nature remains pervasive and valued within Western culture in myriad ways (e.g. Wilson 1992, Macnaghten and Urry 1998). While I overtly note “nature” as tied to my deliberate spiritually-oriented behaviour, in my introduction to Maungawhau I find other ways in which its concepts creep into my account that are harder to trace and not always salient at the time. This underscores the value in the continual reflexivity of this approach: layers of connection may not always be teased out as identity facets able to be named, but through complex and often surprising connections between wider historical/cultural contexts and personal experience.

Landscape phenomenology and autoethnography share several commonalities and, I argue, complement each other well. Both utilise the researcher – be it their body, practices, history, or emotional responses - as a tool for engaging with wider social and experiential questions. Both require a cautious reflexivity and engagement with broader scholarly material, lest they veer towards totalising over-generalisations. Both autoethnography and landscape phenomenology offer processual ways of thinking through practice, using diary entries in particular to both actively work through this and document it for future reference. As such, for both, the vast majority of what is written during the process of research remains unpublished.

Interestingly, for both, there is often an emphasis on richness and the *evocation* of experience in published accounts (e.g. Davis and Ellis 2008, Hockley 2011, Tilley 1994). Material is not simply descriptive but frequently poetic, personal, sensually loaded, attempting to go beyond factual precision to approach or invoke something akin to the richness of experience. Tilley and Bennett write, ‘Such an account must, of necessity, exploit the tropic or metaphoric nature of language... This is to exploit the carnal dimensions of language, rooted in sensorial experiences of other persons and the world to make communicative meaning affective’ (2004, 28). This reference to the “sensorial experiences of other persons and the world” highlights both the complex embodied underpinning of communication, and the inclusion of both researcher and recipients of academic writing within this. It also recognises both the writing and reading of any academic text as processes rather than simple conveyance of information (Butz 2010).
Autoethnography brings a continual prompt of reflexivity to landscape phenomenology, reminding researchers not to simply occupy the role of landscape phenomenologist but note the specificity of this endeavour itself and what is brought to it. Jones (2011, 5) makes the interesting observation that many recent landscape phenomenologies detail landscapes to which the authors ‘come as strangers’, spaces not habitually known before study. He suggests these would be different if performed in spaces with personal history, highlighting the importance of memory in everyday experience. My phenomenological and autoethnographic material is most concentrated upon Maungawhau. I recount the impact its strangeness made on me, but also spaces washed with familiarity: laden with memories, yes, but also infused with a sense that I have roamed upon it many times, indeed, once considered it mine. Jones raises the dubious spectre of “purity” in his differentiation, celebrating strangeness because ‘the moment of encounter is pure’ (2011, 5). Rather than rendering my experiences corrupted, I hope my history with the mountain, where presented, contributes a richness to my accounts, the vividness of experiences that stood out from hundreds of others. More unexpectedly, my experience with Maungawhau coloured my encounters as I visited other volcanoes for the first time, manifesting in an unanticipated sense of familiarity and confidence when approaching the similar grass-covered terraces of other cones. It offered unexpected more-than-cognitive indications of what part of me felt the volcanoes were. It also helped me distinguish my feelings about certain cones, notably the car park circle of Puketāpapa/Mount Roskill and the mown slopes of Cornwall Park: feeling the presence or absence of manicured grass in a way that may well have been missed otherwise. Notably, it is a sense acknowledged through combined phenomenological and autoethnographical diarising, considering personal responses in combination with sensory impressions.

**Going forward**

The methods discussed here intersect with and inform each other throughout; autoethnography and landscape phenomenology in particular can be paired with each other as ways of thinking through, drawing on and conveying experience, but discursive analysis of text is similarly explorative and immersive. Drawing inspiration from ECA I return to this metaphor of “immersion” as part of analysis, a non-linear process that returns repeatedly to text and other research sources to draw comparisons and probe observation. Textual work and physical exploration of the volcanoes therefore parallel each other: beginning with travel on clearly defined routes but also exploring other areas that seem promising; returning, retracing and reorientating; noting the environment but also allowing and utilising personal reactions to it, opening oneself up to be affected but casting a critical eye on these
responses; travelling with attention to specificity but with an eye to making comparisons across areas within the whole. Much of my phenomenological and autoethnographical writing is concentrated in chapter five. The following chapter takes a step back before this, however, and offers an historical context to both volcanoes and city.
4. History of Auckland’s contemporary volcanoes

In subsequent chapters I discuss ways the physicality of Auckland’s volcanoes contributes to the media articulation of their identities. Individually, and as a group, the volcanoes are already shaped by previous understandings of what these sites should be and what action is appropriate. This chapter illustrates a number of influences that have gone into creating the volcanoes as they are encountered now.

Many of these changes have been extensive. At a 2012 visit to Maungawhau’s historic Tea Kiosk during Love Your Mountain Day, I found myself one of many attendees marvelling at vistas from a Maungawhau of the past. Blown-up photographs from the 1890s decorated the walls, a nostalgic juxtaposition of present views with history that was originally offered for the Rugby World Cup (Thompson 2011a). These images depicted an environment that was predominantly farmland, although the beginnings of Mount Eden Village can be picked out: there Mount Eden Road, there a grand house now repurposed as a café. The landscapes that the photographer looks out upon are also populated with more volcanoes. Te Pou Hawaiki is visible in one photograph, a low mound with surprisingly obvious volcanic crater. Rarotonga/Mount Smart backgrounds one image, the network of hills that were Te Tātua-a-Riukiuta/the Three Kings, another. These volcanoes are grass-clad and terraced, their summits remarkably like contemporary cone reserves. Showing no indication of their future destruction they seem eerie and poignant, like smiling people in old photographs who don’t know that they are dead. Some changes in the volcanic landscape have been dramatic, illustrated by Tom Grinter who, working in his Mount Albert Road garage in the late 1920s, ‘looked up and was surprised to see Mount Eden appear over the far side of what had previously been a vista of the Southern King’ (Reidy 2007, 48). Others have been gradual, such as the slow tide of housing spreading across the isthmus, over tuff craters and part-way up volcanic slopes, both obscuring and delineating the city’s volcanic forms.

This alteration, overbuilding, and removal of many of Auckland’s volcanoes highlights how specific and social are those volcanoes seen today. Ingold observes,

> Buildings, like other environmental structures, are never complete but continually under construction, and have life-histories of involvement with both their human and non-human inhabitants. Whether, at a certain point in its life history, a structure looks to us like a building or not will depend on the extent and nature of human involvement in its formation.

(Ingold 2000, 154)
As with buildings, volcanoes continue changing long after their moments of “birth” (Fairfield 1992). I begin this chapter with the assumption that the volcanoes as encountered are relational in both experience (e.g. Reid 2007, see following chapter) and physical form. Swyngedouw characterises the city as “cyborg”, ‘part social and part natural, but without discrete boundaries, continually internalizing the multiple contradictory relations that re-define and re-work every body and thing’ (1996, 70)\(^\text{23}\). The volcanoes were re-worked into new entities whose boundaries are not geological but defined by lawyer’s pen and encroaching houses. They were shaped alongside the emergence of a city itself formed in part of the volcanic landscape - sometimes devouring cones for roading and for building supplies (Hayward, Murdoch, and Maitland 2011), at times prizing the volcanic loam of the central isthmus (Bush 2006) or its outskirts (Thompson and Clements 2003). Hayward et al. illustrate the extent of this reworking through re-presenting the familiar scoria cone of Maungawhau as the yolk within a wider poached-egg form (2011, 129). Quarries set into this “white” surprised me in stretching so far from what I was used to thinking of as “the volcano” (see fig. 4.1).

\[\text{Fig. 4.1: Historical quarries on and around Maungawhau, based on Bush (2006). Te Pou Hawaiki is marked in blue, large scoria quarries on the side of the volcano in light orange.}\]

\[^{23}\text{Swyngedouw’s chosen metaphor and case study, water, is itself entwined with the volcanic within Auckland (Hayward, Murdoch, and Maitland 2011). Rainwater filters and flows underground through cracked basalt to form the springs and reservoirs that sustained the early city. The Domain was the city’s first water source, Western Springs owes its existence to volcanic lava fields, and the pump house that watered much of the North Shore still stands next to Lake Pupuke. A number of smaller volcanic-sourced springs fed early industry, including breweries in Newmarket, while Onehunga still uses unfluoridated water from springs drawing on rainwater filtered through One Tree Hill. Hayward et al. explain how the water reservoirs on many volcanic summits, while often significantly damaging the surface of the cones, may have contributed to their preservation (2011, 68-70), the continued need for gravity-fed supply meaning that to the most utilitarian eyes those cones supporting reservoirs were not to be completely destroyed. The starkest illustration of this is Mount McLaughlin, now an artificial ziggurat, its summit-top reservoir preserved as the rest of the sprawling mountain was removed.}\]
Fig. 4.2: Auckland's volcanoes, lava flows and tuff features
Yet while Maungawhau is relatively neatly “poached” (see fig. 4.2), other volcanoes’ lava may trail off in a flow less readily identifiable “as” the volcano. Maungarei/Mount Wellington is an example. Its Lunn Avenue quarry is astonishingly large: since quarrying ceased 2001 an entire new “village” with school and “market” has been installed within (Stonefields 2007). Strange, then, that Mount Wellington’s governing board celebrated in their management plan the relative intactness of the mountain (Auckland City Council 1989b), as did Holloway (1962). The vast pit is divorced from the mountain, a different conceptual entity despite sharing the hill’s volcanic origin. This perceived separateness contrasts with protest against quarrying at Rangitoto’s basalt flows, similarly distanced from the central cone yet evidently part of this “volcano” (Woolnough 1984). Such distinction seems more to do with its apparent surroundings than inherent volcanic essence; one girded by the Waitematā, another by developable land. Often, there is no ready geological distinction to resolve the apparent sliding between the conceptual “volcanoes” and their lava outpourings, covering much of the isthmus (see fig. 4.2), (Hayward 2013, Kenny 2013, Lindsay 2014, Borgia et al. 2010). Consideration is frequently confined to the legal reserves, particularly in a preservation context (Warner 2008). The implication is volcanoes that are as much social as they are geological; physically shaped by human activity but also conceptually and experientially bounded in relation to the city (Reid 2007). Indeed, as Reid notes, this very contrast underscores the experience of the remaining cones as positive presences, stark and meaningful against the urban landscape.

I begin this chapter with a series of non-human processes, noting the contingency of the volcanoes’ forms and as their continued shaping in a dynamic non-human context. Then, five broad periods of human history are discussed: Māori sculpting of these sites; from founding of Auckland in 1841 until 1900, when Auckland was still considered a “pioneer” town (Laurenson 2010); the first half of the 20th century; the swift change of the 1950s and 1960s; and, briefly, the legislation and entities formed in the latter part of the 20th century. Because my interest is the shaping of the contemporary volcanoes, the history provided is quantitatively skewed towards post-colonisation, focused upon practices that most drastically changed the environment. Māori modified the volcanoes and wider landscape considerably. Only from 1841, however, have they been erased from the landscape entirely.

Many factors, some seemingly insignificant, have contributed to the shaping and varied survival of volcanic sites. Murdoch notes their destruction would have been more comprehensive had the fledgling city been less rich in timber, with many of its buildings constructed of wood in a manner unusual for the time (Murdoch 2014). He highlights
changes in labour patterns with the new standard working week, making recreational day-trips to locations further from the city possible, and valued. Hayward et al. (see above) also note the significance of summit-top water reservoirs. However, I broadly note the comparative endurance of large volcanoes over small; those close to the emerging city over those more distant. This is not claimed as the sole determining factor in the volcanoes’ survival, but I suggest that it can be read as an exaggeration of existing differences in the volcanoes' ecological charisma. While larger volcanoes can also withstand greater damage, I detail below how the clearly present cones were more likely to be reserved, protested and protected, with their foothills, smaller and distant siblings considered easy prospects for exploitation. The clear exceptions – Matukutūruru/Wiri, Rarotonga/Mount Smart and Īwairaka/Te Ahi-kā-a-Rakataura/Te Hākia-Rakatā - border the emerging train lines and Great South Road, offering ready sources of metal for these projects. The continued visual presence of comparatively charismatic cones was ensured in the 1970s through council measures granting visual protection to those prominent cones, certain views of which were deemed to hold “regional significance”.

There have been shifts, also, in what counts as the geological volcanic field. Hochstetter’s (2009 [1864], 44) declaration that Auckland possessed “no less than 63 points of eruption” continued to be used by later sources (Fowlds 1928) but the current figure most commonly given is “around 50” (Hayward and Kermode 1994). This includes a reconsideration of the volcanic status of some points such as the Boulton Hills in Māngere, now overbuilt, and the completely demolished Duder’s Hill in Devonport (Wolfe 2002, 212, Warner 2008, Fowlds 1967), recognised as a section of Mount Victoria’s cone rafted seawards by lava (Hayward, Murdoch, and Maitland 2011, 119). Conversely, Grafton volcano was “rediscovered” in 2011 (Hayward et al. 2011) while others such as Bogghurst Park and Puhinui reserve are entirely newly recognised (Hayward, Kenny, and Grenfell 2011).

Contingent foundations: volcanic formation in prehuman Auckland

The prevailing image of volcanic eruption is as unstoppable force (see chapter 8). Yet the process of volcano formation in Auckland is a swarm of sequential contingencies (Hayward, Murdoch, and Maitland 2011), influenced by subterranean structure, surface water, topography, and even the weather. The products of this vary considerably, from each other, and from towering stratovolcanoes such as Ruapehu and Taranaki that are perhaps more familiar examples of the volcanic to many New Zealanders. According to current knowledge,
Auckland's field of volcanoes is predominantly monogenetic: its volcanoes tend to erupt only once (e.g. Németh et al. 2012), forming a collection of modest eruptive centres across the field. This field is on a “hot spot” thought to correspond to an area of magma around 80km below the surface, some distance from the junction of tectonic plates that underlies the majority of New Zealand’s volcanic and geothermal sites. While volcanoes such as Ruapehu sit above magma chambers in which magma “stews” becomes more viscous andesite or rhyolite, Auckland’s basaltic magma rises swiftly from the lower mantle (Ashenden et al. 2011). Its indeterminate journey is influenced by forces and weaknesses, deep faults, ‘near-surface geology and topography’ (Irwin 2009, 83), and may even cease before reaching the surface (Constantinescu and Lindsay 2010).

Interactions between magma and the surface result in wildly different eruptions and landforms (Allen and Smith 1994, Hayward and Gill 1994, Hayward, Murdoch, and Maitland 2011). If there is water on or near the surface then a “phreatomagmatic” eruption is likely (Constantinescu and Lindsay 2010). The explosion - or explosions as the water source replenishes - are stunningly violent. Most dangerously to nearby life and landscape, these can produce “base” or “pyroclastic surges”, where ‘superheated steam, gas, ash and lapilli... [blast] out sideways at speeds up to hundreds of kilometres per hour’ (Hayward, Murdoch, and Maitland 2011, 6)  

Ash and lapilli are two gradients of solid particles emitted by the erupting volcano, collectively called “tephra”. Tephra is “ash” when smaller than 2mm across, “lapilli” when smaller than 64mm, and “blocks” and “bombs” when larger.  

If magma surfaces away from groundwater, or once available water is used up, much gentler “effusive” fire-fountaining occurs. Driven by the expansion of dissolved gas nearing the surface, molten rock becomes frothy and fountains upwards (Németh et al. 2012, Hayward,  

24 The modifiers “predominantly” and “tend to” are the consequence recent data suggesting Rangitoto may have been active for ~1000 years (Shane et al. 2013). See chapter eight.  
25 Ash and lapilli are two gradients of solid particles emitted by the erupting volcano, collectively called “tephra”. Tephra is “ash” when smaller than 2mm across, “lapilli” when smaller than 64mm, and “blocks” and “bombs” when larger.
Murdoch, and Maitland 2011). The result, when it cools, is scoria: light rock filled with bubble chambers, varying between black and red with the oxidation of its iron components. Auckland’s scoria cones were built by this substance accumulating around the vent. This process is remarkably quick – Hayward et al. (2011, 8) note that a 30-metre high cone can form within a day, 100 metres around a week. Vicissitudes of weather can influence this formation, with the wind casting the fountaining stone this way or that, potentially unevenly shaping the resultant cone.

As dissolved gas is exhausted the ejected magma may stream more steadily, forming lava flows (Allen and Smith 1994). These often emerge from the base of the scoria cone, itself too light and fragmented for lava to ascend through to its peak. The flow may sweep some of the cone away to leave a horseshoe “breached crater” such as Ōhinerau/Mount Hobson (Hayward, Murdoch, and Maitland 2011). There is considerable variation in the character and amount of lava emitted by Auckland’s volcanoes, and its characteristics may change over the course of an eruption. Hotter and less viscous lava moves relatively swiftly, while thicker lava may flow slowly and stop suddenly, as in parts of Maungawhau, forming rocky protrusions tens of metres high (Carr 2012). Flow is also influenced by topography, including Auckland’s sandstone ridges (Kereszturi et al. 2012). Flowing lava and fountained scoria have different points of rest: while the scoria cones have slopes of approximately 30 degrees on their outer slopes and caters, lava can spread out more smoothly, as illustrated by Rangitoto’s wide skirts (Hayward, Murdoch, and Maitland 2011). Different eruptive styles may also combine and intrude upon each other, forming sites of remarkable complexity. Three Kings volcano is an example, before quarrying comprised of differently sized scoria vents within a vast tuff crater itself partially filled with solid basalt (Cameron, Hayward, and Murdoch 1998); Maungarei/Mount Wellington is another (see fig. 4.3), embodying a number of the features discussed above.

At no point, then, is there an “essential” volcano that imposes itself upon the landscape. The relational volcano that emerges does so out of complex interactions that include the available magma, cracks and weaknesses within the Earth, pre-existing topography and the ephemeralities of weather. Once lava has cooled a volcano may be impacted or buried by subsequent geological events, while the complexities of climate, flora, fauna, time and geographical position continue to shape each eruption site. Ecological systems, like cities, do not simply settle upon the volcanic landscape but develop their specificities in interaction with its peculiarities (Wilcox 2007). Volcanic features such as lava flows become the sites of unique ecologies, some of which are preserved in small reserves near Maungawhau and in Otuataua Stonefields, while the newly developing forest on Rangitoto has generated
significant ecological interest (Wilcox 2007), still changing in form before residents’ very eyes (Eagles 2007).

![Diagram of Maungarei](image)

**Fig. 4.3 Maungarei, from Hochstetter (2005 [1867], 237)**

**Māori shaping of Tāmaki and its volcanoes**

The Auckland isthmus and its surroundings were significantly altered by Māori. Previously covered in podocarp and broadleaf forest (Davidson 2011), this desirable area (Stone 1995) was a strategic junction between Northland and Waikato. Its two harbours were connected by narrow portages linking eastern waters with west, still referenced by the “Portage Road”s at Otahuhu and New Lynn. It also boasted extensive coasts and waterways, flora and fauna, and volcanic soils ‘ideally suited for Polynesian agriculture’ (Cameron, Hayward, and Murdoch 1998, 55). Archaeological information suggests occupation of the volcanic region from around the 14th century (Cameron, Hayward, and Murdoch 1998), with radiocarbon data implying ‘widespread occupation of the cones and their environs’ from around 600 years ago (Hayward, Murdoch, and Maitland 2011, 55).

Auckland’s cones are thought to have been central to the inhabitation of Tāmaki as a whole: settlements radiated *from* these inhabited volcanoes, ‘origin points of a land use system’
This included what is now called “Stonefield” gardening systems, tied but not exclusive to Auckland’s volcanoes, with areas of central and South Auckland considered most typical of these sites (Furey 2006, 26). These gardens eventually covered over 8000ha, of which no more than 200ha remain. Their construction significantly changed the landscape, notably through clearing enormous quantities of rock. This was transformed into structures including stone walls, path markers, supports for terracing, mounds, and wind shelters (Furey 2006). Such features provided scaffolding for gardening practices that helped Māori grow plants originating from tropical climates: stone walls created microclimates, while basalt mounds were also likely warmer than their surrounds (Veart 1986, Furey 2006).

Still visible on many cones, although without their original drain and hut structures, kūmara pits/rua kūmara were another Māori adaptation to a cooler climate, enabling the overwintering of crops that grew perennially in the ground in their original tropical context (Veart 1986, Furey 2006). The other evident modifications of these cones - tuapapa, or terraces - provided shelter and level ground for activities such as cooking. Despite these settlements later being known primarily as defensive pa (Reid 2007), they were not shaped originally for fortification. Hayward et al. note long periods of peace within the 500+ year occupation, particularly as tribal and subtribal groups were 'unified by their ancestry' through Tainui (2011, 59). Inhabitation varied over time and between cones, with large maunga such as Maungakiekie, Maungawhau, Maungarei and Te Pane-o-Mataaho/Te Ara Peru/Mount Māngere "sprawling settlements" and likely "subtribal focal points" (Hayward, Murdoch, and Maitland 2011). With only hand instruments, the terrain was continually modified (Davidson 2011), with the current level of earthworks achieved by the mid-eighteenth century (Hayward, Murdoch, and Maitland 2011, 55).

26 My focus here is on physical modification of the environment, with attention to cones. However, it is worth noting that while Rangitoto alone erupted after human habitation, volcanic cones and craters figure in tradition that illustrates a considerable understanding of their volcanic origin (Hayward, Murdoch, and Maitland 2011, 44). As an example, Cameron et al. (1998, 138) describe the Ngāi Tai tradition of "Te Riri a Mataaho" - the "Wrath of Mataaho" - which links together Pupukemoana, Rangitoto, Onetepoto and Tank Farm explosion craters. Mataaho’s name unites other volcanic features: Hayward et al. list Te Pane a Mataaho/the head of Mataaho, or Mangere Mountain; Te Ihu a Mataao, or the nose of Mataaho at the northwestern end of Maungataketake; Te Tatua o Mataaho or the girdle/belt of Mataaho, later renamed Te Tātua o Riukiuta; Te Kapua Kai o Mataaho, or “the food bowl of Mataaho” at Maungawhau. Mataaho’s movements over the land are referred to as Ngā Tapuwae a Mataaho, or “the footprints of Mataaho”, particularly referring to Pukaki and Crater Hill, but also applied more generally to the field’s explosion craters (Hayward, Murdoch, and Maitland 2011, 44).
The complex history of pre-European Tāmaki can be read in Moon (2007), and more briefly in Stone (2001a) and Hayward et al. (2011, 58-63). Fortification began ‘in earnest’ with the increasingly distinct identities of related groups by the 16th century. Interregional conflict in the 17th century intensified fortification, and Hayward et al. attribute the fortification on cones on the southern and eastern edges of the isthmus to emerging friction between tribes of Tāmaki and Hauraki. The mid-18th century then saw intertribal conflict between the Tainui tribes of Tāmaki and the collective that were to become known as Ngāti Whātua, from the Kaipara region. These Kaipara tribes killed Waiohua chief Kiwi Tamaki at Titirangi and took several pa on Tāmaki before defeating the last Waiohua forces at Te Ara Peru/Mount Māngere. Te Taoū leader Tuperiri established himself permanently at Maungakiekie, and strategic marriages were made between survivors from Waiohua and those from Te Taoū that remained on the isthmus. Despite this, Hayward et al. note that ‘By the end of the eighteenth century Tamaki makaurau lay in the midst of ongoing interregional disputes and tension from the north, south and east, with the result that the cones on the isthmus were no longer viable places to be occupied permanently’ (Hayward, Murdoch, and Maitland 2011, 62).

When Europeans arrived at Tāmaki, then, it was to an environment where much of the work to transform the isthmus into a place suitable for living and farming had already been carried out. It was also to an isthmus unusually devoid of human inhabitants, in part because of the influence of Europeans themselves. Hone Heke had led Ngāpuhi into the area armed with muskets between 1818 and 1826, devastating pa such as Mokoia in Panmure (Holloway 1962), while introduced disease also took a significant toll (Cameron, Hayward, and Murdoch 1998). Former Ngāti Whātua heritage manager Ngarimu Blair nonetheless underscores the agency of the tribe in the creation of the new city of Auckland (2002). Ngāti Whātua chief Apihai Te Kawau sent a delegation to Russell inviting Hobson to establish the capital in Tāmaki, as Kawharu notes, ‘opportunities to trade and to develop further commerce with the settlers and to obtain protection from further threat of war from the northern Ngāpuhi were enticing reasons’ to bring powerful Pākehā settlers to the region (Kawharu 2004, 77). This invitation was soon accepted, and the new city of Auckland was officially founded September 1841.

**Early reservations for a smaller “Auckland”**

The growing city was to consume increasing quantities of scoria and basalt over the following century and a half, quarrying away parts of many cones for purposes such as roading and building. In the face of this, the largest determining factor in whether or not
many volcanic cones survived was their exemption from private ownership in the first few decades of settlement (Hayward, Murdoch, and Maitland 2011). Auckland was founded at a time when the setting aside of land for recreation was increasingly internationally promoted. “Parkomania” followed the opening of New York’s Central Park in 1857, and urban parkland was a salient topic in public conversation (Murdoch 1998, 32). The provision of healthy open space alongside the built-up urban setting was argued as an antidote to the ills of industrialisation. Royal instructions arrived with Governor Hobson in 1840 encouraging the reservation of “places fit to be set apart for the recreation and amusement of the inhabitants of Town or Village” (Hobson in Murdoch 1998, 33). The first of these in Auckland had volcanic connections, with Auckland Domain set aside within a year of the city’s founding (Bush 1971). Sir George Grey designated a number of volcanic cones as reserves upon becoming governor of New Zealand in 1845, proposing then and in 1851 that “all the volcanic hills of Auckland” should be placed under reservation (Grey in Hayward, Murdoch, and Maitland 2011, 84). Grey explains this in debate around the One Tree Hills Reserve Act 1886, stating it as intended to provide ‘parks and natural objects of beauty for the city’ (1886, 560).

As illustrated within this debate, the “city” of the time was limited to a centralised area on the isthmus with boundaries far exceeded by the volcanic field (see fig. 4.4-4.5). Grey had reserved volcanic hills of interest to an “Auckland” that was, in Sir O’Rourke’s words ‘between the two seas’, and privileging those volcanoes closest to or visible from what is now the CBD. A number of central volcanoes were exempted from sale in the 1840s or - like Maungakiekie/One Tree Hill and Ōhinerau/Mount Hobson - reserved on assessment of sales conducted during the Fitzroy Period (One Tree Hill Borough Council 1989). Significantly for the later delineation of the volcanoes, the preservation by Grey of the “volcanic hills” focused on the summit points but frequently neglected the lower slopes. This is most dramatically seen in debate around Mount Hobson. James Dilworth petitioned to the government for the removal of the reserve, complaining, "It was a very small piece of land I

27 O’Rourke anticipated a population that would ‘in a very few years, perhaps another generation, cover the whole of the isthmus’; conversely, Mr Dargaville argued that, being three or four miles from the town centre, Maungakiekie was ‘totally useless for the ordinary purposes of recreation to the people of Auckland’ (1886, 557).
28 Under the second article of the Treaty of Waitangi, the Crown possessed “the exclusive right of Preemption”, meaning that all land that Maori were willing sell must be sold to the Crown, which would then negotiate onselling to private buyers. Despite significant markup on Crown sales, there was not always sufficient funds for the Crown to purchase land. In response, the Governor FitzRoy created a waiver allowing private sales in 1843, soon revoked by Governor Grey in 1845.
29 Many of these not gazetted for several decades, remaining instead as Crown “waste land”. In 1869 a number of these sites, including Maungakiekie, were listed as education reserves to be leased as income-generating sources for the Education Board. Although not officially “reserves” at this time, they are included as such in fig. 4 for brevity.
may say in the centre of my farm: it is not required for public purposes; and it has cost the Government neither money nor trouble. Therefore why keep it from me or annoy me any longer about it?” (Dilworth in Carlyon and Morrow 2011, 299, see also Stone 1995).

To be set aside as a reserve was not to be sacrosanct from quarrying or modification. The Public Reserves Act 1854 alludes to multiple assignable purposes, with Ōtāhuhu/Mount Richmond, for example, designated a Gravel and Spring Reserve in 1875 (Auckland City Council 1989a, 8). However, even those managed as Domains or recreation reserves were not guaranteed protection. If the founding of Auckland was at a time when parks were valued, the early decades of Auckland were also marked by a continual need for funding. Laurenson (2010) notes the period as a precarious time of booms and crises, with historians only characterising the city as emerging from a “pioneer” town with the turn of the 20th century. Municipal bodies were frequently unable to provide more urgent necessities such as roading and sewerage (see Bush 1971), and until around 1910 Auckland’s Council ‘found the upkeep of the Domain and Albert Park almost more than it could comfortably manage’ (Bush 1971, 168-9).

Simultaneously, work on roading was a continual issue and the demand for scoria was high (Scott 1983 [1961], Bush 1971). Quarrying for both basalt and scoria were significant industries, and Bush notes that ‘quarrying and Epsom were synonymous for most of the period of Epsom’s transition from farmland to suburb’ (2006, 59). Hayward et al. explain that while some revenue was generated through grazing leases, many councils ‘made ends meet by selling off the rights to quarry the scoria for local use’ (2011). Often the very boards charged with park protection were the cash-strapped authorities also responsible for roading and other public works. Local bodies themselves quarried the volcanoes. The Onehunga Endowments Act 1877 (section 4) announced that Mount Smart Domain was to be managed under the Domains Act 1860 and 1865, but also ‘the various Highway Boards having a right to take metal therefrom free of charge’ provided this conformed to rules set out by the Borough ‘for the proper working, protection, and ornamentation of the said reserve.’ Such rules were notably liberal. Fowlds describes continued council quarrying on the mountain in 1928, asking, ‘It is questionable whether it is right and in order for a local body to sell material from a recreation reserve?’ (Fowlds 1928, 18).
Fig. 1.4: Reservation and destruction of Auckland’s volcanic cones in relation to urban growth, 1871-1915

(Sources for figs. 4.4-4.6 include Hayward, Murdoch, and Maitland 2011, Auckland Regional Council 2010a, Fowlds 1928, Golson 1957, Curtis 1967) Destruction of craters not noted, see Hayward et al. (2011, 84)
Fig. 4.5: Reservation and destruction of Auckland’s volcanic cones in relation to urban growth, 1945-1964
Less drastic military alterations to selected volcanic sites began in the 19th century and continued to the 20th century. In contrast to those “scars” associated with quarrying (Warner 2008), these alterations are currently valued as “military heritage” and are used to underscore the importance of these sites in heritage evaluations (e.g. Veart 1990). The most apparent modifications were in relation to the “Russian Scare” of the 1880s. A muzzle-loader fort was constructed on Maungauika in 1885, three further batteries fitted with 8-inch disappearing guns were added, and a similar disappearing gun also installed on the summit of Takarunga/Mount Victoria. These were placed in relation to other strategic forts: mines were strung between North Head and Bastion Point between 1892 and 1908, and anti-submarine nets during WWII (Hayward, Murdoch, and Maitland 2011, 71). Further modifications on Maungauika were made by prisoners from 1888 to 191431 and military measures were extended during World War II. This included a fire command post on the summit of Rangitoto to co-ordinate Auckland’s coastal defences, and a mine base located on the island at Islington Bay near Motutapu (Hayward, Murdoch, and Maitland 2011). Te Pou Hawaiki, while previously quarried, was excavated to 20 metres below ground level for a World War II military bunker, later used for Auckland’s civil defence headquarters until the early 1970s. Others were marked more lightly: Te Kōpuke/Tītīkōpuke/Mount St John bears two concrete bases of WWII anti-aircraft gun batteries, and “Tank Farm” explosion crater gains its name from the fuel tanks dug into the northern side of the explosion crater in WWII. Some volcanoes are further characterized by military memorials. The northern side of Mount Hobson is marked with daffodils, planted by local residents “to commemorate all those who gave their lives in the Second World War” (Cameron, Hayward, and Murdoch 1998, 206), while Pupekawa is now dominated by the Auckland War Memorial Museum, opened 1929 to mark the impact of WWI upon the nation, extended in 1960 after the second.

**Aesthetic foundations for later protection**

The sensibilities of the early 20th century emerged with unanticipated relevance a century later as “rediscovered” 1915 legislation concerning Auckland’s volcanoes became a significant weapon for volcanic preservation. The ways this came about are discussed further chapter six. The legislation itself was part of the larger Reserves and Other Lands Disposal and Public Bodies Empowering Act 1915 (henceforth “the 1915 Act”) dealing with a wide range of issues and known colloquially as ‘the “washing-up” Bill’. The relevant text is short enough its key paragraph is quoted almost entirely within a newspaper column:

31 Further details of historical military installations and modifications of Maungauika can be found in Veart (1990)
"it shall be unlawful for any person, unless expressly authorised in that behalf by the Governor in Council to make ... any excavation, quarry, terrace or cutting of any kind ... on the side or slope of any of the volcanic cones or hills in the Auckland provincial district which is bounded by or abuts on to a domain or other public reserve, without leaving an angle or batter of not less than 40 degrees from the top of such excavation, quarry, terrace or cutting ... to the floor or base of such excavation, quarry, terrace or cutting." (Rudman 2003c).

A second subsection further required these cuts to be planted over with approved trees or shrubs upon completion, and two other subsections discuss penalties and enforcement.

This small body of text was prompted by significant public sentiment. Ironically, given the role of the former Mount St John Protection Society in unearthing and mobilising this “forgotten” Act, a major impetus was the proposed quarrying of Mount St John. The Chairman of the One Tree Hill Domain Board wrote to parliament requesting that the slopes of the volcanoes be seized under the Public Works Act (Morton 1914), effectively extending the reserves. Morton’s outrage was backed by the mayor of Auckland, James Parr, who publically derided ‘the vandal gashes in the volcanic cones’: ‘What a wretched, jelly-fish people we are to allow it’ (1914). A well-attended July 14 meeting protested their threatened destruction, making it into a list of noteworthy dates for the year despite the breakout of World War 1 (1915a). It led to a petition to parliament backed by twelve heads of local council, plus the Auckland Harbour Board and Education Board. This requested intervention in the preservation of the “hills”, suggesting both the 40 degree rule and the planting of trees to ‘help the effects of past vandalism’. While a parliamentary report deemed outright purchase of the hills prohibitively costly, the petition’s suggestion met little opposition and the law was passed in October 1915. The explanation stated, ‘The volcanic hills in and around the City of Auckland are being destroyed by quarrying operations, and the legislation has been framed with a view to preventing their destruction’ (1915b, 689).

Curtis (1967, 64) presents this legislation primarily in terms of the aesthetic, arguing that its continued enforcement would ‘prevent the creation of unsightly scars on the volcanic cones’. Others have characterised the early 20th century more broadly as focused on the aesthetic and the visible. The Scenery Preservation Act 1903 reflected an interest in the preservation of scenic and “historic” sites, which Nightingale and Dingwall note held an

---

32 Although not entirely random, but reflecting the cone’s centrality and the continued affluence of its surrounds (Bush 2006).
33 As Sir Barry Curtis, Mayor of Manukau City, Curtis oversaw the purchase of Pukaki lagoon in 2007 (Ihaka 2007b).
‘explicit drive to promote the country’s tourism industry’ (2003, 24). This drive further increased following a 1906 amendment, where the focus increasingly turned to securing scenery along tourist routes (Leach 1991). The visual was certainly a salient consideration with regard to the volcanoes’ preservation at the time of the legislation. A 1914 Lands and Survey Department report is filled with aesthetic assessments that include a criticism of Mount Wellington’s quarry as ‘a great disfigurement to the cone’, a recommendation to plant bulbs and keep cattle away from Mount Richmond to make the cone ‘very pretty’ and ‘a beauty spot’, while the continued destruction of Mount Smart was justified ‘as it is in a spot where hill [sic] will be little missed’.

Nightingale and Dingwall emphasise the complexity of this aesthetic, noting ‘the distinction between historic, scenic and iconic should not be overstated’ (Nightingale and Dingwall 2003, 15). Historical and scientific values were included in the 1903 legislation that Leach (1991) notes as reflecting an emerging aesthetic tied to flora and landscapes that were specific to New Zealand. Here, both the beauty of the landscape and biological and “historical”/native characteristics were recruited in the creation of national identity (see also Clark 2004). This mix of identity creation and the visible can be seen in the notes of the Auckland Scenery Conservation Society, established at around the same time, with Logan Campbell elected president on its 1899 inception (TNZH, 5 September 1899, 5). It included a committee to prevent the “disfiguration” of volcanoes through quarrying, but also schemes such as the failed “restoration” of the western pa on Maungakiekie complete with ‘inducing some Maoris to inhabit’ (Auckland Star, 18 September 1899, 4). Discussion surrounding the 1915 Act mentioned the historical and geological, but often returned to the aesthetic. This, too, was related to city identity, as encapsulated in Morton’s initial petition. He argued, ‘From a geological point of view these hills are of unique interest, while it is universally admitted that they form one of the most interesting and beautiful of the many features that render our city and its surroundings so attractive’.

In emphasising the aesthetic relationship between visible hills and emerging city I do not intend to reduce the features of the legislation to a single rationale. A further pragmatic concern prompting the 40 degrees and reinforcement may have been to ensure that the reserves above the quarries were not undermined. The petition notes the need to ‘erect and maintain substantial and unsightly fences around the summits of these Hills for the protection of the public’, while Holloway’s detailing of the expenses required to maintain a fence in the 1870s also notes the shrinking of the reserve within through slippage (Holloway 1962, 203). Legislative controls on land entirely in private ownership would have further been viewed as problematic. Yet the consequence of the Act’s limitation to those cones
meant that only relatively central and prominent volcanoes came under its protection, those possessing visual intimacy with the city. It is clear that it was not granted solely on the basis of volcanic origin: section 11 of the same Act noted that Lot 235, Section 16 held ‘valuable deposits of scoria’, allowing it to be purchased by Auckland Council to utilise this (1915b, 678). This lot was the site of Maungahir/Little Rangitoto, which had by this time been already quarried to the ground: the legislation was therefore as much about the “cones or hills” as about the volcanic.

Other documents within this period continued to emphasise the aesthetic and privilege large, visible, ecologically charismatic volcanoes. This is seen in “Auckland’s Unique Heritage”, published by the Auckland Town Planning Association one year after the Association’s formation in 1927. As some quarrying was accepted in the report as inevitable, the board recommended that ‘an effort would need to be made to find alternative sources of [scoria] supply on the foothills, where it would not offend the eye, or on ground level’ (Fowlds 1928, 2). Following this logic, for example, quarrying on the northwest foothills of Ōhuiarangi/Pigeon Mountain was deemed ‘well away from the main hill so that it is not doing much harm’ (Fowlds 1928, 20). Those features lacking a visible volcanic nature required less attention, with Tāmaki Head dismissed as ‘not a distinct cone [so] it is probably not worth taking any special action regarding it’ (Fowlds 1928, 19) and Kohuora Hills discounted ‘as they are not obvious features of the skyline’ (Fowlds 1928, 22). Most clearly, with regard to unquarried Puketutu, the authors could ‘only appeal to the public interest of the owner to see if the landscape which passing visitors can always admire will not be marred by any quarrying’ (Fowlds 1928, 22-3, emphasis mine).

These conclusions are reinforced by report by the Commissioner of Crown Lands published the same year. Here, too, the overall shape of the cone is valued and prioritised over expendable subsidiary mounds. Quarrying near Mount Māngere is acceptable because ‘the main slopes of the mountain will not be affected so that the hill should be preserved’ (Campbell 1928, 6). A similar argument was made regarding the foothills of Mount Wellington (Campbell 1928, 5)34, while quarry work towards the base of Rangitoto was noted as potentially improving the island so long as it focused on small mounds near the waterfront ‘and the regular contour of the actual cone would remain undisturbed’ (Campbell 1928, 8).

Although the 1928 Town Planning report repeatedly called for purchase of further volcanic hills no council took this step until the late 1990s, but further volcanoes were gifted the city’s

---

34 One of these foothills was presumably Purchas Hill, now recognised as of different volcanic origin and valued accordingly (Hayward, Murdoch, and Maitland 2011).
park system. Cornwall Park was bestowed by Sir Logan Campbell in 1901, alongside 142 acres designated to generate maintenance income through leasehold housing (Cornwall Park Trust Board Inc. 1983, 10). Most significantly, Mount Roskill, Big King and the remnants of Taurere/Taylor Hill were gifted to the city. Existing reserves were also added to, such as Dilworth Trust’s gift of the western slopes of Mount Hobson in 1921. At the time the 1928 report was written the Railway Department’s quarry on Mount Albert was closing, leaving what was to become the archery field on the eastern side, while the Mount Wellington Road Board announced its quarry on the southern side was to be closed. The 1928 report called for others to emulate these benefactors. The next gift to the city would be the last, however, with Motukorea Island bestowed to the city in 1955 by Sir Ernest Davis, an ex-Mayor of the city, a celebration of the island’s salvation from use as a sewerage plant.

**A volcano-hungry boom and its responses**

A number of reports on the state of the volcanoes and volcanic pa were published in the 1950s and 1960s, giving a sense of Auckland “in ferment” (Whitelaw 1967). This is reflected in a 1957 report compiled by a sub-committee of the Auckland Historic Places Society. This publication was an attempt to curb the destruction of volcanoes as it occurred:

> The rapid growth of the city in recent years had led to an unparalleled call upon the scoria and metal resources of the isthmus. The rate and extent of scoria quarrying now constitutes such an alarming threat that Aucklanders must needs take stock of the natural and historic legacy which is disappearing before their very eyes’ (1957, 6).

Other reports echo this: Brown (1961, 65) states that the destruction of hill pa ‘has now reached crisis proportions’; five years later he notes more of the hill pa ‘gone to provide material and filling for construction work’ (1966, 102).

This growth of Auckland occurred in multiple senses. Auckland’s population boomed in the post-war decades, such that Cumberland could refer to the ‘so-called “exploding” population’ requiring of council attention (1977, 24). The city had seen an increase of over 200% between 1945 and 1975, from 258k to over three-quarters of a million, almost twice the rate of the rest of the nation’s other urban populations (Cumberland 1977). This growth was a combination of factors: a post-war birth increase; internal migration, especially by previously-rural Māori; and immigration, initially from Britain but increasingly from Pacific Island nations during the 1950s, encouraged to provide New Zealand with labour in its booming manufacturing industries (Perkins et al. 1993). This population exploded outwards despite urban intensification (see fig. 4.4). Higher car ownership combined with the creation of the
Northwestern Motorway encouraged growth to the west, and the opening of the harbour bridge in 1959 similarly saw an enormous boom in suburbs across the Waitematā (Laurenson 2010, Verran 2010). Expansion to the south was further facilitated by state housing schemes (McIntosh 2005, Perkins et al. 1993).

Hayward et al. note the “rocketing” demand for aggregate with this sudden growth (2011, 79). Volcanic material was used for metal underlying roads and in construction, such as Winstones’ use of Three Kings scoria in cinder blocks and decorative “Roskill Stone” (Simpson 1965). Quarrying on many volcanoes was intensified: some previously quarried on a small scale suddenly became major operations, such as Taylor’s Hill, Pigeon Mountain and Three Kings (Hayward, Murdoch, and Maitland 2011). Others were previously untouched, quarrying starting at McLennan Hills in 1952; Puke o Tara (also known as Otara Hill) in 1955; and Maungataketake, also known as Ellett’s mountain, in 1962\(^ {35}\), only five years after the Historic Society’s call for legislation to limit quarrying, pleading, ‘Even if this legislation were to apply only to Ellett’s Mount, the only private cone on the isthmus as yet untouched, the effort would be justified’ (Golson 1957, 20). These later cones swiftly levelled to ground level or below. The site of McLennan Hills is now overbuilt with greenhouses and Puke o Tara, industrial developments.

Two major projects in the 1950s and 1960s had particularly significant impact on the volcanoes, particularly in Ihumatao: the sewerage treatment works and Auckland International Airport. Both were situated near Māngere, although their construction and location were the result of decades of deliberating and conflict. Both had long been regarded as urgently needed facilities for the growing city but suffered what Bush calls “the Auckland disease” of ‘disagreement on the means of attaining a commonly-desired end’ (Bush 1980, 24). Regarding the first, the necessity was unquestionable (Bush 1980). The main outfall at Ōrākei bay\(^ {36}\), opened 1914, was a mere six years later polluting the shores around the discharge site to the point of menacing health (Fitzmaurice 2009). Yet this plant was only one of over two dozen outfalls discharging raw waste into the Waitematā and Manukau harbours, fourteen of which served industries including the freezing works around the

\(^{35}\) Archaeological excavation was gained from this site before its complete destruction, with a very large salvage excavation in 1972, and again in 1982 (Carter 1992, 20). Carter further gives a more detailed summary of excavations in Auckland until the time of writing in 1992, showing a trend towards an increasing proportion of salvage operations as compared with pre-planned investigations.

\(^{36}\) It would be remiss to refer to the sewerage outfall at Ōrākei without mention of the disastrous effect on the Ngāti Whātua village here. Sewerage outfall made shellfish harvest untenable, while the raised pipe – built to support Tamaki Drive, which opened up the eastern suburbs of Auckland to its wealthier residents – prevented drainage and caused the collection of stagnant bog around the village (Laurenson 2010).
Westfield-Penrose area and discharged waste equivalent to a population of 300,000 persons (Fitzmaurice 2009, 4).

The replacement for this was set to be on Motukorea, known as Brown’s Island. This idea was raised in 1931, but vigorously opposed by the Auckland and Suburban Drainage League, later joined by “Robbie” Dove-Myer Robinson. The details of the resultant debate can be found in Fitzmaurice (2009), and more thoroughly in Bush (1980). Although the Browns Island scheme was approved and construction commenced 1952, overseas experts were brought in and declared that the scheme could not comply with the discharge standards required. Design for the Manukau project began late 1955, and the Manukau Wastewater Treatment Plant went into operation September 1960 (Fitzmaurice 2009, 6).

One could possibly count the successful campaign to shift the works from Motukorea as effective protection of the volcanic island. However, opposition to the Brown’s Island scheme did not focus upon or even incorporate its status as one of Auckland’s volcanoes, despite the League canvassing a wide range of arguments during their long and at times desperate campaign (Bush 1980, Fitzmaurice 2009). Rather, opposition to the scheme centred on those who considered themselves likely recipients of outfall from Motukorea, including the Tamaki Ratepayers and Residents Association and the Tamaki Yacht Club (Bush 1980, 21). Fitzmaurice notes the Māngere plant considerably improved the water quality of both the Waitematā and Manukau harbours despite loadings greatly exceeding anticipated levels (2009, 6). Yet the areas around the volcanoes of Ihumatao were extensively affected. A system of oxidation ponds stretched between Puketutu Island and the shoreline, from what is now Ambury Farm to Ihumatao. Included in this area was Māngere Lagoon, previously open to the tides: its small central cone was ‘decapitated’ to become ‘the hub of a radiating network of embankment spokes’ subdividing the crater into treatment ponds (Hayward, Murdoch, and Maitland 2011, 196). The small scoria cones at Moerangi/Mount Gabriel were quarried away for use in the works (Hayward et al. 2011, 202) and basalt from Otuataua contributed to embankments between the ponds (Hayward et al. 2011, 206).

Ironically, this overbearing project may have contributed to contemporary efforts to develop the area as a protected heritage space. Sandra Coney, who at the time chaired the Parks and Heritage Committee of the Auckland Regional Council, noted the establishment of the Māngere plant as potentially preserving the surrounding area from development. The notorious smell of Māngere that made the area ‘synonymous with sewage, and a stench that

---

37 Fitzmaurice draws heavily on Bush in his account of this period, but changes this figure to 30,000.
sometimes pervaded the entire city’ during the 60s and 70s’ (Clement 2011a) caused the rest of Auckland to shun the area, discouraging new construction and modification (Coney 2007a). The sludge ponds were progressively drained and removed around the turn of the 21st century and a new treatment plant was officially opened in 2003 (Fitzmaurice 2009), two years after the establishment of the Stonefields park at Ihumatao. Remedial work associated with “Project Manukau” includes a new coastal walkway from the Stonefields to Mount Māngere’s lava fields.

The location of Auckland’s airport in Māngere was similarly the subject of lengthy deliberation, this time due to continued delays from financial and political disputes (Thompson and Clements 2003). The volcanoes were considerations in these discussions, but not for preservation: the 1948 report by UK expert in aviation Sir Frederick Tymms, for example, argued for location in Pakuranga by noting ‘the two small volcanic cones existing on the site [likely Green Mount and Puke o Tara] would provide all the hard fill necessary for the stabilisation of the runways, thus reducing the cost of construction’ (Tymms in Thompson and Clements 2003, 61). These same volcanoes would have provided flight path obstructions, and so their reduction was beneficial to Tymms’ proposed airports on two counts. A 1955 report similarly noted that ‘tops of Puhinui and Wiri mountains would have to be removed’ if Wiri was to be an option (Thompson and Clements 2003, 70). A Māngere option with significant reclaimed land was chosen, ironically suggested by Thompson and Clements to be because this impacted less on peninsula’s volcanic soil (2003). Reclamation significantly increased demand upon the nearby cones. Volcanic material was used in the construction of the runway, the taxiway area a channel around a metre deep that was in part filled with an underlying base of scoria (Thompson and Clements 2003, Goldsmith and Bassett 2008).

Auckland’s dramatic growth elsewhere placed the volcanoes, with their easily-won scoria and ready proximity, under considerable pressure over a brief period of time. Hopes to channel the interests of affected landowners to allow for the preservation of some volcanoes (Golson 1957, Brown 1961) may have been optimistic: Curtis’ 1967 dissertation calculated the scoria value of privately owned volcanoes at $8.4 million – a rough estimate but indicative of large value, although paling in comparison to the $40 million of that in public ownership (1967). Yet if the physical hills could be destroyed, it was hoped that scholarly information could be gained from them before their destruction. The Historic Auckland Society urgently requested the government to legislate for adequate notice before quarrying, decrying the destruction commenced on Pigeon Mountain, Puke o Tara and Matukutūreia/Mount McLaughlin before geologists or archaeologists could photograph,
record or investigate the cones (Golson 1957, 21). The enforcement of the 1915 Act was also “urgently” requested. At the time, if private owners wished to quarry, they needed only to refer their intent to the local Council and Inspector of Quarries, while even public works carried no requirement for archaeological investigation. The Auckland University Archaeological Society became aware of the planned 10 million gallon reservoir on Mount Wellington only when the Auckland City Council asked for tenders for its construction (Brown 1961, 64).38

In a history of Puketutu commissioned by the Kelliher Estate, Goldsmith and Bassett describe the 1950s as markedly different from the current climate. They attribute Kelliher’s permission to quarry the previously untouched island as a response to the spirit of the age: ‘The cry Kelliher faced in the 1950s from politicians and the public, to which he responded, was to provide scoria for nearby public works. Development was the ultimate virtue. Fifty years later the mood and local needs have changed’ (2008, 106). This review can be read as crafted to justify Kelliher’s actions to people of an age where, as the authors note, ‘preserving and restoring Auckland’s volcanic heritage [is now] elevated in status above the imperatives of development’ (Goldsmith and Bassett 2008, 106). Yet others have noted that this period was marked by a pervading ethos of progress and advancement in many Western countries (Wilson 1992), ‘the excitement of the construction and disregard for the human cost of development’ (Read 1996, 80). In the face of this the landscape itself was fair game for improvement: plans from this period included the removal of (non-volcanic) Hamlin’s Hill to reclaim large portions of the Manukau Harbour (Brown 1961), while considered improvements for Mount Wellington included an artificial ski slope (Auckland City Council 1989b).

Yet Laurenson’s (2010) history of Auckland challenges the “myth” that, during this period where other beloved monuments and places were also destroyed, Auckland’s eyes were only to the industrial future. The pamphlets and reports themselves show that, in some quarters and to a degree, great concern was shown for the volcanoes. Alongside the above-noted rate of damage to the volcanoes, foundations were laid over this period for several factors that were to influence their preservation and study. Archaeological salvage missions were one aspect of this, and in the 1960s Auckland became the centre for Archaeological innovation in New Zealand (Walton and O’Keeffe 2004). The New Zealand Archaeological Association (NZAA) was founded 1955 and in 1958 began the "NZAA File" site-recording

38 However, this incident led to “good relations” with the Waterworks Department. The Society was directly given notice of the 1961 installation of Puketāpapa’s reservoir, and the subsequent excavation was entirely financed by gifts from the Mayor and Mt Roskill Borough Council (Shawcross 1962).
scheme, originally intended for research purposes, but by 1967 focused increasingly on protection through legislation (McLean 2000). The New Zealand Geological Society was also founded 1955, although Hayward (2005) notes that geology was previously well served by the Royal Society and other institutions. The first AGM of this society noted threats to Auckland’s volcanoes, and a resolution was passed allowing the committee to act immediately when damage to such features was threatened. The committee’s later successes included an ongoing campaign to preserve Wiri’s volcanic lava caves, culminating in the government’s purchase of these and their registration as a scientific reserve in 1998 (Hayward 2005).

The Historic Places Act 1954 created the Historic Places Trust, albeit with only one paid staff member and limited capacity (McLean 2000, 36). The Town and Country Planning Act 1953 brought increased emphasis to zoning and granted local authorities more control over this. This brought the slopes of many volcanoes some measure of protection from quarrying, as if they were already covered in housing they were zoned "residential" and incompatible with this practice (Curtis 1967). However, considerable excavations could still be made into the hills for residential construction and sites could also be registered and de-registered by local authorities at short notice, offering little assurance for permanent protection (Brown 1962). Such legislation was, however, subsequently built upon to provide more solid protection for the volcanoes. As Walton and O'Keefe note, ‘these institutional developments both reflected changes in attitudes to the past, and helped consolidate and advance them’ (Walton and O'Keefe 2004, 264).

A final story from this period recounted by Fairfield (1992) poignantly illustrates both a driving focus on development and local concern regarding it. Human bones, obviously pre-European, were revealed by a bulldozer at the northern edge of Ōhuiarangi/Pigeon Mountain. Their presence highlights a further value not yet noted in the appeals for the volcanoes’ preservation: as sacred places, including burial sites. An official from Wilson and Rothery Ltd, the firm undertaking the work, offered reassurance that the bones would be respected, however, weeks later Fairfield photographed them ‘crushed and scattered in an untidy mess, broken and uncared for, lying beside a tool-shed’ and later deposited ‘amid local road works’ (Fairfield 1992, 67). A “local kaumātua” stated, ‘I myself went up there and saw the bones of these people scattered around in all directions – broken up, trampled on, and left lying everywhere...I think this is one of the most damning things I have ever known or seen....’ (cited in Fairfield 1992, 67). This sentiment was echoed in a local paper’s editorial. The damage done to the volcano and the surrounding area by the heavy equipment was already causing protest, with meetings attended by residents, academics
and members of council. Golson, speaking at one of these, gave an even more disturbing account of the bones’ treatment: a bulldozer driver approached him and confessed that the company owner had instructed him ‘to scatter them and make the biggest mess he could as quickly as possible!’ (Golson in Fairfield 1992, 67).

**Late-century rise of protective measures.**

Intensification of development in the 1970s triggered the former Auckland Regional Authority/Council to preserve views to volcanoes deemed of “regional significance” (Auckland Regional Authority Planning Division 1976). These measures came to reinforce the visual presence of many volcanic cones within the city. Significant views were protected by blanket building height restrictions around the cones, and through protected “view shafts” between the mountains and selected locations around the city. These requirements remain in both the Regional and District plans. Hayward et al. (2011, 86) describe these measures as “world-breaking”, an international first in visual protection of landscape features through planning control. They shaped the environment of the city, most famously causing the location of the Sky Tower to be moved from its originally proposed location off Symonds Street to its current inner-city location (Cumming 2002a). Roy Turner, the planner behind the measures, argues that “[w]ithout the controls there would now be a ring of Pines right around Mt Eden, Mt Hobson and the others” (Turner in Cumming 2002a).39

The selection of locations to anchor the view shafts was made on the basis of “regional significance”. While including views from key public spaces such as Devonport wharf and the historic Alberton House, the majority of these are taken from major roads: Ōtāhuhu/Mount Richmond, for example, was described as likely to be dropped from the list of protected volcanoes save for its location alongside the Great South Road (Auckland Regional Authority Planning Division 1976, 66). This is of particular relevance in Auckland, where car travel in particular has remained significant part of the culture (e.g. Carter, Craig, and Matthewman 2005, Duncan and Ross 2010, especially Mitchell 2010, Duncan 2010). Local government committed to automobile infrastructure from the 1950s (Carter 2005). The completion of the vehicle-only Harbour Bridge in 1959 led to a ballooning of growth on the North Shore (Bloomfield 1973), with the motorway to West Auckland having a similar effect. The resultant sprawl outwards (Whitelaw 1967, Bush and Scott 1977) follows a web of limited routes that tangle and knot together approaching the city centre. Meanwhile, other suburbs on the isthmus such as Mount Roskill developed from the 1940s around the
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39 The “Pines” referred to the exclusive apartment block on Maungawhau’s eastern side that prompted the measures, including an initial trial in relation to this cone (Auckland Regional Authority Planning Division 1974).
widespread availability of personal transportation and the ideal of each nuclear family possessing its own freestanding house and section (Craig 2005). The result is not only that the visual experience of volcanoes is defined largely by car - it is notable that no view shafts stem from Auckland’s train tracks - but also that the physical perception of Auckland itself is arranged around charismatic volcanoes experienced on four wheels (cf. Wilson 1992).

The viewshaft bylaw also notably reinforced attention to the larger, physically dominant central volcanic cones. The Domain, Taylor’s Hill, Mount Robertson and Pigeon Mountain were listed as cones whose visual protection is not warranted on a regional level (Auckland Regional Authority Planning Division 1976, 11). The volcanic basins such as Ōrākei are similarly excluded, while those on the periphery of the city, as well as the volcanic islands, were not included because their rural and oceanic surroundings were considered adequate protection.

A number of other legal measures were passed in the last third of the 20th century that have resulted in a complex system of plans and schemes, consultation and legislation regarding the volcanoes. The 2007 management plan for Maungawhau/Mount Eden begins with 10 pages detailing these (Auckland City Council 2007), including a chart that illustrates various influences. The Reserves Act 1977, Historic Places Act 1993, and Resource Management Act 1991 sit at the top, underneath which are the Auckland Regional Policy Statements and the Auckland District Scheme. The Reserves Act 1977 expanded the possible classifications of reserves were expanded, reflecting and defining sites’ perceived primary purpose. This was in part driven by increased focus on the “environment”, with “ecology” replacing the aesthetic as the motivation for protecting “natural” environments (Nightingale and Dingwall 2003, 57). The vast majority of the volcanoes previously had been classified as “recreation” reserves, and this was maintained.

The Act required each reserve to have a management plan or be covered by a more general plan. Early examples included Mount Albert (1981), Maungakiekie/One Tree Hill (1983), Mount St John (1983), and Maungawhau/Mount Eden (1986). Many have remained unchanged since the 80s and early 1990s despite stipulations as to their period of renewal. At the time of the council merger in 2011, Auckland City Council was still using the plans for Ōtāhuhu/Mount Richmond, Mount St John and Maungarei/Mount Wellington from 1989.

---

40 A review of this visual protection began in the 1990s, manifested in “Change 8” that became operational in 2012. See chapter five.
41 Different sections of a reserve may hold different classifications: Maungawhau, for example, became an “historic” reserve above the summit road and recreation reserve below (Auckland City Council 2007)
while the Domain and Cornwall Park management plans were from 1993 and 1994 respectively (Auckland City Council 2012). Some cones, such as Taurere/Taylor Hill, remained without a plan of their own. A number of commentators further note that such plans are readily disregarded (e.g. Fryer 2010, Howden 2008, Rudman 2005g): recommendations from Maungawhau’s 1986 Plan such as the removal of cattle were ignored, appearing in much weaker form in its 2007 replacement (Rudman 2006f).

The Historic Places Act 1993 grew from the Historic Places Amendment Act 1975. The latter made it unlawful to modify any archaeological site without permission from the Historic Places Trust. This includes archaeological sites that had not been registered as such, so long as there is ‘reasonable cause to suspect that it is an archaeological site’. This is important as registration is remarkably ad hoc, and Paterson (2009) expressed surprise that Maungakiekie was not included at his time of writing. However, this Act and those following it remained focused on the preservation of information rather the sites themselves (Allen 1998). The Historic Places Act 1993 notably recognised wāhi tapu, defined as ‘a place sacred to Māori in the traditional, spiritual, religious, ritual, or mythological sense’, wāhi tapu areas, and the Māori Heritage Council was established in relation to this. Applications regarding archaeological sites were also to include an assessment of Māori values and statement regarding consultation with Tangata Whenua (Barber 2000b).

The final of these, the Resource Management Act 1991, ambitiously consolidated and superseded around 25 natural resource and planning statues, modifying or repealing more than 150 others (Young 2001, 1). The aim was to replace piecemeal legislation with an overarching principle of sustainable management, with proposals weighed within the Environment Court. Accordingly, elements such as protecting as a ‘matter of national importance’ ‘outstanding natural features and landscapes from inappropriate subdivision, use and development’, as seen in section 6(b) of this Act, can be overruled by activity deemed in the interests of sustainabiility. This occurred in 2002 and 2003 regarding Puketāpapa (Peart 2004), discussed chapter six. This Act is also notable for its move towards greater public participation, including the requirement for local authorities to present plans and strategies for open consultation.

Floating at the centre of the Maungawhau Plan chart are two further non-statutory documents: the Draft Open Space Framework and the Volcanic Landscapes and Features Management Strategy. The latter was formed in 1997, and covered all volcanoes within the Auckland City Council’s purview (Auckland City Council 1997). And yet, like the individual
Fig. 4.6: Destruction and reservation of volcanic cones, 1987-2008
management plans themselves, the attention paid to the management strategy fell short of initial intentions: intended to be reviewed every three years from 1997 but unchanged until the 2010 council merger. Although a thoughtful and nuanced engagement with these volcanoes, its non-statutory status leaves its actual impact unclear. Indeed, despite these significant legislative plans and considerations, as commentators such as Fryer note and as discussed further chapter six, it is often the actions of community and iwi groups that actually prevent damage to the volcanoes and promote the implementation of change.

Conclusions

The volcanoes we engage with now are shaped and constructed by numerous forces, values and accidents; their apparent forms and boundaries not geological but formed by lawyer’s pen and the sometimes conflicting needs of the encroaching, hungry city. Some volcanic summits were granted a measure of protection early on, those cones visually and physically near the emerging town, although others, particularly Rarotonga and Mount Albert -- too near to hungry rail lines - were quarried away regardless. Those that remained continued to be shaped by understandings of allowable destruction, privileging the aesthetic of lone, visible summits at the expense of foothills and distant sites. They remained the focus of public attention and subsequent legislation, and in the 1970s the city came to be shaped around their visual presence through the creation of viewshafts to those whose visual presence was deemed “regionally significant”. This ongoing story is not merely an issue of protection but a process of creation that is ongoing as cities and values develop and change, the weather continues to fall upon their surfaces, other volcanoes may emerge, ‘the hardest rocks become soft and fluid matter on the geological scale of millions of years’ (Deleuze 1994, 2).
5. Not-so-empty signifiers: volcanic experiences, presences and absences

Fig. 5.1: Art installation on Takarunga/Mount Victoria by Robyn Gibson, 2011 (Image used with permission from Urban Arts Village)

I have previously emphasised that the Herald’s representations of the volcanoes often function as articulations of the familiar rather than as mimetic representation. While the prior chapter detailed how these came to be, this chapter offers more intimate accounts of this presence, drawing on autoethnography and landscape phenomenology to do so. The initial section concerns Maungawhau/Mount Eden. It notes features that seem to typify the experience over varied visits, particularly in its ascent. I then highlight the presence of the volcanoes throughout the city, using my regular bus trip as an example, before noting their continued presence through prostheses of imagery and names. In doing this I illustrate how the volcanoes can be understood as both not-city, and experienced in opposition to its urban surroundings, and intrinsically part of the city, drawn upon in the formation of identity.

Part 1: Maungawhau

From the first time I stared, gazing, into its crater, I knew that Mount Eden was special. I came to Auckland at 9 years from a well-to-do "village" across the harbour from Wellington.

42 The politics of naming (Berg and Kearns 1996) and in particular the replacement of many Maori nominalisations with those of European origin is discussed chapter seven. Here, I note my language
An outsider, not Simmel's (1950) perceptive, anthropological stranger, but reluctant and resentful. Auckland was in many ways wrong: too much traffic, so I could no longer ride my bike on the streets; a sky that glowed dirty orange at night, obliterating the stars. I was a romantic child. I missed my friends, but also the bush, the stony beaches and peaceful streets of my former home. The final kilometres of pylon-bordered motorway into the city cemented the difference between new home and old. Our own suburb was at least leafier: Mount Eden, named like the city itself for an admiral who had revived the European founder of the city’s career, Lord Eden of Auckland. Like so many visitors and new migrants (New Zealand Tourism Research Institute 2001) we were treated, in this case by our new neighbours, to an introductory visit up the suburb’s namesake mountain.

The “mountain” itself is hardly a mountain, although at just shy of 200 metres is the highest volcano on the isthmus (Hayward, Murdoch, and Maitland 2011, 129). One can climb from the bottom to the top in 20 minutes if relatively fit, walking by road or weaving around the grassy slopes that, until recently (Adams 2009b), were cropped by cows. And of course, it is volcanic. I knew that it was “dead”, its pastoral slopes somehow a reassurance of this, but had been told there was a crater: the most exciting feature of the trip. Perhaps I was over-eager. My ignorance of the history of the place caused me to mistake the first “kūmara pit” I saw for the promised crater: strange lozenge-shaped indentations in the ground, a metre or so deep and a few metres across, interesting, but hardly astounding. There were a number of such rua kūmara along our path to the summit; Mount Eden’s craters apparently prolific, but disappointingly tame. I remained polite until, continuing the southward climb, the real crater emerged into view.

Walking along that same path, my most usual route to the summit, I often recall that moment of seeing the unexpected crater that first time. It was unlike any landscape I had previously encountered, but perfectly “crater”-shaped enough to be immediately recognisable, bowl-shaped, a Maori name Te Kapua kai a Mataaho, the “food bowl of Mataaho” (Hayward, Murdoch, and Maitland 2011, 129). In that first encounter it seemed vast, the official depth of 50 metres does not convey the impression of swallowing one’s gaze, and it was impossible to resist approaching the edge until I could peer down to its centre. McGreevy (1991) writes that travellers approaching Niagara Falls are often overwhelmed in this way: there are reports of apparent attempted suicides by people who felt no depression but simply compulsion, drawn into the depths. Thankfully, although now discouraged, I could avail
myself of this impulse many times without catastrophe; clambering downwards through the grass, wary of precarious rocks and the occasional thistle (or worse, cow dung), towards the central pile of scoria, jagged and volcanic red. From here the crater walls reach up on all sides. It is sheltered and still, the field of vision narrowed to the rocks in the encircling green, the people around its fishbowl rim, the sky, and the promise of a long climb up again. It is alien and wonderful. I knew from that first sighting that Mount Eden was special. And, it was basically in my back garden.

Over time, Maungawhau became “my” mountain. I say this tentatively, aware that Māori hold a special connection with maunga (mountains), noting their expression in formal mihimihī (greetings) where one’s maunga, awa (river), and whakapapa (genealogy) are recounted (Ngaha 2014). My claim is not meant in the same way. Its implied ownership also sits uneasily with me. I know that there is conflict over the volcanoes, Maungawhau included (e.g. Clark and Milne 2004), that others love them in different ways, that people once lived and loved and died on the mountain and that people work there still, tending to the slopes and knowing it differently to myself. To say Maungawhau is “my” mountain is then not intended as a claim of exclusivity. Still, I felt a sense of ownership, a connection to the mountain that I am fearful of romanticising or dismissing as sentimental privilege. I am hardly alone in this: for example, a New Zealand Tourism Research Institute (NZTRI) study (2001) collected testaments from those who lived near the maunga, often expressing similar sentiments. Evident love concerning Ōhuiarangi/Pigeon Mountain/ and Mount Albert shines through in the pages of local publications such as Fairfield (1992) and Scott (1983 [1961]), conversations held with others, and the monument benches dotting other cones.

Strange, then, that one must turn to the social sciences for a word to describe this feeling, most famously Yi-Fu Tuan’s (1974) “topophilia”, love of place (West-Newman 2008). He argues this as borne of frequent engagement. Over a number of years I certainly engaged frequently with Maungawhau. I could stare at it from my bedroom window, close enough to pick out individual cows and visitors. Particularly as a teenager, I would walk up there often. When I moved out of home I consciously tried to find a flat near the mountain (made further endearing by its closeness to my university), and when I was able to purchase my own little flat with the help of my mother, again, I was pleased that it was near “my” mountain and just around the corner from her. Now I have my own “grown-up” house and can no longer afford to live in the area. Yes, I miss it, even as my feelings have become complicated over the course of academic involvement.
Encountering “nature” through the “wild” cows of Mount Eden

As sensual experiences go, engagement with cattle initially has little to recommend it. They smell acceptable (even the scent of their dung is pleasant enough as animal waste goes, grassy and inoffensive), but their hair is bristly and wiry, and their bodies do not move to bump against you as do those of cats or dogs. More than half of the time you cannot even approach them. You can try hunting them nonchalantly, slowly, targeting one lying down in the hopes that laziness will prove a greater incentive to stay than apprehension does to shy away. Usually they will almost equally nonchalantly decide to examine grazing elsewhere, only really obviously fleeing if pursued. But occasionally - and I never worked out if this was more likely when they were newly brought to the mountain or stationed there for a period and so habituated - they will let you reach them, even feed them. Then you can watch their strange yellowish tongues as they scoop the grass from tentative hand (hold it open for fear they’ll bite, and half the grass blows away), trying not to let them slobber on you. You can try to stroke down their noses, the bristling hair forming a whorl that denies even the possibility of stroking with the grain. Or, you can pat their barely responsive, lumpy bodies; again, in terms of pure tactile experience, decidedly lacking. You are unable to bury your fingers in their hair, and perhaps you wouldn’t want to: I was told that they have ticks, corroborated by a council sign at Mount Māngere warning that dogs may catch these pests from cow-inhabited grass. Regardless, attempting to stroke and feed them was a continual sport and source of excitement for me on Maungawhau when younger and, I admit, even as an adult on other volcanoes. The cows were removed from the mountain permanently in 2009 (Adams 2009b), most obviously because of the damage caused to the mountainside, and I understand that they had to go - a change in perspective brought on through this study. When visiting other maunga such as Mount St John I am quick to notice boggy, churned up sections mashed by heavy bovine hooves. But I miss them, also, most of all for their strangeness. In their own lumpy way, they were emblematic of part of what made Mount Eden special to my urban sensibility: they were wilderness in the city.

I am not alone in my affection. Clark and Milne (2004) specified the cows as a “flash point for tension” between different groups interested in the mountain. Those who lived in the area reported significant affection for them, with over 75% of the local residents surveyed against their removal. The authors attribute this to cattle as ‘a symbol of the rural nature of New Zealand that has long since disappeared from urban areas’ (Clark and Milne 2004, 2, see Curtis 2002). For one like myself unfamiliar with the specificities of the rural, the mechanisms behind the cattle’s presence were invisible: despite visiting the mountain at various times for many years, I never saw a farmer. Rather, the cows would mysteriously
appear and disappear, one day on one of the smaller peaks, the next on slopes far from the main path. There was an unpredictability to them: like true wild animals, they had to be hunted.

There is, of course, very little “wild” about domestic cattle. Shields, discussing mutual definition of city the country, notes that binaries have a time and place: ‘spatial setting inflects the meanings of even the most basic metaphors of the most elementary moral division of good and bad’ (1996, 234). On Maungawhau and other volcanic cones wilderness is relative; grass grown long with wildflowers, the fascination of distinction from one’s own friendlier, domesticated pets. Although scholars such as Franklin (2002) and Clark (2001) underscore that such distinctions rest on dubious ground - highlighting nature as present even in the depths of the city in gardens, proliferating weeds, unanticipated ferality - “nature” and “city” often continue to be conceptually opposed, with this relational “nature” remaining important to inhabitants and planners (Castree 2004). The very concept of nature as restorative and morally superior to humanity is tied to the formation of the modern industrialised city, born in part from a perception of the ills of accelerated and concentrated human activity (e.g. Williams 1980, Soper 1995, Cronon 1996, Macnaghten and Urry 1998). It contrasts earlier accounts of the nonhuman more likely to posit this in terms of menace. Now, as what is meant by “nature” slips and changes depending on context, encompassing “wilderness”, “countryside” and shampoo branding, this opposition to humanity often remains a predominant feature (Castree 2005). Despite their visible Māori and European modifications, there is still “nature” enough in Auckland’s volcanoes to enable semiotic classification if one is so inclined. Reid (2007) underscores the connection between green grass and both “nature” and “recreation”, while the connection between nature and trees, such as those which have progressively colonised the slopes, is well established within Western society (Macnaghten and Urry 2001b).

The limited social science studies relating to the volcanoes underscores this. Vadnal and O’Connor (1994) asked local respondents to place hypothetical monetary value on leaving Rangitoto undeveloped. They emphasise perceived lack of human engagement, “nature” and “greenness” as primary elements of its expressed importance. While the forested island has minimal apparent human influence43 and is frequently tied with active volcanism (see chapter eight), its “naturalness” was posited as representative of the “greenness” of the city and other volcanoes. The list of the valued attributes of One Tree Hill Domain gleaned from a survey of 304 visitors is also replete with synonyms of nature and contrasts with the city:

---

43 An illusion deliberately maintained, including the destruction of many of its harbourside baches (see Kearns and Collins 2006, Yoffe 1994, 2000)
Peace and quiet, rural character, country in city atmosphere, trees, rocks to write names in, nature, ambience, not polluted, fresh air, scenery, friendly people, undeveloped, sheep and cattle, wide open spaces, lack of people, retreat from the city, walking, views from summit, dog walking, clean fresh air, escape, picnicking, jogging facilities, less formal than Cornwall Park, no flower beds (LA4 Landscape Architects and Auckland City council 1997).

NZTRI’s (2001) survey of people living near Maungawhau similarly showed 81% of residents selecting engagement with “scenery and greenspace” as a “very important” activity on the mountain. When invited to use their own language to describe the benefits of living next to it (then summarised), 21% cited “nature/birds/trees”, with a further 16% noting “country in the city” and 36% “greenness”. Almost all categories could be tied to existing concepts of nature, with others including “clean air”, “open space”, “beauty”, “peace and quiet”, and, at 17%, “cows”.

Echoing these respondents, “nature” can also be seen enacted in my frequent meanderings upon the mountain. For me, a key part of these mountain visits was tied to rambling, taking a different path to that the time before or leaving recognisable paths altogether. Such exploration seemed to invite a sense of a special relationship, an intimacy, with the mountain. Michel De Certeau (1984) famously described walking as a kind of appropriation: to move through an area, especially following one’s own path with one’s own movements, is to make it one’s own. In part, this appropriation reflects the sense of ownership and familiarity that I, and the residents who confessed to the NZTRI researchers (2001), felt with regard to our “back yard” (Clark and Milne 2004, 3). Similarly, dogs cheerfully lope off-leash next to their owners on these mountains despite city-wide laws against this outside designated off-leash areas, while one often sees summertime picnics evidently including wine despite the alcohol ban.

The valorisation of walking also has a history. Edensor (2001) describes walking in the Romantic period as a search for locations to utilise the “romantic gaze” (Urry 1992), partake in appropriate contemplation, and search for the “sublime”. These were celebrated in what Solnit (2001, 118) observes as ‘a thousand miles of conventional sentiment’. Discussed further in chapter eight, the Sublime once referred to that which inspired terror and awe, encountering the stupefying otherness of God. Such terror is no longer required: Cronon

---

44 Two conveniently located towards Maungawhau’s base. The entirety of Te Tātua-a-Riukiuta/Three Kings Reserve is also a popular off-leash area.
(1996) notes its religiosity domesticated in the 19th century to that of a parish church, Bell and Lyall (2002) its frequent appropriation for touristic consumption. Even downgraded, though, the sublime remains exempt from daily experience. Michael (2001, 108) explains it as relying on a separation of humans from nature. One does not live within the sublime; one seeks it to experience then return, transformed.

Bell and Lyall note, ‘mountaintops were sites of particular revelation but also precarious places where one’s psychic composure might tumble when faced by the vertiginous grandeur of the view’ (2002, 5, Cosgrove and della Dora 2009a). As mountains go, the “vertiginous grandeur” of Maungawhau may seem trifling; like Mount Royal in Montreal (Debarbieux 1998), another semi-mountainous urban landscape feature, it earns its name through contrast with surrounding landscape. Still, the term seems appropriate at times in describing the potential fierceness encountered on this often green and pleasant volcano. Especially in the evening when the sun threatens to set, the busloads of tourists have left, and the clouds are low and moving; when the wind bites at one’s ears, yes, Maungawhau contains echoes of the overwhelming. The city lights themselves add to this, an increasing insistence stretching into the distance, their own spreading presence making it difficult to see the city only as background. This otherness is not only in the physical mountain itself, but the sky, the wind, the rain (if one is unlucky – there is no real shelter on the summit). One can easily imagine oneself as a Wordsworth, or a Shelley, striding across the Lake District.

Yet Maungawhau’s tricky surface also prevents a simple superimposition of the Lake District or elsewhere. The slopes demand constant attention. Leaving the paths is both enjoyably challenging and precarious, especially when descending the steepened terrace “scarps” (Davidson 2011), grasping at the long grass and half-crouching so that any fall is to sitting on the slope. Effort has recently been put into the summit paths, for a time dressed in scoria chips that seemed designed to scuttle underfoot. Many tracks, especially further from the summit, are simply foot-tracks or “desire lines” made for and by feet. If well-used, such as on the summit loop of Maungarei, these paths can change the surface even as they accommodate themselves to it: footfalls and rainfall wearing through protective grass and deepening established channels, cutting into the side of the mountain to reveal red scoria and sometimes shell middens, remnants of Māori occupation45. These areas are precarious, the friable surface easily disintegrating, best shunned for the grass growing alongside.

45 Without learning about these, however, they can be easily passed over. As my husband noted when I pointed out a patch to him on Mount Albert, many contemporary Western gardeners add shell to delineate paths.
Edensor notes that, for the Romantic walkers, ‘....the idea of following a path was dismissed as unsuitable practice. For Wordsworth and others, those spaces imagined as “untrodden” were conceived as the most sacred and special’ (2001, 91). Maungawhau seemed filled with areas that, if known not to be untrodden, seemed at least literally “off the beaten track”. I note with interest the contrast celebrated above between One Tree Hill Domain and the picturesque flowerbeds of Cornwall Park (LA4 Landscape Architects and Auckland City council 1997). To my surprise, the mountains’ less polished areas have become synonymous with my perception of volcanic cones, granting other cones a familiarity, and invoking the confidence of long-practiced negotiation. The care necessitated underscores the difference between volcano-top and other city greenspace. It recalls Cronon’s elaboration of the “wildness” in everyday objects, ‘...forcing us to acknowledge that they are not of our making” (Cronon 1996, 88), possessing ‘its own reasons for being, quite apart from us’. It stretches the imagination to conceptualise the local authorities creating anything like this of their own accord.

Yet Cronon’s famous essay also highlights the manufacture of “wilderness” areas and perception that overlooks the labour and history behind them: the work that shapes the British “countryside” (Bender 1998) or Australian outback (Strang 1997), the potential subjugation or even forcible exile of previous inhabitants (Cronon 1996). As Wilson notes, ‘an “untrammeled” wilderness’, or indeed imaginings of it, ‘beckons to us with entire panoramas of amnesia’ (Wilson 1992, 205). Maungawhau itself was not forcibly wrested from Māori, and indeed was the very place from which Te Kawau transferred the city’s founding triangle of land (Blair 2002), its angles discretely marked on the contemporary summit-top obelisk in red. The terraces I use as ready-to-hand convenience while meandering were carved and re-carved painstakingly with hand-held ko (see Davidson 2011), the sites of complex lives set within a landscape of appropriation not limited to the few kūmara pits and terracing evident now. The mountain may have its own inhuman

---

46 The illusionary nature of “untrodden” paths, and the reliance on faint desire lines in exploration, was highlighted by my trip to Motukorea. This island is currently ungrazed, with many parts seldom visited, and its woven blanket of introduced kikuyu grass was sometimes thigh-deep when I sunk into it, springy and prone to scratch. Walking through it was a tiring battle that quickly discouraged superfluous exploration.

47 This is not entirely true, however: See discussion of created volcanoes chapter eight.

48 Accounts disagree as to whether this was gifted or sold. This ambiguity is politically loaded: as a gift indicating an ongoing relationship between Ngāti Whātua and the city; as a sale, from a European perspective, requiring no additional reciprocity. This is explained from a Ngāti Whātua perspective in “Lament for the lost” (2010a), part of a Herald special on the history of the city. This also notes an extra 500 acres added without consent during its paperwork, the easternmost boundary shifting outwards from the intended Judges Bay to Hobson Bay.

49 This recognition is made more difficult to the untrained eye given that Maori built their cities of wood, long since disintegrated. It was a shock to me to visit the Auckland War Memorial Museum and
reasons for existing, but the patterns on it that lead my feet through certain paths are shaped by generations of different intentionality, if far removed from my daily wanderings then not entirely incomprehensible or forgotten (see Blair in White 2009). As Patterson (2009) points out, the eroded sections within the paths often carve into constructed terraces, destroying valued creations of the past. My fantasies of exploration and discovery also minimise the continued valuing of these reminders of those who have gone before (Murdoch 1998, 77).

Layton and Ucko note the oppression inherent in the colonial “discovery” and renaming of places. This is evident also in ‘the rereading as wild or barren of a landscape that, to its indigenous inhabitants, is filled with tradition’ (1999, 5). Blair, particularly, wonders about the invisibility of Māori to many in Auckland. He notes that most people raised in Auckland ‘haven’t a clue about the previous thousand years of history’ of the city. The 1.2 million visitors to Maungawhau a year encounter no physical markers to correct or challenge this silence. Such histories were certainly absent from my early experiences of the summit; relegated to the past and eclipsed by fictional wilderness and adventures.

Perhaps more remarkably given the long-standing history of these criticisms, this comparative, semiotic equation of Auckland’s volcanoes with “nature” has been institutionalised during the time covered in this study, enshrined in Environment Court case law and council documents, as discussed below in relation to Change 8 to the ARPS (Auckland Regional Planning Scheme50) and visuality. It was accepted that the previous definition of "naturalness", concerning freedom ‘from the effects of human disturbance and intervention’ did not adequately fit these cones, and new definition was codified:

With regard to the volcanic cones, their naturalness does not equate to a pristine, unmodified or indigenous state, but reflects the general absence of manmade structures and a dominance of natural elements, including the volcanic landform, open space and vegetation, whether exotic or indigenous.

Further elaborations on “nature” were included that focused on the volcanoes’ visual comparison with the city from a distance, as discussed below, and an important driver for this was the Auckland Volcanic Cones Society’s court action and focus on the “landscape” values. Yet this comparative semiosis of “elements” also resonates with my on-the-ground

---

see the reconstruction of kumara storage: hardly recognisable as the familiar “pit” but a cleverly-designed hut engineered to moderate storage temperature.

50 Changed to the ACRPS (Auckland Council Regional Planning Scheme) following the 2010 council merger.
experienced of Maungawhau and elsewhere, an experiential separation and opposition from the realm of humanity with which I am most familiar; Auckland City.

Specificities of the summit

Walking on the mountain forces and facilitates specific modes of engagement, different from the flat (see Wylie 2002). One reaches the summit warmer, slightly out of breath. Recuperating on benches encircling the survey trig, one can observe differences in the bodies of those who have arrived through various means. Those who walk or run aim for the summit and pause, gazing out for a long moment, often breathing at least a little heavily in the process. As Wylie (2002) notes, to reach a pinnacle is an accomplishment. This effect is lessened through accelerated transport. Those who drive often linger in their cars before strolling to the visible points of interest, and those who came by tourist bus often emerged chatting and laughing. They have no reason to give a moment’s pause and be silent, although some do. The work is done for them.

The summit always appears to be the ultimate goal of walking on the cones. Tilley (2004) posits a common\textsuperscript{51} association of height with transcendence, noting struggle, ‘a defiance of gravity’ (Tuan 1974, 28) that characterises ascent. This contrasts the readiness with which a body can descend, intentionally or not. In English, words such as “uplifting”, “celestial”, “elevating”, and “inspiring” underline linguistic ties between spirituality and verticality (Bell and Lyall 2002, 6) while the biblical expression “the high places” is an English rendering of 

\textit{bamot}, ‘a place marked for worship’ in particular ways (Cosgrove and della Dora 2009b, 1). The trope of mountain-climbing, mountain-conquering, is repeatedly played upon. Volcanoes are ascended on “summit day”, 50 years following Sir Edmund Hillary’s “conquering” of Everest (Dye 2003c, a). The achievement of “seven cones in seven hours” recalls the loftier collection of seven continents’ highest peaks in as many months (Moore 2001). The chance to “conquer” (Crean 2011) or “scale” one or more summits is repeatedly celebrated (Hoffart 2007, Wright 2012b, 2011c, Cumming 2002b).

If one were a Western mountain explorer, the summit is where one would place one’s flag. Instead, on almost all of Auckland’s cones, a black and white survey trig is posted. It serves as a clear goal during ascent, a marker of arrival, although also, noted by Blair, a potential symbol of appropriation. Formal paths are built with this in mind, from urban volcanic roads to the foot track ascending Rangitoto. Other structures on the volcanoes’ summit-tops reflect these as both visible and affording distant vision (Wylie 2002): monuments, like the

\textsuperscript{51} But not universal, as Nicholson (1959) and Tuan (2013) demonstrate.
obelisk on Maungakiekie (see chapter seven) or illuminated cross/star on Puketāpapa (Falconer 2010). Memorialised buildings hint at previous use as look-outs, the military buildings on Maungauika and Rangitoto, a signal station crowning Takarunga/Mount Victoria. “Compasses” on Maungawhau and Maungarei, and Mount Victoria’s bronze, birds’-eye sculptures of Devonport and surrounding city, encourage the situation of self within a wider landscape, inviting comparison of the proffered map, including distances to far-off cities and destinations, to visibility all around.

From the summit, the surrounding city is removed, separated by distance and a buffer-zone of green slope. The city and surrounding area become image-like: the connection with a “landscape” painting is clichéd but irresistible. The haze of the city itself adds a dreaminess to the apparent stillness afforded by great distance. Both the concept of the visual “landscape”, and the distanciated “gaze” implied by but not exclusive to it, have been critiqued within the past two decades of scholarly engagement with landscape and place. Their historical specificity is noted, through cultural comparison (Rössler 2009) or the invocation of its dismissal by Wordworth’s “shrewd and sensible” Lake District woman: “Bless me, Folk are always talking about prospects [views]; when I was young there was never such a thing neamed” (cited in Read 1996, 135). The landscape view has been noted as particular, external, and detached: it has historically been the view of an “other”, primarily of the wealthy, contrasted to those who may be working within the gazed-upon area (Cosgrove 1985, Thomas 1993, Milton 1993). This distinction is succinctly represented in Layton and Ucko’s (1999) introductory title: “gazing on the landscape and encountering the environment”.

Eyes feel different gazing outwards, compared to engaging with more immediate concerns. This distanciation is most famously represented by De Certeau’s gaze from the top of the World Trade Centre, his ‘voluptuous pleasure... of looking down on, totalizing the most immoderate of human texts’ (de Certeau 1984, 92). Such totalisation enables one to take in vast stretches of Auckland at a time: in taking visitors up volcanic summits I feel like I am gifting them the city. Other volcanic cones are always there to assist in orientation. As an Aucklander, my gaze upon the landscape is hardly disinterested: I seek out landmarks every visit, identifying roads and visible shopping centres as well as obvious, familiar points of orientation. The sneered-at dominating “gaze” also does not quite encapsulate how distance sucks at my attention. Belgrave illustrates this agentic capturing in an op-ed criticising “hysteria” surrounding Maungakiekie’s euthanised “One Tree” (see chapter seven):
People who climbed the hill did so for the view, not the tree. The tendency here was to give the tree a cursory glance, say "Hey, that's the tree Mike Smith stuffed," and then turn to look out at Auckland, at the depth of the place, the way it sprawled to the horizon. People stood for ages in the wind staring at that view, and that depth (Belgrave 2000).

De Certeau resists the pleasure of this elevated totalisation in favour of the situated and fleeting appropriations of walking alongside numerous other “antidisciplines” of resistance. And yet, he also notes that it is a liberating disengagement: one is ‘lifted out of the city’s grasp’, enjoying a freedom from ‘the rumble of so many differences and... the nervousness of...traffic’ (1984, 92). One acts in different ways on Maungawhau and other volcanoes; except, perhaps, at the busiest summit-tops during tourist hours, people are different. Partly, there is space. Simmel (2002 [1903]) notes the many lives brushing up against each other within the city, the frequency and intensity of stimuli, can lead to a cauterising of emotion. People pass each other, disengaged. There is comparatively little sensory assault on the volcanoes, particularly on the slopes or in quieter off-peak moments. As celebrated in the Maungakiekie survey, “friendly people” tend to greet each other as they pass, an acknowledgement of others sharing the space impossible on an urban street. In a similar way, Macnaghten and Urry (2001) similarly note the conceptual “space” afforded for feelings such as “tranquillity” in the forest, including differences in the way that people interact with others. As on Maungawhau, these different modes of engagement with other people in differentiating the forest from the city and other trappings of modernity:

It is... being close in the open air, and passing through and under the complex intertwinnings of roots, trunks and branches of the mixed woods of "nature" [that can] involve a complex resistance to the "others" of work, study, domestic labour, the city, the modern (2001, 180).

This echoes the established association of “nature” as ‘a refuge from man; a place of healing, a solace, a retreat’ (Williams 1980; see also Wilson 1992, Soper 1995). Yet, I would suggest that on Maungawhau, as perhaps differently in the forest, this difference in emotional affordance is not simply due to the mountain’s greenness and ties to nature, but facilitated by the volcano’s elevation, its mountainous mass itself.

Although the city is visibly present as one stands upon the mountain, then, it is not the same city as encountered upon descent. On the mountain, surrounded by the distant city, there is
literally extra space to exist, explore different ways of being with oneself, with others, land and sky. It is this difference that I feel remains valuable, despite the need to examine its potential for reiterating colonial assumptions; I cannot join De Certeau in abandoning this small opportunity for distinction. Similarly, although conscious of the dangers of attributing “nature” to a very cultural landscape, I also enjoy Maungawhau’s ties to the nonhuman, the potential for encountering numerous Others to daily urban life (even now the cows have gone), the different modes of bodily engagement that it generates. Maungawhau, and the other volcanoes, feel special. I enjoy that here, in the not-city, I can also be different.

Part 2: Volcanic presence through Auckland

I wrote above of an escape from the city; I turn now to living in and moving through it. Part of the meaningfulness of the volcanoes, the import of their use in symbolism and reference, is the presence of the cones within the city. To illustrate this I begin with my regular bus journey from the western central isthmus to Auckland University. I make no claims as to its representativeness, but this offers an indication of the ubiquity of the volcanoes on this isthmus. This experience of landscape afforded by travelling via road-based vehicle differs from that offered by many phenomenologies (e.g. Tilley 1994), although sometimes included (Wylie 2002). Wilson argues, ‘[t]he car imposed a horizontal quality on the landscape as well as architecture. The faster we drive, the flatter the earth looks,’ (1992, 33), a widened perspective appropriate to the scale of the city and coterminous with the expansive field itself. While Thrift argues that driving a car is ‘filled to bursting with embodied cues and gestures which work over many communicative registers’ (2004b, 46), my engagement as a passenger, particularly following a bus’s established route, is primarily as spectator.

Sensual engagement with my immediate surroundings is often deprioritised, even actively rejected - coughing fellow-travellers, assorted body-odours, the mysterious stain on a nearby seat - while visuality attains greater primacy. Distances are traversed: as through vision itself, separated elements are more easily connected with each other, combined into a perceived whole (Cosgrove 1985). Jacobs (2006, 216) compares the car to the cinema, noting how both intensify the visual, ‘a symbiosis of movement and modern technology’ that

---

52 As noted previously, ground-level craters are less visible across distance. Volcanic features, particularly lava flows, similarly shape many of the contours of Auckland (see Warner 2008), but may not always be apparent as volcanic.

53 One may argue that engagement in the bus is therefore atypical of the experience of many Aucklanders. However, even while driving, as noted below, the cones offer navigation points and deliberately present landmarks from arterial connections. Vehicular ascension of narrow, winding summit roads is different, but these seldom go anywhere but up the cones, their potential role as through-fares deliberately curtailed (Huia Lodge 2012). Their ascension is unlikely to be part of daily practice, which is my focus here.
compress time and space, offering particularised experiences that come to background contemporary urban life.\footnote{Jacob’s comparison also hints at parallels between vehicle window and photographic image. What is encountered through the glass at any moment in time, particularly with regard to distant landscape features, can be readily captured by camera. The vehicle window flattens experience of all but the closest surroundings, and any person sitting at my bus seat with normal vision, or indeed, a camera, would be privy to the same afforded landscape. This is \textit{not} a claim for “objectivity” (Pink 2007), and these photographs are selected to tell a particular story.}

I begin just outside the known volcanic field, my house nestled in a hollow carved a tributary of the Whau River. The bus climbs from this to the ridge of a nearby main road. As Verann (2011a) points out, many of Auckland’s major roads are raised, often following elevated pre-European paths across the landscape. The first volcano seen is Ōwairaka/Te Ahi-kā-a-Rakataura/Mount Albert\footnote{Mount Albert is most frequently translated to “Ōwairaka”, “the dwelling place of Wairaka”, and a nearby suburb is named for this.} (Fig. 5.2). From this angle it is covered more plentifully with houses and trees than many of the other cones, the boundary between mountain and the surrounding suburb blurred. “Poor, pathetic, decapitated Albert” (Searle and Davidson 1973, 12); I didn’t know until this study that it this rose an extra 15 metres above its current height, but now often find myself imagining a ghostly extended peak. Mount Albert is the westernmost of Auckland’s volcanoes: passing near to it, one enters volcano territory. The end of the rise the bus travels along offers an impressive view of a landscape populated by volcanoes, with the top of Rangitoto looming behind. The volcanoes have long been used as boundaries and indicators of place, such as initial triangle of land offered by Ngāti Whātua, or the massive “Waiātematā to Manukau block” bordered by Maungakiekie (Stone 2001a, 308). The volcanoes were visually convenient markers that speedily summarised vast tracts of land, likewise acting, and still act, as convenient survey points for the mapping of the city. Mount Albert’s summit reflects this, a survey trig station barely visible amongst the trees.

The bus briefly comes into sight of Puketāpapa/Mount Roskill when turning south from Mount Albert and into a semi-industrial area (Fig. 5.3). Although only fleeting, the grass-green is a striking contrast to the grey of the factory buildings and panel beaters, especially in winter. The very motorway that threatened the volcano’s northern slope has facilitated its
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prominence: its planned path since the 1950s prevented building to its immediate North that would have obscured its lower slopes (2002a). We dip into a valley surrounding Oakley Creek, the waterway flanked by narrow parks of grass and willows that form a swathe of uninterrupted green towards the overlooking Mount Albert, and up to the ridge-top Mount Albert Road. This sandstone crest offers considerable vistas of the isthmus toward the city, especially while paused at nearby bus-stop. To the right between 1950s houses is Big King, lower in stature than other central volcanoes, water-tower topped and covered with foliage (Fig. 5.5). A house-covered remnant of its tuff ring is a little to the North, a cliff-like feature I had always noted when driving past, but never previously knew was volcanic. One Tree Hill/Maungakiekie is more distant, but easily identifiable by its distinctive obelisk. But the largest features in the landscape lie ahead, Sandringham Road disappearing towards Maungawhau (Fig. 5.6) and the ever-present spindle of the Sky Tower.

Maungawhau remains a constant companion for this part of the journey, appearing to move slowly, as distant objects do (Fig. 5.6). Approaching town the wider landscape is only fleetingly apparent through a mess of factories and warehouses, the road climbing through other, older, two and three storey buildings. The encircling arms of the Waitākere ranges seen sometimes to the left, Maungawhau to the right along the steep streets that fall away from the road-crowned ridge (Fig. 5.7). Towards the central city it is Rangitoto that can be seen on occasion through the towers and apartments. One catches a peek of it across Grafton Cemetery while crossing the motorway towards the central part of town, between buildings, framed by the plane trees of Symonds Street as the street descends into the reclaimed land of downtown (Fig. 5.8). What Rangitoto lacks in continued contact it makes up in lurking presence. Massive and dark, it reappears again and again in “brooding splendour” (Mason in Ross 2010, 164), a defining feature of the Waitematā harbour around which Auckland’s central city was built (Fig. 5.9).

Other paths through and near the isthmus frame and encounter volcanoes in different ways, the arterial roads and motorways particularly. Coming from the south, One Tree Hill/Maungakiekie is a beacon, an indication to me at the end of long road trips, as it has been to others (Gower and Orsman 2000), that home is nearby. The Newmarket Viaduct of the Southern Motorway curves in close proximity to Mount Hobson, Mount St John and Maungawhau near town, Mount Hobson’s visual connection exploited by less reverent “vandals” (Hayward, Murdoch, and Maitland 2011, 132), for multiple summers hosting a stylised penis, several stories high, formed with weedkiller. More benignly, it has also served as highly visible public space for temporary guerrilla art (Collins 2011). The alternative SH20, coming from the airport, skirts past Mount Māngere to almost perfectly frame Mount
Roskill in its newly developed extension, the maunga now a feature in what would have diminished its Northern flank. Rangitoto is conspicuous from most directions, its summit higher than the highest observation deck of the Sky Tower, its massive bulk carrying over half of the volcanic material in Auckland’s entire volcanic field. Ever-present when moving along Tamaki Drive, through Beachaven or the older suburbs of the North Shore (an area that, until the erection of the harbour bridge in 1959, was largely built along the Eastern Bays, facing the island (Bloomfield 1973) this forest-clad volcano is a constant and imposing presence; as James Mason notes, from Takapuna beach, “central to vision and imagination” (Mason in Ross 2010, 164).

Given the ubiquity of the visual volcanoes, they are encountered when moving about one’s daily tasks whether they are sought out or not, imposing themselves unasked-for on vision and, potentially, consciousness. They help navigate and conceptualise way-making within the city itself, as Kearns and Collins (2000) briefly note. They contribute to the “imageability” of Auckland, referencing Lynch’s seminal text in which an imageable or “legible” city can be conceptualised as holding an overall pattern (Lynch 1960). Lynch describes such cities as comparatively memorable and possessing of a stronger sense of presence, with “landmarks” significantly contributing to this: elements that are not themselves part of the residents’ journey through the city but instantly recognisable, standing out against city backdrop and used by those familiar with the area for orientation. Notably, they are referred to with pleasure, with Lynch’s participants reporting that they ‘enjoy [the] uniqueness and specialization’ such landmarks embody (1960, 78).

Auckland’s volcanoes function as such landmarks. They possess “figure-background contrast” (Lynch 1960, 79) semiotically through their green, as noted in the ARPS, apparent “naturalness” and rurality, their pre-European terracing similarly a foil to the house-clad mass of the suburbs (Reid 2009). They are also differentiated through their physical elevation, their ability to be seen from a distance and each other. This effect is reinforced by their visual similarity, as can be seen in the work of the recently deceased artist Sir Peter Siddell. His dreamy, detailed paintings contain a number of volcanic features that may be depictions of actual cones but are often abstract: green, terraced domes garnished with houses and trees, immediately recognisable as Auckland cones but no summit in particular. The multivocality of these is seen through children’s interpretations: education staff in the Auckland Art Gallery note that children instantly “recognise” a particular painting differently: ‘Mangere children see the Mangere Mountain and North Shore children see Mt Victoria’ (Bunting 2009). This relative uniformity between cones gives them coherence, tying together and defining the parts of the city in which they reside: areas where these green cones are
present, particularly much of Auckland’s central isthmus, Māngere and Devonport on the North Shore, are defined in the “Super City” council’s Draft Plan as a “volcanic landscape type”, as opposed to the “downland” and “upland” landscape types of surrounding areas, including those once containing equally numerous volcanoes, now quarried away (Auckland Council 2011, 85).

As noted in the previous chapter, their contemporary presence is the result of measures taken in the late 1970s to offer “visual protection” to selected, already-prominent charismatic cones (Auckland Regional Authority Planning Division 1976). These measures are discussed with surprising frequency within the Herald (Rudman 2000e, Cumming 2002b), particularly as this protection was reviewed in 2005 (Beston 2005c, 2005e, Rudman 2005e), and then the results of this review threatened by the unitary plan (Marshall 2012, Rudman 2012). Such articles are overwhelmingly supportive, including an editorial that argues emphatically for the preservation of "Auckland's most unique feature" (2005e). The identifying uniqueness of this visual presence forms the basis of several arguments: ‘a key part of Brand Auckland’ (Rudman 2005e), ‘giv[ing] Auckland its distinctive landscape’ (Marshall 2012) and ‘imposing setting’ (2005e). It is argued that ‘without the protected volcanic viewshafts, Auckland would quickly become just another boring, building-cluttered, cityscape’ (Rudman 2012) as ‘only Auckland is built on, and around, such an extensive array of small cones, craters and lava flows’ (Cumming 2002b). The visibility of this uniqueness is underscored here: ‘After all, if you can't see the maunga, do they even exist?’ (Rudman 2012) These articles articulate identity, and specific protection measures, with the familiarity of experience: ‘Round a bend and there in the distance is another of our volcanic cones’ (Rudman 2005e). Sir Harold Marshall’s op-ed succinctly channels Lynch in noting, ‘The views of the maunga matter to Aucklanders... They define our place, they are way-points on our journeys, they identify our suburbs and are the graphics of our illustrated history’ (Marshall 2012).

**Legal concretions of the volcanic visual**

In the previous chapter I note a move from a focus on the aesthetic to other “values” underlying volcanic preservation. Yet more recently the visual experience of volcanoes has played an increasing role in the shaping of the city. The protection of the volcanoes’ “visual integrity” was enshrined within the ARPS through Change 8, which also involved a limited review of visual protection measures and considerable expansion of written material concerning the volcanoes. This is particularly seen in policy 6.4.19.2, demanding that ‘The physical and visual integrity and values of Regionally Significant Volcanic Features shall be
protected by: (i) avoiding activities that individually or cumulatively: (a) result in significant modification or destruction of the feature; (b) are physically or visually intrusive”56. This interest in visual preservation was also reflected at a local council level with Auckland City’s Plan 192, which increased measures for visual protection within defined areas bordering selected volcanoes.

The foundations for this were laid in the Resource Management Act 1991. Section 6(b) required as “the protection of outstanding natural features and landscapes from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development” as “matter of national importance”. This move was credited by landscape architects as elevating the importance of “landscape” itself (Swaffield 1999, Read 2012). Yet the visual emphasis in Change 8 and Plan 192 could further be attributed to the efforts of the Auckland Volcanic Cones Society (AVCS). This group both explicitly focuses on the “landscape values” of volcanoes and, since their successful prevention of a visually intrusive development as the Mount St John Preservation Society, have actively used the legal system to attempt to counter volcanic damage. Their legal attempts to prevent the incursion of SH20 into Puketāpapa/Mount Roskill/ (discussed chapter six) established the application of 6(b) to the volcanoes. Although unsuccessful in their bid, Puketāpapa was acknowledged as an “outstanding natural feature” (ONF) (2002a), a designation also accepted by the High Court (2003a). Both hearings also included extended consideration of the landscape impacts of both planned motorway and the AVCS's proposed alternative. The Society’s work was further used as the basis for the Transit NZ-funded resculpting of Puketāpapa using AVCS landscape architect Richard Reid. The partial “win”, despite considerable physical impact, was visual. It included aesthetic contouring that allowed the cone ‘a semblance of its old dignity’ by creating ‘a slope down to the motorway approximating that found elsewhere on Auckland's cones’ (Rudman 2003g), and was celebrated for ‘protecting the mountain’s natural shape’ (Dearlaney 2005b, see also Dearlaney 2009b, Rudman 2004b, c, 2009d).

In 2007 the AVCS successfully used the Environment Court to achieve the remodelling of planned developments within the Lunn Avenue quarry, alongside Maungarei, primarily considering the view of the mountain from within “Stonefields”. Their case included reference to the newly drafted Change 8 visual considerations. The Court also noted, referencing Section 6(b), that ‘the values of the unbroken, base to peak, view of the cone of

56 Further text relating to the visual importance of the volcanoes added by Change 8 includes policy 6.4.19.3, objective 6.3.6, and extended discussion of under issue 6.2.6.
Maungarei/Mt Wellington are such that the proposal, or even the two-thirds Council compromise of it is, in our view, *inappropriate* development...'. This ruling was a notable example of the extended prioritisation of the volcano’s visual presence, as well as highlighting the continued role of the AVCS in physically shaping the city. Beyond these legal victories, a landscape focus may further be promoted through the AVCS’s dedicated and prolific lobbying for the volcanoes, such as protesting developments at Ōrākei (Orsman 2008), public talks, and countless written and verbal submissions on legal documents and proposals, including plan 192 and Change 8.

The visuality of the volcanoes that is enhanced here is also tied with understandings of “nature”. The “naturalness” of 6(b) was not intended as a denial of pre-European influence upon the sites. “Natural” here reflects a legal precedent, also relating to section 6(a) concerning the ‘natural character of the coastal environment’, which has tended to underscore it as a *product of* nature as opposed to human construction. This potentially incorporates pasture and exotic fauna, and does not preclude modification (Read 2012, Peart 2004, Maplesden and Boffa Miskell 2000). The resultant acceptable “nature” is distributed across a spectrum from pristine to “built up”, and dependent on context: in the words of one landscape architect, a site need not be untouched but “natural enough for 6(b)” (cited in Read 2012, 40). These understandings were explicitly applied to the volcanoes in debate surrounding “Change 8”, which also included the beginnings of a list of ONLs and ONFs, the latter at the time notably equivalent to the “major urban volcanic cones”. The “naturalness” of the volcanoes was defined as illustrated above, following environment court precedent, while textual changes further underscore the value of the volcanoes’ semiotic contrast with the surrounding city:

They provide islands of naturalness, of open space and of green that interact with an urban landscape... They are outstanding natural features and have a landscape value that arises from their combination of naturalness within an urban environment and their cultural associations.

**Absences of the volcanoes in the experience of Auckland**

This visual presence has a temporarily, however: Auckland’s volcanoes disappear after sundown, becoming shadows against the snaking city lights. The notable exception is when used to showcase human endeavour: an illuminated cross on the summit of Puketāpapa.

---

57 “Protection of historic heritage” was not recognised in section 6 of the RMA until a 2003 amendment. Its prior absence has been noted as potentially excluding from consideration cultural and historical elements that are not linked to perceived natural values (Peart 2004).
around Easter, morphing to a star for Christmas; and the illuminated obelisk atop Maungakiekie. These monuments crown shadowed hills, the few streetlights blending easily into the swarming background of city lights, “Omnipresent Rangitoto” (Sayers 2011) a dark absence on a dark harbour. Increasingly, the volcanoes also disappear as destinations at night, with some night-time activities actively discouraged. Summit roads closed to vehicular traffic from around 11, earlier during firework season, with Maungakiekie most recently gaining gates in 2008 (Arnold 2008). The brief coverage of their installation mentions “vandals” and drinking and leaving bottles on the summits. The volcanoes at night become, in these accounts, places of deviance, the haunt of delinquents and “loutish behaviour” and not places to visit.

This temporality further takes on a gendered aspect, reflecting the pressures women feel to avoid isolated areas, particularly at night. This was underscored to me as a teenager, unexpectedly encountering a man who addressed me with inappropriate comments on one of Maungawhau’s wilder slopes. This left me unscathed but with a lingering sense of “what-if” coloured by awareness of where blame often falls if a female wanders away from the beaten path and others’ surveillance. A trip up Maungawhau around dawn, to watch the community of exercisers there, suggests that this concern is more widespread. One can observe a lone male runner, a group of women, a group of men, a pair of women, a lone man, a group of women: it is unusual to see a woman by herself on the mountain in the dark, save occasionally with a dog. My discomfort regarding Mount Eden was tied to a series of well-publicised rapes that occurred there in the 1990s, but I am not writing this because I feel it is unusual, or specific to Maungawhau. Macnaghten and Urry (2001b), for example, note that women often feel menaced in forests in ways that men do not. I instead include it as a caveat: a limit to the engagement described earlier in this chapter. My fantasy of wandering lonely as a cloud is revealed as an imperfect translation, distinctly gendered (Solnit 2001). Edholm (1993) similarly notes that Baudelaire’s famous flâneur whose views of Paris are often used as a window into a particularly modern way of being, was a specifically gendered possibility denied to the women of the time, themselves objects of the flâneur’s gaze, ‘either housewives or whores’ (Edholm 1993, 157) and unsafe.

---

58 The notable exception is the practice of gazing upon some illuminated marvel, where the mountains become spectatorial sites. Glenday (2011) gives a beautiful account of crowds watching the Rugby World Cup opening fireworks atop Mt Eden; the same can be said of Guy Fawkes, despite a firework ban on the mountains themselves. I similarly sought out Maungawhau’s summit to observe comet McNaught in 2007, finding the sharing of this with dozens of like-minded others formed an unanticipated pleasure.
Similarly, although Thoreau expounds on the pleasure of the moonlit walk - ‘certainly more novel and less profane than day’ (1992, 113) - this is an activity I feel unable to emulate, descending swiftly and via the road if I have remained past when dusk sets in. Thoreau is, regrettably, accurate: at night Maungawhau is wonderful, the air slightly more exciting, the pathways more deserted. Tuan asks, ‘Much has been said about the aesthetic poverty of modern built-up areas as compared with the visual splendours of traditional cities. But how would we judge them at night?’ (1974, 175). A marvel – arterial routes and motorways spun, shining, into a web. The wind is cooler, but also more gentle. I would love to linger here, allowing attention to be drawn away from my surroundings and enfolded into the glowing distance (Wylie 2002), or track the slow appearance of stars on cloudless evenings. Yes, I am resentful that these options are denied to me; a shadow on experience, as the mountain itself becomes a dark absence past sundown.

**Part 3: The volcanoes as prosthetically encountered**

Auckland, then is a city of volcanoes (Searle 1964). Their ubiquity highlights that, to invoke a perspective taken up by a number of landscape scholars (Thomas 2006), many Aucklanders *dwell* amongst the volcanoes. Popularised through Ingold’s (2000) interpretation of Heidegger (1971), this perspective centres on everyday processes. It is marked by a connection to the unremarked-upon, where ‘we practice a profession, we do business, we travel and lodge on the way, now here, now there’ (1971, 147). As noted previously, studies focused on dwelling have tended to look at certain types of landscape, notably prehistoric and small-scale societies and neighbourhoods (Bender 2006, 306), and emphasise the world as encountered through the body. While valuable, such emphasis can tend towards neglect of prosthetic ways of knowing the world. Edward Casey claims ‘there is no knowing or sensing a place except by being in that place’ (1996, 18). Tilly and Bennett also state that ‘we can never escape our own bodies.... I may move around and experience different aspects of a thing but I always experience them through my body in the same way. I cannot alter the manner in which I sensuously experience the world’ (2004, 4). Yet in the same chapter Tilley cites Marshall McLuhan (1964), patron saint of *Wired* magazine and synonymous with the insight that technologies extend and transform the senses. Such an insight is apt for contemporary Auckland. Here, prosthetically sensuous engagement with the environment is routine and unexceptional; to use Thrift’s (2004b, 41) term, part of our “technological unconscious”\(^{59}\). Through the prostheses of word and image, in name and

\(^{59}\) Thrift’s use of this concerns a driver’s control of a motor vehicle, moving in relation to it and the surrounding world without conscious thought about the separation between body and object. I use it here with regard to the role such prosthetic engagement can take in shaping a basic understanding of the world without a sense of distance or separation from knowledge gained through direct bodily
symbol as well as the deliberate attention of newspaper editor or artwork upon a cafe wall, others’ contemplation of the volcanoes becomes part of the everyday social fabric of the city.

The opportunity to boast unique volcanic identity is utilised by a succession of councils (Auckland City Council 1999, Auckland Council 2011, Auckland Regional Council 1999), as the previous Auckland District Plan states ‘Visually and aesthetically, the volcanic [sic] create a strong impact. They are the most powerful icon of Auckland.’ (Auckland City Council 1999, 5C.7.6.4) This can be seen in Auckland City Council’s previous motif, backgrounding newsletters and still found in many bus stops throughout the isthmus, a collage of city indicators including Rangitoto, the obelisk crowning Maungakiekie, and the written statement “53 volcanoes” (see fig. 5.10).

![Fig. 5.10: The Auckland City Council motif on a bus stop (photo by author)](image)

Volcanic cones, and in particular Rangitoto, have featured in logos for the pre-merger cities of Auckland and entities within these (see fig. 5.11), including those for Auckland City and

---

60 The origin of this specific number is unclear, particularly as this was in operation before the 2011 discovery and rediscovery of “new” volcanoes.

contact. As C Wright Mills wrote in 1956, ‘We are so submerged in the pictures created by mass media that we no longer really see them, much less the objects they supposedly represent’ (Mills in Matthewman and Hoey 2006, 538)
North Shore City Councils, Tourism Auckland and the regional rugby union, united by Rangitoto. Political forces as diverse as the Green Party and the mayoral campaign of ex-National MP John Banks have used Rangitoto as a feature of their campaign billboards - an attempt to connect political interests with Auckland in its entirety - while an etching of its silhouette lines the concrete walls of some new sections of motorway (New Zealand Transport Agency 2009, 16). Meanwhile, local newspapers use the mountains as locations to shoot a variety of characters ranging from local sports teams to politicians as well as advertisements for the newspapers themselves: the Central Leader assures readers it is “Really local” by printing images of Maungakiekie’s summit and cows on another cone (Neilsen 2011). Local media also uses the volcanoes as backdrops, and Rangitoto in particular often forms part of simple establishing shots of the city.

Such use of Rangitoto is well-founded. Cox’s *Fountains of Fire*, an introduction to the volcanoes written in association with Auckland Museum, claims that ‘to be in sight of [Rangitoto] could almost be taken as a definition of being in Auckland’ (2000, 1), ‘its familiar profile an integral part of the city itself’ (Cox 2000, 26). As Janet Frame described in *An Angel at my Table*, this volcano is:

‘... the island everyone in Auckland claimed as theirs, speaking of its perfect shape viewed from all directions as if they had helped to design and form it. ‘See, there’s Rangitoto,’ they said... I found endearing this eagerness of Aucklanders to claim Rangitoto (Frame in Ross 2010, 166-7)

So frequently invoked, Rangitoto becomes implied in other images presented to portray the city, whether intended or not. The most recent image to represent the Auckland City Council was a blue triangular motif, an abstract shape modified with added fireworks to signify council “events” and suggested by *Herald* reader to ominously resemble “an erupting Rangitoto Island” (in Samways 2007). In criticising the “Brand Auckland” logo, a coloured “A” dissolving into a dynamic mess of lines, one source opined, “The ‘A’ element - Rangitoto rising out of ‘Auckland’ - seems to me to be more about deconstruction and hairs in the lens cap than heritage and spirit” (Berney in Orsman 2008a), while Orsman himself described the umber logo as “lava-coloured”, an interpretation shared by Rudman (2011b). Sayers (2011) similarly sees magma in the logo’s messy fibres, yet the logo was not explicitly designed to be volcanic: the “lava” colour is celebrated on Brand Auckland’s website as tied to the Pacific spirit of the city, not molten rock, the logo actually available in a variety of colours.
Fig. 5.11: A collection of volcanic icons
Echoing this stubborn association, Rangitoto, and indeed all volcanoes from around the city, are notable in their deliberate absence from the new “Super City” logo: a stylised pōhutukawa flower representing the merging seven districts and cities. The design for the logo was decided via competition. Judge Hamish Keith disparagingly warned about the unoriginality of volcanic iconography - “I know we'll see 10,000 Rangitotos, 24,000 thousand Maungakiekie, 175,000 Sky Towers” - what TVNZ called “very Auckland clichés” (ONENews 2010). Auckland’s volcanic cones as symbols of the city are well-entrenched, then, moving from “iconic” to “clichés” that require deliberate effort to lessen their hold on the city’s imaginary.

**Symbols of the local**

Volcanoes are also used to symbolise locality within the heterogeneous city, Maungawhau features strongly in local iconography and community-building events such as the longstanding annual “Artists in Eden”. Artists work through the morning creating pieces that relate to the overlooking maunga (see fig. 5.12). The artwork to be auctioned off later that day to benefit local art endeavours. Community group Friends of Maungawhau (FOM) holds an annual Maungawhau-appreciation day where the summit road is closed to traffic, tours given, displays shown, and walking on the mountain is encouraged (Tawhiao 2009). Tellingly called “Love Your Mountain Day”, “love” is explicitly urged, but the ownership assumed. The “Mount Eden Village” shops is itself represented by the mountain. Its logo shows two abstracted people holding hands, backed by a simplified silhouette of Maungawhau in green; the same painted contours crowning the two obelisks that herald entrance into the village area. Panmure similarly enthrones a symbol of local Maungarei/Mount Wellington on obelisk marker, and has hosted an annual “king of the mountain” race up the volcano since 1958 (Panmure Business Association 2011). It should be noted that both artist and racing events are sponsored by local business groups. Connection between volcano and locale is commonly celebrated in other fora, illustrated fig. 5.11, and continues to be reinforced through processes such as Penrose High School’s rebranding as “One Tree Hill College” in 2008.
The volcanoes form the very definition of many areas of Auckland. Some are well known, such as Mount Eden, Mount Wellington, Mount Albert, Mount Roskill, and Ōrākei, while others may be less obvious, such as Ōtāhuhu (from “Te Tahuhutanga o Te Waka Tainui”/”the ridgepole of the Tainui canoe” (Hayward, Murdoch, and Maitland 2011, 187), also known as Mount Richmond). Some suburbs are named for volcanoes now obliterated: Manuwera for Matukutūruru/Wiri Mountain, also known as Te Manurewa o Tamapahore (Hayward et al. 2011, 213) and Otara, from Puke o Tara/Te Puke o Taramainuku (Hayward et al. 2011, 180). This tendency has pervaded Auckland’s European history. Many of these suburbs are previous areas of local government that have kept their names. It has continued in more recent designations including Maungakiekie, both an electorate established 1996 and ward of Auckland City after the 1989 amalgamation (One Tree Hill)

61 “Remuera” was similarly described as stemming from Remu-wera, thought to be the Māori name for Mount Hobson and meaning “the burnt hem of a garment”. This maunga is known officially as Ōhinerau/Mount Hobson, while Haywood et al. (2011, 132) also note “Ohinerangi”/”the dwelling place of Hinerangi”.

62 “The drifted-away kite of Tama Pahore” (Wichman 2001, 9). “Manurewa” was further reinterpreted in the 1920s as “flying bird” (Wichman 2001).

63 The history of Auckland’s local authorities is convoluted, the boundaries and designations changing frequently. Bloomfield (1973) provides an excellent summary of this activity until 1971. Many earlier authorities, such as the Mount Eden Borough Council, were also represented by logos incorporating volcanic imagery. Auckland was amalgamated into four “cities” and three districts in 1989, and all cities and districts incorporated into the “super city” in 2010.
Borough Council 1989). It is seen also in Puketāpapa, a local board registered 2010 (Puketapapa Local Board 2010). Protest at the attempted separation of parts of the Mount Eden suburb from the “Maungawhau-Hauraki” ward, including the mountain, highlights the emotional connection to local volcanoes and their associated names. Speaking against the change, Community Board member Chris Dempsey emphasised the ‘strong attachment’ locals feel to the volcano: ‘if you live to the south or southwest, you see it as an anchor point in your landscape’ (McCracken 2009a). Though Adams signifies place-images such as signposted street names as ‘extremely sparse and low in affect’ (Adams 2009a, 2), then, the perceived connection of suburbs, streets and maunga can provoke considerable emotion if its severance is threatened.

Beyond these overt invocations, the volcanoes as signifiers of place creep into understanding in subtle ways. I found this when moving from fertile, rocky Mount Eden to New Windsor, situated on dense grey-beige clay a step down from Craig’s (2005) “thin topsoil” and into the stigmatised (Matthewman 2005) western earth. Trying to take up gardening, I discovered that this clay floods, sticks glue-like to my tools in winter and sets concrete-hard in the sun. A new kitten insisted on returning to her litter tray on finding little soil suited to dig. Each plant I look at seems to demand “free-draining” soil, and my first crop of sunflowers grew a pitiful hip-high. The first year, as I doggedly hacked at rock-like clumps with my trowel, I caught myself imagining explaining to the neighbours how unused to it I was: “I’m from Mount Eden, you see”, social distinctions entangled in its inconveniently concrete properties. The clay defines the less-valued west, invoked by Matthewman’s (2005, 149) description of the area: ‘where soil turns to clay, fields turn to bush and even the beaches are rough’. These social distinctions are in part tied to the soil, the clay-filled regions settled later, harder to work and cultivate than the central areas rich in the fertile soil that the first surveyor-general celebrated about the region (Fairfield 1992, 46)\textsuperscript{64}. At the same time, the equally clay-filled foundations (Searle 1964) of the more desirable North Shore seldom gets a mention. Almost entirely built along the oceanside until the opening of the Harbour Bridge in 1959 (Bloomfield 1973), and thereafter burgeoning in size and real estate prices as the “place to be” of the 1960s (Laurenson 2010, 191), the “Shore” is instead typified as a “seashore paradise” (Laurenson 2010, 191) characterised by its beaches and the off-shore but visible Rangitoto. Social stratification, then, is only successfully planted in some soils, although once there it is difficult to eradicate.

\textsuperscript{64} Coleman (1967) further explains difference in fertility of the soils: a farmer shifting from the volcanic loam of Mangere to the Waitākere clay of West or North Auckland would need twice as much land to make the new farm an equivalent replacement. The fertile earth of Tāmaki is rare: David Simmons (Simmons in White 2009) notes that only 5% of New Zealand’s land holds its “A1” grade.
Contributions to the volcanoes’ use in symbolism

Franklin (2002) terms the linking of nonhuman image with place “naturalisation”, focusing on animals as symbols, from Australian Aboriginal totemism to British heraldry and contemporary iconography. Following Levi-Strauss, he notes animals as “good to think” social differentiation, alike and yet distinguishable. In a similar way, Auckland’s volcanoes are part of a recognisable set, and can be aligned with different spatial groupings within the city. Their distribution seems well-suited to this: as noted in 1928 (Fowlds 1928), scattered among many areas of the emerging city. A later report celebrates the potential for many new areas of Auckland to have their own as a marker of identity, ‘miniature Mt Edens of the outlying districts’ (Golson 1957, 7). The naming of many of the bodies within Auckland illustrates that this convenience has been utilised, although many of those less valued “miniature Mt Edens” symbolising less-valued working-class suburbs (McIntosh 2005), were soon obliterated by quarrying.

Bloch (1998) extends Levi-Straus’s argument by suggesting that appeal of animal totemism, as with the trees that are his focus, is that they make ‘good substitutes for humans’ (Bloch 1998, 40). We share significant characteristics with them, enough to encourage affiliation. Like trees, physical characteristics of the volcanoes, interpreted through our particular knowledges about these, lend themselves to this resonance. As noted previously, and discussed further in chapter six, the volcanoes are easily anthropomorphised. They are discrete points changing with the seasons like “living things” (Franklin 2002, 86), possessing an imagined distinct moment of “birth” and with their own biography and circumstances (well-illustrated in Hayward, Murdoch, and Maitland 2011). As illustrated above, the convex volcanic cones further stand out against the surrounding isthmus, able to be viewed from a distance and from multiple sides. This facilitates shared visual experience: the distanciation so derided in the distant “prospects” allows for communion in perception, the comparative stasis of far-off things that endures through local movement. We are tacitly aware that others around them can partake of the same view, the same interaction, as ourselves (Sayers 2011).

Conveniently, this experience can be captured in an image: an icon or silhouette, a portrait, but “highly stylised to minimise their own subjectivity” (Franklin 2002, 93), or at least their awkward little bumps, trees, buildings and graffiti. Parker (2012, 16) terms this “emollition”

65 The other feature noted by Bloch, interdependence and ties such as ecological links through the food chain, can also be seen in the volcanoes, which have shaped physical Auckland and the lives of people within it, helped feed generations, and are now dependent on human understanding for their continual survival.
with regard to human cultural icons, a softening of inconvenient details in biographies to help them fit a developing image. Many physical volcanic cones themselves are, as noted chapter four, already emolliated, shaped to fit a volcanic ideal as their nearby smaller siblings and rougher foothills were removed. Others can be warped extensively, their distinctive jizz enabling them to remain recognised: the stylised logo of Mount Eden Normal Primary School with the mountain’s terraces, the elongated triangles of the North Shore and Auckland City Councils, still recognisably Rangitoto (see figure 5.11).

Through the use of such “natural” iconography distinctions by and within the city are themselves naturalised (Franklin 2002), offering clear “natural advantage” (Bell and Lyall 2005, 221) over other cities and between suburbs that is not necessarily benign. Seyers’ (2011) examination of the use of landscape in city branding notes the connection between this use of the nonhuman landscape and “optics of imperialism”. She describes this as an act of amnesia, like Cronon (1996) noting that “natural” symbols can be appropriated as symbols of place that bypass the history behind contemporary circumstances. Bell and Lyall similarly regard this focus with suspicion: ‘The claiming of nature as a central identity motif is a means to bypassing grappling with the far more complex culture: the ebbing, flowing, u-turning vagaries of the people component of a good-sized city’ (2005, 221).

While this makes political sense and can be found elsewhere in the world, it is also a practice particularly suited to New Zealand. Bell notes, ‘[w]hile the claiming of kiwis, silver fens of dramatic landscape may seem “natural” to us, years of reception of messages telling us so has formed these beliefs – just as Americans grow up with repetition of their nationalistic messages as daily experience’ (1996, 38). Clark (2004) offers context to this, highlighting the cultural specificity of the concept of “nation” itself. He observes that the traditional justifier of nationhood, a lengthy history with the soil, was absent for the new “settler society” in Aotearoa. This history was further possessed by an existing and inconvenient “native” population. Instead, nationhood was created with reference to the country’s distinctive flora, fauna and the shape of the land itself, both searched for and “revealed” through scientific treatise, poetry and artistry. Franklin (2002) similarly describes “naturalisation” as particularly suited to settler Australia. In a similar way, my description of volcanoes as body-like and distinct resonates particularly with “Western” society and its idealisation both of the individual and of the nuclear family. Although founded on the seemingly-natural and reinforced by the physical, the “us” it resonates with is specific.

**Beyond introductions: the meaningful volcanoes**
That the volcanoes function so well as symbols of place, then, both of city and smaller districts, is attributable both to their physicality and cultural and historical circumstance. My intention within this chapter has been to incorporate this physicality as I introduce the volcanoes, recognising that some encounters may be shared by others, and that subjectivity is inevitable but can be explored, itself tied to wider cultural context.

I use my encounters with Maungawhau as an introduction to a particular kind of engagement with the cones, recognising that each volcano also carries with it its own specificity. I discuss the specificity of elevation, climbing and negotiating the slopes and the summit, and the ways that these experiences contribute to layers of meaning and interpretation. This is particularly so with the dubious concept of “nature”, encountered in routine negotiation as well as when deliberately sought out. Descending from the maunga, I draw attention to the constant physical presence of the cones throughout the city, particularly on the central isthmus. These are safeguarded through bylaws that underscore the visual, and this focus has increased over time. Echoing this pervasiveness, I illustrate the volcanoes’ presence in representation, articulated with city-wide and more local identity: ties can ambush unexpectedly, in the behaviour of a kitten as much as the designing of a logo.

Here, representation is situated in the physical, encountered through daily negotiation of the city. This continued presence, physical and prosthetic, underlies the importance of their meaning: the flipside of what Entrikin (2009) calls the “point of contact” between meaning and object. Keith Basso (1996) gives a culturally specific but powerful example of this through his fieldwork with Apache Indians. Termed “shooting with stories”, a morally significant story is linked in telling both to a place and the misconduct of the person for whom the story is intended. Each time the victim sees this place they are reminded of their misdemeanour, the site now serving to police correct behaviour. While the volcanoes may not be so deliberately tied to individual behaviour, culturally loaded understanding and connotative issues are still invoked when one catches a sight of “None Tree Hill's” obelisk-crowned summit as one drives along the motorway, or yet another image of Rangitoto against the harbour, understood in an instant as intended to convey “Auckland”. Their continual physical presence contributes to this meaning, but it is also a reason why their meanings matter.

It is to a more detailed examination of what is enfolded in the everyday volcanic landscape of this city to which I now turn.
6. Volcanoes under threat: “Saving our volcanoes”

As illustrated in the previous chapter, the uneven and familiar presence of the volcanoes within the city can be deeply affective. The bid for volcanic protection, discussed within this chapter, offers some of the starkest examples of how these relational elements are deliberately used in the articulation of the volcanoes to influence their more-than-cognitive “meaning”.

This is illustrated by discussion of Pukewairiki. This unimposing volcano is part of the Highbrook Business Park in a recently peripheral area of East Auckland, farmland until 2005. It is reached through freshly-laid streets with the recently-transplanted look of new development: small trees, corporate logos, sky, glass and concrete. Down a gravel road overhung by pylons, the low crater is eaten away on two sides by the Tamaki River. One gravel path runs through the reserve, mid-way up its curving slope such that a visitor’s eyes fall inwards, to fenced-off swampland backgrounded by SH1, the nearby Onehunga Power Station, and those pylons. There is no escaping human presence here: the park is a mass of mown grass landscaped with four ruler-straight barriers of harakeke, possibly for effect or to counter the buffeting estuary wind. Although briefly seen from the motorway or the new Highbrook Drive (itself built into Pukewairiki’s western tuff ring) if one knows to look for it, the crater is not immediately obvious as a volcanic feature: Diana Clement’s tour of lesser-known Auckland volcanoes describes it as ‘perhaps the least impressive of the cones we visited that day... the one that needed the most imagination to see where a volcano had once bubbled up’ (Clement 2011b). Its prominence on the semiotic landscape is similarly

—

66 Also called “Pukekiwiriki”, more appropriately applied to Red Hill in Papakura (Hayward, Murdoch, and Maitland 2011, 183), “Waiouru” after the surrounding area and, recently, “Highbrook Park” volcano.
subdued: despite the colonial penchant for redesignating notable landmarks (Carter 1987, Berg and Kearns 1996), Pukewairiki was never given a European name (Hayward, Murdoch, and Maitland 2011, 183).

It is distant, unimpressive, highly modified, and lacking wealthy residential neighbours. It is seemingly an unlikely candidate for repeated mention in New Zealand’s largest newspaper, even less so when the modifications protested are the planting of trees along its rim. These ‘incongruous and discordant cordon of Norfolk Pines’ jar against a crater that ‘looking down... is rather spectacular’ (Rudman 2007e), ‘alien pines’ that will eventually block the views to other landmarks while ‘an unnatural hedge of close planted totara form an outer palisade’ is an ‘abomination’, a ‘travesty of landscaping and of conservation’ (Rudman 2007c). ‘[N]ot only will the fantastic view to other peaks from the crater rim soon be obliterated, so will the special feel and form of this unique ground level volcano’ (Rudman 2007c). These strong words were marshalled for this unassuming site because it is one of Auckland’s volcanoes, part of the columnist’s wider media “campaign” for volcanic preservation (2009a). An early article protesting threat to the “perfectly formed Waiouru explosion crater” (Rudman 2001d, see also Hayward 2001) encompasses the volcanoes as a whole, arguing for unified planning control and political intervention. It advocates support for what ‘not only smacks of common sense, but seems like a vote-winner’: ‘Saving our volcanoes’.

“Saving our volcanoes” was a persistent theme throughout my period of study, echoed in news articles through sources such as Hayward, the AVCS, Friends of Maungawhau (FOM) and sympathetic councillors. It was bolstered by guest articles by the same, and a handful of editorials, but to a great degree attributed to Rudman’s “campaign”. This was prolific: 70 articles about the volcanoes’ protection or management, or with over 150 words concerning this, can be attributed to Rudman over this time. Many more of his columns reference this more briefly67. As Wahl-Jorgensen (2004) notes, columnists’ relative freedom enables them to set the agenda for discussion outside the bounds of their articles, and Rudman also introduced the issue of Puketāpapa to the Herald’s readers. No articles mentioned the motorway’s potential impact upon the volcano until it was highlighted in his columns (Rudman 2000a, e). Large broadsheets have been similarly noted as setting the agenda for wider media coverage (e.g. Benz and Liedmeir 2007, 163): notably, the Roskill conflict was also scantily addressed in the Central Leader (Clarkson 2001), the local newspaper covering the area involved, until its Herald discussion. Other volcanic advocates, notably Hayward,

67 Others still discuss the tree on Maungakiekie (see chapter seven) and volcanic threat (see chapter eight).
Greg Smith from the AVCS, and Glenday and Howden from FOM, have written guest columns/"op-eds" concerning volcanic protection (Howden 2005, Smith 2005, 2010a, b, Hayward 2001, Glenday 2011). Smith and John Street from the AVCS, Howden and Hayward have been further able to contribute to the representation of the volcanoes through their establishment as sources for news and statements relating to the volcanoes (McNair 2000, Manning 2001): Smith is cited in over 20 articles in the period studied, Street and Howden around a dozen each.

Within this chapter I highlight the techniques used within articles arguing for volcanic protection, called “advocate articles” for brevity. These articles continually, and with remarkable consistency, argue for preservation of the entire field of Auckland’s volcanoes. Yet this is not simply done through logical argument, but draws on charismatic cones to infuse less prominent volcanoes with an aura of concern, augmented through visceral anthropomorphism and evocative language. These arguments are therefore explicitly “local”, tied to an idea of readers’ experience, and related to communal identity. While the discourse of “heritage” is drawn upon, this is used as opposed to represented. Authoritative people, documents and classifications are invoked to achieve goals that may be neglected by, or even counter to, those worked towards through official heritage channels. I also note how this body of advocacy is also cumulative. Reference to “victory” of Mount Roskill, the 1915 Act of Parliament, and the AVCS itself operate as touchstones that argue for volcanic protection across the field. These ready-made articulations link all of Auckland’s volcanoes together with local identity, prior vindication, and affective concern.

“Heritage”

These debates take place against a background of “heritage”. This concept is both diffuse and narrow, and appears as such in relation to the volcanoes: an abstract but deeply affective drive towards protection and identity, and a closely-examined system of concepts and practices that intersects with myriad institutions and processes.

Hall and McArthur’s (1996) definition, “that which we want to keep”, carries a simplicity echoed elsewhere, such as Jones and Shaw’s “things worth saving” (2007, 1, see also Lowenthal 1979). Harvey (2008, 20-21, 2001) argues for an inherent ‘human need for heritage, shared by all societies’, although manifesting differently according to the ‘yearnings’ of each. This need not be conceptualised as “heritage”. Olwig (2008), for example, writes of “natural heritage” landscapes and national identity, a topic likely more familiar to New Zealanders as celebrated through media image or protected through
language of “conservation” (e.g. Young 2004, Bell 1996, Bell and Lyall 2002, Clark 2004). “Heritage”, then, may be a top-down designation of something that is already felt or encompassed within other frameworks. Its potential subject matter is wide: objects, landscapes, buildings; practices, languages, and knowledges (Graham and Howard 2008a). Reflecting this, heritage professionals stem from a number of disciplines, including archaeology, geography, history, and those concerned with ecological and geological conservation (Smith 2006).

And yet, “heritage studies” has itself become a discipline, or “interdisciplinary field” (Smith 2006, 2, Graham and Howard 2008b) under which these differences are subsumed by common frameworks. International charters, conventions and organisations of heritage professionals have served to promote international conversation and are influential in many countries, including New Zealand (Smith 2006)68. UNESCO is perhaps the best-known of what Smith refers to as “authorising institutions of heritage”, particularly recognisable for its World Heritage List. Another is ICOMOS (e.g. Walton 2002), an advisor to UNESCO on matters of cultural heritage. A New Zealand branch was established 1987, its 1993 ICOMOS New Zealand Charter incorporated into documents such as the management plans for the Domain, Maungawhau and Maungakiekie, and the Albert Park and

---

68 This is not to argue for international homogeneity. Hall and McArthur (1996) for example, compare the ICOMOS charters of Australia and New Zealand, noting differences particularly in the acceptability of the relocation of structures (since altered in the 2010 New Zealand document). See also Altschul (2010).
Maungawhau/Mount Eden conservation plans. In this narrower context “Heritage” is a discourse in Foucault’s earlier sense, approximating “discipline” (Foucault 1972). It engages with “things worth saving” in an idiosyncratic manner that constitutes them in particular ways. Smith (2006) usefully terms the dominant strands of this the “Authorised Heritage Discourse” (ADH). This is self-referential, reflecting and constituting other heritage practices such as techniques use by heritage managers, archaeologists and curators. Simultaneously, it naturalises certain assumptions about what “heritage” is and should be. Particular characteristics of this have included: privileging of professional evaluations and knowledge; the perception of the past as innately valuable; and physical places and objects particularly valued, especially those on a grand scale and/or possessing “time depth”.

The identification of “values” and “significance” (e.g. Okamura 2010, Mathers, Darvill, and Little 2005) has particularly gained priority within the AHD, particularly following the 1988 Burra Charter (Smith 2006, Clark 2006a, Cameron 2006). Questions as to whose, and which, values are prioritised and have occupied extensive discussion, and are “inevitable” in the management of any site (Clark 2010, 2006a). Almost inevitably, however, priority will be given to professionally determined “values” that operate along established lines (see especially Clark 2006b, 96, English 2007, Holtorf 2010). Professional site assessment may include a number of ranking systems relating to disciplinary or management considerations, such as designation as of “local”, “national”, and “international” significance (Donaghey 2001, see also Altschul 2010, Okamura 2010). Auckland’s volcanoes have similarly been classified and ranked within these systems, such as the early distinction between views of “local” and “regional” importance (Auckland Regional Authority Planning Division 1974, 1976), the New Zealand Geopreservation Inventory (GSNZ 1983-), and the list of Significant Natural Heritage Areas in the ARPS/ACRPS. Conservation and management plans take note of individual heritage values, as does the Volcanic Landscapes and Features Management Strategy (VLFMS). While considerable academic labour is expended in determining methods for validly assessing significance (e.g. Walton 2002, Donaghey 2001), the consequences of these often exceed academic or legal context. These ranks frequently hold moral weight. They may be reflected in public understanding of the importance of place (Walton 2002), a tendency most evident in relation to international systems such those organised by UNESCO. They may also be mobilised in ways that escape the confines of the AHD, as is discussed below in relation to volcanic advocacy.

---

69 Other forms of rank include the registration of historical sites (but not historical areas, or wāhi tapu sites and areas) as category 1 or 2 under the Historic Places Act.
Decisions and policy regarding Auckland’s existing volcanoes are almost always incorporated into official systems under the auspices of the ADH. They are discussed primarily in the ACRPS within the “heritage” chapter. Their importance is similarly presented to the public using the concept and often language of this heritage framework. This is most evidently seen in the ARC’s 2010 booklet/“factsheet” entitled “Auckland’s Volcanic Heritage”, clearly situating the volcanoes’ “heritage” within the AHD:

Together the features of the Auckland Volcanic Field are a valuable heritage resource for the region’s communities, combining geological, archaeological, ecological, recreational and aesthetic values. In recognition of these values, the Auckland Volcanic Field is proposed for inscription with UNESCO as a World Heritage Site. This factsheet provides information on the origin and heritage features of Auckland’s volcanoes (Auckland Regional Council 2010b, 3).

The Auckland Council (and previously, the ARC) have also held an annual “Heritage Festival” since the mid-2000s. It features a range of events – in 2012, over 200 - the majority run by interested groups and individuals. A number of these have related to volcanoes. This includes guided walks with geologists (e.g. of Maungawhau, Maungarei, North Shore Volcanoes, Rangitoto, Three Kings, following Maungakiekie to the Onehunga foreshore, and a 2011 visit to Hayward’s newly discovered volcanoes); Māori historians and storytellers (including Pita Turei on Maungawhau, Māngere education centre at Māngere); conservationists such as FOM; those interested in military defence (notably Maungauika, Maungarei, Auckland Domain) and post-settlement history (Hampton Park, Cornwall Park, tours and open days at Rangitoto’s baches). It has also included open days at the Kelliher Estate on Puketutu, a 2009 lecture on volcanic risk, and a council “volcanic bus tour” the same year, shunning the larger volcanoes in favour of the newly purchased Onehunga grotto, the Domain, and Mount Wellington quarry70. Although often run by people operating outside of the AHD, these diverse events simultaneously present these sites more generally as “heritage”. As Smith (2006, 3) notes,

‘Heritage is a multilayered performance – be this a performance of visiting, managing, interpretation or conservation.... Simultaneously the heritage performance will also constitute and validate the very idea of “heritage” that frames and defines these performances in the first place.’

The overarching narrative or metadata (Van Dijk 1998) of the festival is “Auckland’s heritage” itself, offered as the opportunity to discover what was already inherently “ours”.

Yet, as noted a number of times within the Herald, the semiotic impression given by many volcanoes does not always correlate with such affirmations of value. While semiotic interpretation is dependent upon knowledge and inclination (Meinig 1979), common themes emerge within many criticisms. A DoC publication regarding archaeological sites, regarded as ‘a “best practice” manual in a New Zealand context’ (Paterson 2009, 147), cautions that ‘an obviously damaged site will suggest to the public that the site and others like it are unimportant’ (Jones 2007, 25). Jones highlights the importance of evident ‘care and concern’ for sites, including attention to deterioration and vandalism. Reflecting this, drawing parallels between the cone and 2009 Mount Albert by-election, the target of their satire, Milne and Rushworth (2009) argue ‘It’s not a mountain at all. The views are good, but there are no tourist buses on the puny 134m summit, no monuments, not even a proper carpark. Lichen-spotted signs explain the area’s history, if you can read the words through the water and weather damage’. What I had previously read on Maungawhau as an openness to appropriation, others read as dereliction. This is particularly so when then-mayor Dick Hubbard launched “project Maungawhau”, an endeavour promptly cancelled by his successor (Orsman 2007b). In a guest article, Hubbard chides, ‘the mountain is tired and tatty… The crater rim is a disgrace. It does not give a good first impression of Auckland, or New Zealand - and there is no sense of Māori heritage. The summit is not an edifying site. It is dirty, the trig station is tired and the notice board is rotting and illegible’ (Hubbard 2005). This assessment is supported by du Chateau (2005), describing it seeming ‘unloved, uncared for, tatty’, and a subsequent editorial, ‘like an afterthought. The neglect is palpable. Welcome to Auckland, indeed’ (2005a).

---

71 As an example, an ecologist I spoke to during a Heritage Festival geological tour of Maungawhau commented that the scraggly newly-planted natives on the mountain’s reservoir would likely appear as weeds to the majority of visitors. Indeed, the unfamiliar poroporo had seemed as such to me.
Differing semiotic “heritage” across Auckland’s volcanoes

More recently, over recent years, the fabric of Maungawhau has been strikingly transformed into a signifier of “heritage”, implicitly through continual work, and explicitly through signage. The removal of cattle in 2009 let the grass grow shaggy, and so tracks extending from the summit to other points of interest were starkly emphasised through targeted trimming of surrounding grass. The main path around the crater was resurfaced with fresh gravel chips, while the road carried a newly painted pedestrian/cycle area replacing a now-redundant cattle-stop. Structures and associated signs were placed at the entry gate of the summit loop to prevent the entrance of large busses, banned from the end of 2011. A midwinter trip to the summit in 2012 saw freshly bared soil indicating a trial of native grasses, a search for alternatives to the matted exotic Kikuyu that smothers most volcanoes, dangerously flammable when ungrazed. Some volcanoes, including Maungawhau, had previous trials in less visited areas, fenced-off rectangles of wilder grass marked out with temporary signs as “protecting our volcanic heritage”. Machinery was seen working on the hill near the crater during a Heritage Festival tour October 2012. In early 2013 these areas were partitioned with rope guides, while temporary signs discouraged movement in certain areas. Like the grass trial signs, these simultaneously asserted the heritage value of the mountain and were a
situated embodiment of “heritage”s subtractive potential (see figure 3). Most notably, from December 2011 Tāmaki Hīkoi members stood upon the summit during the days, greeting people with a smile and answering questions, a literal Māori presence on the city’s most-visited maunga (Hueber 2012).

Yet concern remains markedly uneven. Auckland’s volcanoes, and even volcanic cones, showed enormous differences in evident “care and concern” (Jones 2007) during my visits, mostly during 2012. On-site interpretation varied considerably, from well-maintained signs lining Maungakiekie’s coast-to-coast walk and summit road, to faded remnants on Ōhinerau, several, particularly smaller cones, with none at all. Many appear standard recreational spaces, their volcanic history hidden: the quarried remnants of cones, like Little Rangitoto and Mount Cambria, or explosion craters and reclaimed lagoons, now sportsfields. The few sites managed or co-managed by DoC are more deliberately presented. Maungauika/North Head hosts two video rooms in repurposed army buildings, numerous interpretative boards, plaques, and signposted walks, the mountain’s contemporary use as a DoC station shown through cutouts of friendly DoC staff amidst other information about the mountain’s history, with interpretative and restoration work also performed by the Auckland Coastal Defences Historical Trust. These additions are recent, and articles towards the beginning of my study debate the future of this cone and its historical restoration (e.g. Rudman 2001c, Deans and Yoffe 2001, Beston 2002, 2004b). Paths to Rangitoto’s summit and the areas around the docks well-defined with numerous information boards, and Mount Māngere had several information boards and occasional small bronze sculptures dotting the shaggy grass, part of a “landmarker” walk.

Māngere Education Centre is nearby, run by the Mountain Education Trust with support from Te Wai-o-Hua, DoC and Auckland Council, one of only two staffed education centres dedicated to specific volcanoes\(^2\), although open only weekday business hours, and its building is removed from the main park (Visitor Solutions 2006). I wondered how many casual visitors would realise its presence. The other, at Cornwall Park, is managed by the Cornwall Park Trust Board, who were established and funded through Campbell’s donation (One Tree Hill Borough Council 1989). Its staffed education centre includes a multimedia room and projected video, publishes several brochures and guided walks, established numerous other information points, and runs events relating to the reserve throughout the year. Other work has been performed by community groups: Friends of Maungawhau have extensively rehabilitated “Batger Quarry” and planted natives on the lower slopes, although

\(^2\) A centre for Otuataua is in planning as I write this.
away from the main path to the summit, as is the stone pou marking the path to obliterated Te Pou Hawaiki (Falconer 2012, Fryer 2009), erected by iwi with ancestral connections to these maunga. A bronze plaque donated by the Panmure Historical Association in 2005 briefly introduces Panmure Basin’s volcanic origins, history, and Māori traditions near one of its major entrances, while the summit compass atop Maungarei was also a donation. Tuff Crater was the most remarkably attended of all explosion craters, including recently mulched natives plantings, freshly gravelled paths and wooden boardwalks, with a notice board describing the area and intended future modification. These are organised by the Forest and Bird association, who target the crater for ecological restoration (Clement 2012, Forest and Bird 2014).

While media sources can at a sweep declare all volcanic features important, then, the practice reflecting this is often more uneven. As councillor Peter Haynes notes, removal of cattle from Maungawhau was an acknowledgement of the damage they cause to features by no means unique to that cone. Yet ‘four years after that, it hasn’t been used as a template’ (Whittaker 2013), and cattle still graze several other cones. Reflecting this inconsistency, activists interested in the volcanoes have long advocated unified management (Rudman 2001d). This has included a dedicated ranger service (Glenday 2011) and/or collective protection and management through World Heritage or National Reserve Status (2005b). Rudman’s criticism of the “ad hoc” nature of their management (Rudman 2007c) is likewise shared by Tāmaki Collective chairman Paul Majurey (Tahana 2011b).

Rudman and other advocates further make a sharp distinction between their own efforts and the fruits of authorised heritage practices. John Street from the AVCS states this emphatically:

"Two years ago one of the justifications for putting up the rates was for the council to establish a volcanic cones department, which they have done. But from our point of view they don’t do a bloody thing. All the protection is what we have to fight and battle for” (Street in Orsman 2007c).

Rudman’s writing makes this distinction repeatedly and pointedly, including reflexive awareness of the fourth estate role of media (Phlean, Rupar, and Hirst 2012) in holding the former to account (Rudman 2004b). The events within my period of study offer some justification for this: the very presence of the continued work done by the AVCS illustrates the continued necessity of the Society’s actions, from the point of view of achieving their goals for volcanic preservation as a bottom line. The influence of their work in the
Environment and High Courts show a measure of official recognition of their efforts, including regarding the Mount Wellington Stonefields, where Auckland Council's official position changed from opposition to matching their own. As illustrated below, the continued argument for volcanic advocacy within the Herald has played an important role within these successes. The frequent argument for volcanic preservation, then, is not simply one of the most common articulations of the volcanoes within the Herald, but has successfully contributed to the physical shaping of the city itself.

**Puketāpapa and the 1915 Act**

The Mount Roskill “battle” was fought over the fruition of 40+year old plan to extend SH20 towards the Northwestern Motorway, its modern incarnation requiring a 10-metre retaining wall to be cut through the northern slopes of Puketāpapa. The struggle was spearheaded by the newly-formed Auckland Volcanic Cones Society (AVCS), who as the Mount St John Preservation Society had successfully worked to stop development toward the summit of Mount St John (Rudman 2000e). The process was drawn out. The plan first passed through regional council processes before being taken to the Environmental Court (2002a), then the High Court on appeal (2003a). Each ruling favoured Transit New Zealand’s original plan, although an alternative onramp design posited by the AVCS was considered in some detail (2002a). Soon afterwards, however, the 1915 Reserves and Other Lands Disposal Act was brought to public attention. A redesign of the interchange soon followed. Transit employed an AVCS-chosen architect to design the landscaping of the new plan in conjunction with Ngāti Whātua o Ōrākei (Reid 2009, 2011). A later intention to make the Waikaraka cycleway running alongside SH20 cut into the mountain attracted further
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73 Reid (2009, 2011) puts this trench and retaining wall at 11 metres, while the more conservative 10 metres is presented by the Environment Court. Despite this smaller figure, the Court emphasises the significance of this in relation to the small mountain. The top of the intended cut would reach a mere 40 metres below the volcano’s summit.

74 Significantly, the Society’s involvement came at the suggestion of a member of the Auckland Regional Council (Smith 2013), even though the plan was approved by the same council processes. This underscores the recognised importance of extra-institutional pressure in protecting even recognised “heritage” sites. This is particularly so as the Society’s work regarding Mount St John had demonstrated a willingness to take legal action, although in this initial case matters were resolved just prior to court activity.

It is evident that significant financial and cultural resources underlie this willingness, as well as the Society’s subsequent recourse to professional services. An appeal to nearby residents for funds to fight the Mount St John development produced almost $30,000 in donations. Smith ruefully noted a similar appeal for Mount Roskill – as Rudman notes, a “working class volcano” (Rudman 2001a, Crampton, Salmond, and Kirkpatrick 2004) - gained a little under $500 (Smith 2013). The Society was successfully able to apply for Environmental Legal Aid Funding to cover barrister and witness fees, which in the case of Mount Roskill included a landscape architect and a traffic engineer (Smith 2005). Members of the society nonetheless devoted considerable unpaid labour to the cases, and others following it. They currently keep a fund for legal proceedings, and professionals occasionally provide assistance pro-bono (Smith 2013).
significant criticism (e.g. Rudman 2003d, 2004b, a, 2005i). This, too, was subsequently redesigned by Reid (Reid 2014, Dearlaney 2009b).

Despite its technical failure, this legal action was of significant importance to both Puketāpapa, and Auckland’s volcanoes more generally. This early legal “battle” provided a local conflict narrative that garnered significant media attention including news articles (Aronson 2002a, Young 2003, Aronson 2002b, 2003d, 2003c), an unsympathetic editorial (2002b)75 and later article by Smith (2005), as well as Rudman’s persistent coverage. The campaign became “news”. Additionally, as noted in the previous chapter, the Court accepted Puketāpapa as an “outstanding natural feature” (ONF) under section 6 of the Resource Management Act (RMA) 1991 (Peart 2004). This categorisation was reinforced in later legal action regarding Maungarei/Mount Wellington (2007), and was cemented within the Auckland Regional Council Planning Scheme the same year through Change 8. At the time of Change 8, only selected volcanic cones were identified as ONFs within the Scheme, a budgetary decision that is likely to rest on their prior legal recognition. In addition, Judge Treadwell praised Auckland’s volcanic system as “unique in the world”, an acknowledgement mobilised in subsequent argument (see below).

Regardless, this positive acknowledgement was unfavourably weighed against the need for this long-planned motorway extension; similarly, shifting the motorway further north was deemed to go against the principles of the RMA through its negative impact on businesses, schools and residents (Green and Hinchey 2003). The “rediscovery” of the 1915 Act introduced a different, starker rationale. Unlike the RMA’s weight of cost against benefit, this early legislation categorically forbids excavation of volcanoes without leaving a minimal slope of forty degrees from the top. This requirement was not met by the planned interchange. Peart notes the comparative impact of this Act ‘illustrates the weakness of highly discretionary legal provisions and the strength of clear directory provisions when dealing with protection issues’ (2004, 17). Indeed, had the 1915 Act not been “forgotten” it would have been repealed by the 1991 legislation, alongside over 150 others (Young 2001).

However, the efficacy of this Act was facilitated and underscored by its intense media coverage (see especially Rudman 2003c, f, h, j, Orsman 2003a). This, rather than the legal status of the legislation itself, likely contributed to Transit’s willingness to modify their plan. As Judge Thompson noted regarding Maungarei, the Act and its processes of enforcement remain a legal “enigma” (2008a). Rudman reports that at least one Council planner was

75 This nonetheless characterised the AVCS as having “a responsible approach”.
aware of the Act before its mediated revelation (Rudman 2003h) and it appears as an appendix to the 1999 district plan. This suggests that it may have been known about by some involved, but disregarded. Similarly, the Act was dismissed by Auckland City Council a number of times after its public reappearance, such in the plans for the Waikaraka cycleway on Mount Roskill itself (Rudman 2003d) and consent approval for building on Mount St John. Its validity was further explicit declaimed in a letter by one councillor to the Three Kings United spokesperson (Rudman 2006c, d, e, 2007b).

Tellingly, Smith from the AVCS stated ‘Brian's column on this subject has been totally significant to this result. We could not have done it without his assistance’ (Dye 2003b). Contrasting official ambivalence, Rudman’s coverage of the newly discovered Act was persistent and remarkably detailed. Several articles were dedicated to explaining its contents, intent and potential relevance (Rudman 2003c, h), explicitly addressing Transit’s potential legal objections to its application (Rudman 2003j). As noted below, it continued to be discussed and referenced throughout the period studied. The above reporting, and ridiculing, of council disregard for the Act highlights a continued commitment to maintaining its prominence and currency. With its status as an “enigma”, an unusual piece of legislation potentially discounted for age and ambiguity, repeated media coverage has helped ensure the Act continues to be used to exert influence upon the volcanoes. Meanwhile, the media “campaign” surrounding the Mount Roskill case embodied a number of rhetorical strategies that continued to be used in advocate articles surrounding the volcanoes to underscore the preservation of Auckland’s volcanoes.

**Harnessing the reflected glow of charisma**

Rudman’s Mount Roskill/SH20 campaign opened with a comparison: the council’s attention to the gradual damage by cattle on Maungawhau/Mount Eden, contrasted against their willingness to allow a highway to be “bulldozed” through the foothills of Puketāpapa (Rudman 2001f). The argument in these comparisons, to be repeated many times in by those working for the volcanoes’ preservation, was that Auckland’s volcanoes inherently deserve protection by virtue of being Auckland’s volcanoes. This discursive equivalence creates, and maintains, a unified category of otherwise disparate places. A number of articles explicitly concern “Auckland’s volcanoes”, flitting between sites or invoking the damage of some as “examples” (Rudman 2007c, Hayward 2001, Rudman 2001d), allowing volcanoes and events that are otherwise unlikely to gain media attention, such as Pukewairiki, to be bought to readers’ attention.
Media attention to Maungawhau illustrates the disparity of normal coverage. As Avraham (2000) notes, if distant sites are reduced to a single issue or stereotype, the richness of the familiar is more likely presented in multidimensional detail. While many other volcanoes are mentioned because of immediate physical danger, the management of Maungawhau is detailed throughout Herald coverage; a disparity in the threshold of attention played upon in Rudman's writing and elsewhere (Street in Rudman 2005i). These issues are highlighted through "project Maungawhau" and the creation of a new Management Plan for the mountain. Its initial consultation in 2005 prompting considerable coverage (Cumming 2005a, b, 2005f, see also Rudman 2005g). Attention was extended with Hubbard's promotion of his project (Hubbard 2005), the stages of the Plan (Rudman 2006f), its projected increasing cost (Rudman 2007d, Orsman 2007d) and ultimate rejection.

As stated explicitly by Auckland Council's acting regional and specialist parks manager (Whittaker 2012, see also Cumming 2005a, 2005a), much recent extra council attention is tied to Maungawhau's role as a tourist attraction (New Zealand Tourism Research Institute 2005, Clark and Milne 2004, New Zealand Tourism Research Institute 2001). This frequent visitation mobilised significant action around the 2011 Rugby World Cup (Dearlaney 2011c, Rudman 2011e). The damage and unpleasantness caused by tourist busses was further a repeatedly discussed issue unique to the mountain until their ban in 2011 (2005c, Dearlaney 2011a, Cumming 2005b, Dye 2005, du Chateau 2005, Cumming 2005a, 2005f, Rudman 2011e, g, f, 2011b). Yet Maungawhau’s role as a tourist site is itself is a compounding of the mountain’s early ecological and aesthetic charisma. Attention to the mountain was shaped by its role as a popular destination for early Aucklanders and visitors to the city, being both fascinatingly volcanic (see chapter eight) and accessible to the emerging town. The completion of the summit road, for example, was spurred by the visit of Prince Alfred in 1869 (Auckland City Council 2007). The mountain’s proximity to the city centre, and the road itself, remained significant drawcards for contemporary tourist operations. Both facilitated the mountain’s inclusion into tightly orchestrated schedules (Visitor Solutions 2006).

Some writers harness the newsworthiness of various issues on Maungawhau to highlight other sites within Auckland (Fryer 2010). Cumming, for example, explains damage to archaeological sites and weed infestation before noting, ‘they seem like the preoccupations of locals with little else to worry about, until you realise there are mini-Mt Edens smouldering away all over Auckland’ (Cumming 2005a). Yet even here, issues such as vegetation may

76 A courtesy rewarded with the spectacle of the Prince’s elephant hauling large stones up the road to the summit.
be discussed in remarkable detail on Maungawhau (English 2001b, Adams 2009b, Tahana 2009b), but only mentioned elsewhere through broad association, “other volcanoes” to Maungawhau’s named specificity. They may also be entirely absent, as was the removal of cattle on Puketāpapa (Reid 2014). Comparison of other volcanoes with the site has therefore become a way to articulate this familiar and favoured volcano with the field as a whole (see especially Rudman 2001f, 2007f, 2006f). “Obsession” (Rudman 2007g) with the mountain is compared to neglect elsewhere (Rudman 2007f, 2006f, Street in Rudman 2005a), while articles ostensibly about the topical volcano can be used to draw attention to other cones (Rudman 2007d, see also Rudman 2007f).

These comparisons may seem logical arguments for consistency. They are also reminiscent of using “flagship species” to generate interest in other species or causes, acting as “catalysts” for concern (Lorimer 2007) and fostering sympathy and revenue. Like well-known volcanoes, flagship species are distinguished by their popular appeal, with “nonhuman charisma” an attempted typology of what makes some species subject to this, and not others. This charisma, and its mobilisation, are explicitly affective: the articulation with the “iconic”, as with flagship species, endeavouring to cast a glow of protective concern over that which does not habitually enjoy this. The same may be noted with the volcanoes as elsewhere, equation with a more familiar volcano justifies the preservation of others. Hayward presents Puketutu as the “Brown’s Island of the Manukau” (Thompson 2007), while to Rudman it was “the Rangitoto of Manukau Harbour” until its quarrying (Rudman 2005h). A composting plant on the island is dismissed, ‘I can't imagine [Living Earth] proposing such an industrial plant on One Tree Hill, so why one on its Manukau Harbour sister volcano?’ (2005f). The plans at Mount Roskill similarly prompt comparison with the ‘outcry if the road builders had come up with a plan to slice the side off Mt Eden or One Tree Hill or North Head…’ (Rudman 2002b, see also Rudman 2007i, 2004d). These sites are familiar, but this is also an emotional ploy: it is no coincidence that these volcanoes are listed as the “favourite” Auckland cones in an AC Neilsen poll of 2400 Herald readers (2004a).

Other elements of “nonhuman charisma” can be seen in attempts to infuse arguments for volcanic preservation with affective potency. In chapter one I tied “aesthetic charisma” to the longstanding anthropomorphism of volcanic cones, drawing on the affective appeal of apparent personhood (Milton 2002), and also augmented or selectively invoked through articulation between cones and human body. This is repeatedly apparent in Rudman’s writing, occurring in the context of a wider, emotive repertoire of linguistic violence. With regard to Puketāpapa, for example, the menacing metonymic “bulldozers” (Rudman 2001d, a) threaten to “plough through” (Rudman 2001d, a) “slice up” (Rudman 2003k) or “hack
away” (Rudman 2003b) at the volcano, while those pushing for the plan are “despoilers” and “vandals” (Rudman 2002d). The impending damage is likened to catastrophic nuclear destruction with ‘closer to midnight on the volcano doomsday clock’ (Rudman 2001e). The anthropomorphistic language is similarly visceral: “butchery”, “amputation” (Rudman 2001a) and “rape” (Rudman 2002d, 2003c). Judge Treadwell’s favouring of Transit the signing of a “death warrant” (Rudman 2003b, see also Rudman 2002b), the vertical retaining wall “disfiguring”, a “scar” (Rudman 2004b, c). A further proposed cycleway invokes the latent anthropomorphism of mountains within the English language77 to equate damage to the volcano with the very seat of human empathy (Lorimer 2007, 919): a “slash across the face”/“gash across its northern face to try to disguise” (Rudman 2005i). Threats to other volcanoes are expressed in similar evocative terms. “Scar” or its variants are used 15 times in the articles studied, including quotes from advocates. “Rape” is used ten times, accompanied by the stark ‘as long as the developer ravishes the poor victim rather less brutally than the rapist before, we'll give you a green light - and if you clean up nicely afterwards, we'll give you a pat on the back’ (Rudman 2008a).

The equivalence used in this anthropomorphism is intended to ‘change what people in Western culture ordinarily classify as non-human and without self-evident rights into moral objects of sympathy and concern’ (Einarsson 1993, 78). Similar techniques have been used to elicit sympathy for landscape (e.g. Read 1996, 128). In drawing connections between volcanoes and human bodies it also exploit the reader’s own embodied, affective responses to imagined bodily damage: the associated visceral horror evoked by “amputation scar” (Rudman 2001a), attempts to disguise a “gash” across a face. If such an equivalence is accepted, the familiar physicality of the volcanic cones themselves underscore this. The frequently-noted discomfort at seeing the “scars” of quarrying, or the harsh cut of a 10m motorway wall, act as reminders of the permanent damage subjected on these body-like entities. They are alien cuts on an apparent natural form.

**Invoking “heritage”**

Lorimer’s final category, “corporeal charisma”, can be related to the glow and prestige of “heritage” itself. This need not be dependent on official classification. Rather, the emotionality of this word, its promiscuity and pervasive currency, indicate that it continues to carry weight regardless of the specificities of a site as recognised through the AHD (Holtorf 2010). As Kirby notes, ‘not only does it carry weighty associations with the past, it is heavy with ideological significance in the present’ (1996, 232).
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77 Also seen in “foothills, “apron”, “skirt” and “toes”.
Volcanoes are pointedly referred to as “heritage sites” (Rudman 2009d, 2005h, 2004a, 2001a, 2011e, Cheng 2006, Dearlaney 2005c) as an implicit argument for or against action. Such categorisation can be used to condemn behaviour, such Cavanagh’s “If you are building a road, you don’t drive it through a heritage site” (2003b). Invocation of the category may differentiate the sites from other readings and their associated activity, as in Howden’s “The mountain is not a farm, it's a heritage site” (Adams 2009b, see also Davison 2010). Rudman similarly contrasts the volcanoes with regular recreation space: ‘It never ceases to amaze me that the council treats Maungawhau as just another park “(Rudman 2005g).

Explicit kinds of heritage may be referenced on occasion, similar to the identification of values within the ADH: “Māori heritage” (Smith 2010a), “natural” (Tapaleao 2010) or “geological” (Rudman 2007c)78. More frequently, however, “heritage” stands by itself as a more abstract designation, carrying the weight of the AHD without its specific claims.

Advocates may further attempt to invoke affective responses similar to places of established heritage value, articulating local sites with monuments that more neatly fit the AHD. Rudman describes Mount Roskill as ‘Auckland’s equivalent of a London Wren church... the crypt of St Paul's’ (Rudman 2004a), while Dave Beamish explains the ancient battle sites as “as sacred to Māori as Gallipoli was to the Anzacs or Culloden to the Scottish’ (Orsman 2011b). The volcanoes are compared to medieval castles (Smith in 2005b), Maungawhau is likened Stonehenge on a number of occasions (Blair in Cumming 2005a, Bulmer in English 2001b, Howden 2005). These equivalences are also distinctions, opposing the volcanoes to their present or threatened situation: Blair (see 2005b) against the cones’ generic treatment as council reserves, Rudman against damage to Puketāpapa, Howden against cars on Maungawhau’s summit. Bulmer’s comparison with Stonehenge turns into a caution, noting the public’s exclusion from the Sainsbury structure (English 2001b). All can be read as active counters to taking the volcanoes for granted.

With a few notable exceptions (see below) “authorised” heritage evaluations are not presented in an educative context, informing the public of a site’s importance. Rather, the classifications and agents of the AHD are critically used in argument. This is frequently to highlight internal inconsistencies, between officials or between authorities and their actions. The Volcanic Landscapes and Features Management Strategy is quoted and summarised to
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78 All are performative: "natural heritage" used by right-wing politician John Banks, “geological heritage” in the midst of conflict over Treaty Settlements and World Heritage Status, and “Māori Heritage” aligns the newly signed Tāmaki Collective ownership of the volcanoes with a future World Heritage Status bid.
protest proposed development at Ōrākei basin (Rudman 2004d, 2008c), for example, as is the district plan (Rudman 2008a). Evaluative statements made by an archaeologist, and Hayward, are also repeatedly invoked in protest. Rudman similarly quotes the planning commissioners from the ARC and Manukau City Council to challenge a composting plant on Puketutu (Rudman 2005f, h, 2006a, 2005d), and Maungawhau’s management plan is also mobilised (Rudman 2006f).

The use, rather than representation, of the AHD is exemplified by discussion of tentative nomination for inscription unto the UNESCO World Heritage system. DoC included the “Auckland volcanic field” in a 2006 list of tentative nominations. Although not equivalent to obtaining World Heritage status itself, inclusion is significant in that a site cannot be considered for inscription until its tentative nomination. This tentative nomination was specific and considered. Its subject was the “field” including the majority of publically owned cones, craters, some volcanic features, and Otuataua and Matukutūreia stonefields. This was put forward as a “serial site”, made of geographically separated component parts that together are posited as of “outstanding universal value”. It was also presented as of “mixed cultural and natural heritage”. This is statistically unusual, with the majority of UNESCO sites belonging to either of the artificially polarised “cultural” or “natural” categories (Fowler 2004). It is this complex combination that was argued to be the driving force behind the proclaimed uniqueness of Auckland’s field (Department of Conservation 2006, 73).

Within the Herald, while the possibility of nomination was mentioned many times, little is said of the specificity of gaining recognition or the values upon which the recommendation was made. Rather, World Heritage listing remains a spectre behind the volcanoes’ treatment. It is a potential reason for protection, an assurance of their worth, and chastisement to those who would harm them. Here, too, advocates use potential nomination to critique actions seen as damaging to the cones. Rudman criticises DoC for not preventing SH20’s impact on Mount Roskill, chastising it for seeing ‘no incongruity in planning to seek World Heritage status for the cone field while standing aside as this rape goes ahead’ (Rudman 2003k); one of around a dozen articles making use of the comparison, largely with regard to Puketāpapa, also Ōrākei and a potential reduction of view shafts. Similar pointed remarks are seen in quotes from advocates such as Street (Orsman 2007c), Smith (Orsman 2008c, Rudman 2007m), Hayward (Rudman 2007i) and Corrine McLaren from Three Kings United (Rudman 2006e). Smith, for example says, ‘Thinking in terms of world heritage status, it doesn't make
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79 Warner argues that the proposal nonetheless over-emphasise cones and craters (Warner 2008, 4), notably neglecting lava flows and quarry sites.
sense if in one sentence you're talking world heritage and the next minute your chopping a little bit away. If they're world heritage you should back away from them’ (Rudman 2003g).

This invocation draws upon the worth signified by potential inscription: as DoC’s guide to listing process says, ‘as world heritage sites, they [would] share the same status as sites such as the Taj Mahal, the ancient pyramids of Egypt and the Grand Canyon’ (Department of Conservation 2007). It also serves to link the volcanoes together as a valued entity: reference to the nomination, however brief, serves as a reminder that the entirety of “Auckland’s volcanic field” is important enough potentially to be awarded recognition at World level (Rudman 2006f).

“Auckland volcanoes (incl. prehistoric forts)” were included in UNESCO’s “Global Indicative List of Geological Sites” in 1991, the result of a recommendation by the Reserves Committee of the Geological Society of New Zealand (Hayward 1991). The 1995 management strategy for DoC’s Auckland conservancy included World Heritage recognition for the field as a goal (Department of Conservation 1995). Almost ten years later, DoC’s call for public submissions for the tentative list held six illustrative examples. Despite the list being explicitly intended to inspire feedback, to Herald writers Auckland’s volcanoes were notably absent, its portrayal weighted by parochial emphasis that “our” volcanoes were being neglected (Johnston 2005, 2005b, Rudman 2005c), and the tie between heritage and identity remained prevalent throughout representation. This prompted support for the volcanoes’ nomination from bodies such as the Auckland City Council (Johnston 2005), and the “Auckland volcanic field” was included in DOC’s 2006 report (Department of Conservation 2006) submitted to UNESCO in time for New Zealand to host the 31st session of the World Heritage Committee June 2007.

The invisibility of the specifics behind this tentative nomination highlights more than anything that these features of the AHD are used more than they are represented; indeed, some of the uses they are put to may run almost counter to their intended purpose. Rudman implements the tentative nomination, and its concurrence with the Waitangi Tribunal’s report on the settlement of Wai 338 (see chapter seven) to argue, ‘these unique volcanoes don’t belong to any one person or tribe, they belong to the world’ (Rudman 2007a). An anonymous editorial in 2011 similarly worries that the Tāmaki Collective’s ownership of 11 cones would indicate “fractured administration” in pursuit of World Heritage Status, arguing for a greater role to be played by DoC to “reinforce the fact that this was a single geological feature’ (2011d). Glenday’s article explicitly addresses the archaeological importance of the volcanoes in response to this editorial, from which Māori values were conspicuously absent,
celebrating how UNESCO classification would recognise “a special physical significance” of this “geological entity”. This stands in contrast to DoC’s document, explicit in its ultimate emphasis of Māori cultural values over the geological:

> The outstanding universal value of this serial site rests in part on its geology and natural landforms, but principally on the physical evidence of a succession of Māori tribal occupations surviving in the modern city which has been built on this young and periodically active volcanic field (Department of Conservation 2006, 72).

Although inscription would incorporate the field into the largest international Authorising Institution of Heritage (Smith 2006) following highly specific processes, then, this specificity is readily smoothed over. The resultant moniker of “World Heritage” is articulated into other goals and aims that are communicated to the public more overtly and repeatedly than DoC publications. Beyond this specificity, what remains most salient is instead the identity element of World Heritage, recognition of “our” spaces and what is necessary in order to achieve this.

**Identifying: “uniqueness” and “volcanic heritage”**

As with “inheritance”, from which it is derived, “heritage” is always the “heritage of”. Anico and Paralta affirm, ‘it is common sense now that heritage has everything to do with identity’ (2009, 1). The connection between “heritage” and “identity” has been particularly noted with regard to heritage in the maintenance of imagined communities, especially on a national level (Graham and Howard 2008b, Smith, Messenger, and Soderland 2010, Morgan et al. 2010, Smith 2006, Trapeznik 2000, Olwig 2008). The connections are further hinted at in the passion often surrounding contestation of heritage (Graham and Howard 2008b, Graham, Ashworth, and Tunbridge 2000). Russell (2010) notes frequent conflation between the two, the assumption that sites and objects of heritage must be preserved because their destruction surely equates to destruction of identity. Russell writes this as a critique, instead advocating a “mycelial” understanding of heritage and identity that accommodates new kinds of relations between heritage sites, people and activity. Yet this same apparent inevitability can be utilised by activists as a persuasive to prevent posited damage.

Arguments for preservation, particularly Rudman’s, consistently articulate the volcanoes to city identity and, by implication, that of the readers (Parisi and Holcomb 1994). Regardless of the specific “values” of any site, this equation between reader and volcano is the most
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80 Pertaining to fungi. Derived from Deleuze and Guattari’s (1987) rhizomes.
frequent argument for preservation. This is explicit in the first article of the Mount Roskill/SH20 campaign:

You would have thought that by now it would have got through to the road builders that we Aucklanders, after an admittedly slow start, now see the volcanic cones we share our city with as part of what makes us Aucklanders. One or other of them might even have received a Christmas card from Mayor Christine Fletcher last December which said Auckland is "as unique as its volcanic cones."

Over the past 150 years it's true we haven't looked after that uniqueness very well. ... Such destruction of our "identity" was, I had hoped, part of our ugly past. (Rudman 2001f).

Such "uniqueness" continues to be highlighted throughout the coverage, becoming the most-utilised adjective relating to the volcanoes. It is used on over 50 occasions with regard to the wider field, assisted by Judge Treadwell's readily quotable description of this as "unique in the world" (Rudman 2001e, 2002d, b, 2003k, b, 2003b). It is also applied to individual volcanoes (e.g. Rudman 2008a, 2003i).

"Uniqueness" resonates favourably with discourses of marketing and tourism, compatible with the contemporary hegemonic profit-oriented ethos which heritage professionals themselves must frequently utilise to justify their assessments (Graham, Ashworth, and Tunbridge 2000). To be "unique" in some way is to adhere to pressures for cities to identify themselves as possessing a point of difference in the global market (Sayers 2011), a marker of individuality noted in a number of presentations (e.g. Clement 2011b, Street in Rudman 2000e, Street in 2005b). As one editorial argues, 'Many cities have a wonderful seaside vista… But none is built round a dozen volcanoes' (2005e). As Rudman notes, Auckland City Council utilised this description late 1999 in its slogan, "as unique as its volcanic cones", a branding to outsiders and citizens alike (Rudman 2001f) that affirms Auckland as a distinct place (Morgan et al. 2010). Further, this marker of "uniqueness" is readily affirmed when moving through the city, reinforced by the view shafts that themselves were themselves argued on the basis of "unique identity" (see chapter five).

At the same time, it is comparative without claiming much at all. The descriptor parallels determinations of significance within the AHD: "uniqueness" cannot be designated by direct experience but by comparison. Yet there are no specific attributes to be contested. While a handful of authoritative affirmations of "uniqueness" are mentioned, notably Treadwell and,
briefly, Councillor Caughey’s observation of ‘unique geological formation’ (Johnston 2005), the majority of these are unattributed, common knowledge. The complex values that underlie the heritage significance of the field are potentially hazardous to negotiate, as highlighted by criticism within guest articles such as Smith’s (2010a) and Glenday’s (2011). This complexity, and the dissonance of heritage itself (Graham and Howard 2008a), is comfortably glossed over through this abstract statement of importance. It transcends specific codified values while retaining the weightiness of value itself.

These trends towards the invocation of broader “heritage” and identification with the city are epitomised with the articulation of Auckland’s volcanoes, and the city itself, to create an entity: Auckland’s “volcanic heritage”. This complex noun can be understood as a step towards naturalisation of the “heritage” status of the volcanoes. Presenting the term as a denotation with apparent real-world equivalence enables the presupposition of an entity “volcanic heritage”. The heritage status of the volcanoes is no longer an argument that need be made but a thing that, by implication, already exists. To paraphrase Barthes, ‘if I state the fact of [volcanic heritage] without explaining it, I am very near to finding that it is natural and goes without saying: I am reassured’ (Barthes 1973, 143). “Auckland’s volcanic heritage” then becomes a lynchpin, able to be invoked in the space of a moment, yet holding the historical and semiotic weight of the “heritage” concept. In Laclau and Mouffe’s terminology, it is a semi-fixed “nodal point” around which subsequent specificities may be negotiated. Its presence simultaneously assumes and reinforces the commonality of the “volcanic”, the “heritage” status of this, and its ownership by the readers (Laclau and Mouffe 1985).

“Volcanic heritage”, although not restricted to Auckland, is of limited established currency in other contexts. This enables it to be shaped and utilised without continual negotiation of conflicting uses; if not an “empty signifier” then sparsely and unobtrusively furnished, inviting customisation (Barthes 1973, Tomaselli and Shepperson 2009). This limited use enabled me to “track” the concept within and beyond the Herald, where it is used exclusively with regard to Auckland’s volcanoes81 (Altheide and Schneider 2013). Notably, it has very little academic use in the context of preservation, although used as a synonym for “volcanic history” in other contexts. Joyce (Joyce 2009, Bird and Joyce 2006, Joyce 2010) posits “volcanic heritage reserves” as a specific type of geological reserve relevant to the Melbourne volcanic field. However, many of these scholarly sources concern the Auckland field. This includes the introduction to the section on volcanic preservation efforts in Hayward et al.’s (2011) guide to Auckland’s volcanoes. It is in Hayward’s (2007) article, briefly describing damage to

81 Including Hayward’s extension of it to the Franklin field as part of “Auckland's volcanic heritage” (Hayward 2001).
Auckland’s volcanoes, and Eagle’s (2001) paper from the “Sustainable Auckland Congress”. This also criticises damage to the city’s “geological landscape”. Six “Cities on Volcanoes” conference proceedings yielded two more uses: Leonard et al.’s allusion to a research project about “protecting our [Auckland’s] volcanic heritage” (Leonard et al. 2007)\(^82\), and Olive-Garcia et al. (2010) with reference to the Chaîne des Puys field in France. Significantly, an international conference on managing protected volcanic landscapes (“Volcandland”) had only one abstract containing the term (Gudmundsson 2012), referencing the “volcanic heritage” of Iceland. This suggests the term is not in common circulation.

The term’s use in the Herald is comparatively frequent, with 41 uses over 32 articles\(^83\). It is seldom differentiated as to which volcanoes are included. This is so even when the reference is actually to a subsection of the field, such as the 1970s protection of sight-lines to some cones (e.g. Rudman 2002a). Conversely, the inclusion of all volcanoes regardless of landscape presence is made explicit on a number of occasions, such as Rudman’s argument that Ōrākei Basin is ‘just as much a part of our volcanic heritage as show-off cones such as Rangitoto and Mt Eden’ (Rudman 2004d). Hayward’s 2011 discoveries are less obviously imposing craters, but nonetheless to ‘be managed as part of Auckland’s rich volcanic heritage’ (Harper 2011b). The term is inclusive, open to application, although almost always used in reference to volcanoes as a group\(^84\). This is consistent with the broader drive towards protection of the volcanoes because they are Auckland’s volcanoes.

“Volcanic heritage” is also consistently presented with a tie to Auckland and the imagined community of readers: 17 of the 41 uses refer to “our” volcanic heritage, 14 “Auckland’s” or “Auckland City’s”, three more “the city’s” or “the region’s”\(^85\). This use of the possessive draws upon and underlines the tie between “heritage” and “identity”. The two uses of the term not related to volcanic protection were made by travel/”life and style” writer Danielle Wright. Both referenced the inheritance of “us” as Aucklanders: ‘reminders of our volcanic heritage’ at the bike trail in Little Rangitoto Reserve (Wright 2011a) and an art installation in the Rugby World Cup “Fan Trail” that ‘pays homage to our volcanic heritage’ (Wright 2011b). Both

\(^82\) Presumably Warner (2008).
\(^83\) Excluding the “City of Fire” supplement and an additional ‘volcanic and cultural heritage’ (Rudman 2011e).
\(^84\) Exceptions are Rudman referencing the “volcanic heritage of” Ōrākei Basin (Rudman 2007i), an ambiguous quote by Smith alluding to the “volcanic heritage landscape”, either of Ōrākei or more generally (Orsman 2008c), and Hayward (Hayward 2001) advocating the restoration of the ‘lost volcanic heritage’ of a number of quarried volcanoes. All uses in the Herald refer to explosion centres, not volcanic features in general. However, the term has been applied to features elsewhere, including a potential threat to a Mount Wellington lava cave in the “Preserving Auckland’s Volcanic Heritage” subsection of Hayward et al. (2011), and lava flows explicitly specified as “part of Auckland’s Volcanic Heritage” by the Hearing Panel for Plan 192.
\(^85\) Additionally, ‘we’re all paying extra rates this year for volcanic heritage’ (Rudman 2006e).
combine a basic celebration of the volcanic past with the present unity of Auckland; constructing a sense of place through features posited as unique. The term has also made its way into official reference to the volcanoes, with the ARC’s 2010 booklet on the volcanoes is also entitled “Auckland’s volcanic heritage”, and appearing in the ARPS following Change 8 (see chapter five).

**Drawing on the Mount Roskill Case**

If Maungawhau is invoked as the charismatic familiar, following the success of the Roskill “crusade” Puketāpapa could similarly be invoked as a success story. Like “volcanic heritage”, reference to the mountain acted as a swift reminder of the web of equations reiterated throughout the media “campaign”. Even as the “preservation” was acknowledged as a reconstruction in dedicated discussion (Rudman 2003g), in brief reference it took on epic proportions: a “battle” in which the mountain was “saved”. Its ambiguity was erased. Success against such a large crown entity highlighted the importance of the volcanoes, the highway redesign interpretable as official acknowledgement of significance. The surrounding landscape of Puketāpapa’s lower slopes, seen from SH20 itself and the arterial Dominion Road, further act as semiotic reminders for those familiar with the debate. Even for those unfamiliar, the evident prominence of the volcano, amidst motorway art designed to celebrate the volcanic, stands in contrast to previous planned disregard. Such dissonance may provide interest to those encountering the story afresh through Rudman’s reminders.

The 1915 Act played a significant part in this “victory” (Peart 2004). Although, as noted above, the Act’s power was considerably assisted by media representation (2008a), it provides an authority for the volcanoes’ preservation that seems legitimated by recent precedent. The Act is explicitly credited on numerous occasions as having “saved” Mount Roskill. Rudman deems it “famous” (Rudman 2009b, c, e, d) despite being to a large degree the origin of this “fame”. The Act’s basic principles are reiterated on a number of occasions in subsequent years (Rudman 2006e, d, 2007f, d), as is Prime Minister Massey’s explanation of the Act as “preventing [the volcanoes’] destruction” (Rudman 2006b, e, 2003i, 2007i, 2004d).

The invocation of this Act speaks to the volcanoes as a category: all “volcanic cones or hills” within Auckland are equated under its auspices. There is potential ambiguity this with application to explosion craters, although Hayward’s authoritative reference to Ōrākei as a

---

86 Notably in the context of an attempted change to its text, downgrading exemptions from requiring the permission of the Governor General to that of DoC.
“tuff cone” (e.g. Rudman 2007i) works to alleviate this. Unsurprisingly, there has been an emphasis on inclusivity by those campaigning for volcanoes’ protection. Soon after success in the Act’s application to Mount Roskill, concerned with the potential encroachment of the proposed Eastern Highway on Ōrākei Basin, Rudman argued for the Act’s application to the tuff crater:

Now Mt Roskill’s water-filled sibling across town in the well-heeled eastern suburbs is at risk from the dreaded eastern highway, yet nobody seems to be waving the 1915 act aloft and crying enough. So I will. After all, isn’t Orakei Basin every bit as much a part of Auckland’s unique volcanic field as Mt Roskill? (Rudman 2004d).

It was also invoked in an unsuccessful attempt to prevent the incursion of the Auckland Art Gallery extension into Albert Park (Rudman 2006g, b). Here, the volcanic status of the questioned area was itself at stake, determined in a commissioned report by Hayward to be pre-volcanic sandstone ridge and hence ineligible for the Act’s influence. It was similarly raised late 2003 concerning an area of the Domain (Rudman 2003e). Although far from the obvious crater area, and application simply presented as a possibility, any debate around the specific application of this Act serves as a performance that includes the affirmation of Auckland’s volcanoes as protected and protectable, a reminder of the Act’s potential application.

The AVCS themselves function as a similar nodal point, their vey name imputing that cones are worth celebrating and/or protecting. This connection was widened to tuff “cones” through their public work regarding Ōrākei developments 2007-10 (e.g. Orsman 2008b) and Te Hopua/Gloucester Park (Dearlaney 2007). These efforts are lauded within Rudman’s columns in language that at times aligns the Society with mythological heroes, tarring their opposition by implication as villains and the less heroic authorities as cowards (e.g. Rudman 2008c). They are “battlers” (Rudman 2008c), “guardians” (Dearlaney 2009a), “heroes” (Rudman 2002a), “brave” (Rudman 2007k), “indefatigable warriors” (Rudman 2009b) who “resurrect” the 1915 Act and “miraculously” save Mount Roskill (Rudman 2009e), “lonely volunteers” (Rudman 2008b) who “save the day” (Rudman 2007e). This language is reflected in the characterisation of the SH20/Roskill issue itself as a “battle” (Rudman 2005i), and Mount Wellington as a “famous victory” (Rudman 2008c).

Beyond this, the AVCS’s role as the driving force behind the Mount Roskill/SH20 campaign enabled the Society to be referenced in most news articles concerning the conflict. This included comparatively benign portrayal in an editorial otherwise deriding “nuisance
objectors" (2002b). Their subsequent legal action has similarly been reported in the Herald as part of news, often sympathetically, quoted without challenge. This includes legal action against a Mount Wellington “Stonefields” property development (Gregory 2007) and proposed design for the SH20 Onehunga interchange (Dearlaney 2007). It also includes concern regarding an apartment’s infringement of view shafts (Orsman 2003b), and advocacy against developments that threaten Mount Eden (Orsman 2007c), Mount St John (Orsman 2007a), and Ōrākei (e.g. Orsman 2008c). They also offer commentary on the Tāmaki Collective settlement (Tahana 2010b). They feature in news articles regarding the volcanoes as a ready source of information, quotes and a degree of authority (e.g. Cumming 2002b, McKenzie-minifie 2007, Johnston 2005, 2005b). This extends to Clement’s 2011 travel article, written with ‘the help of the Auckland Volcanic Cones Society, University of Auckland, and the former Manukau City Council’: an equation with two conventionally authoritative sources of knowledge.

Particularly when combined with their own articles (Smith 2010a, 2005), this grants them a strong presence within the Herald, an implicit reminder that all Auckland’s volcanoes are valuable. The 1915 Act is similarly mentioned in news articles (e.g. Dearlaney 2009a, 2005b, Orsman 2007c, a, Falconer 2004). The impact of the advocate articles and the articulations made in them, then, stretches considerably beyond these columns and into the wider media coverage of the field.

Conclusions

Within New Zealand’s biggest newspaper, the “heritage” most frequently rehearsed is seldom Authorised Heritage. Specific values are present but rarely discussed, even in relation to highly specific processes like tentative nomination for World Heritage Status. Rather, I encounter a “volcanic heritage” here based on myself as an Aucklander, and the Auckland I know. It is presented through connections with ecologically charismatic cones. It is tied to Auckland identity the implication that any “heritage” lost is a personal loss. This equivalence is further seasoned with inferred flattery that the uniqueness of these features somehow resonates with my own inherent specialness as an Aucklander. It is also sharply spiced with empathy invoked through my body, akin to the bodies of volcanoes threatened with “disfigurement” or worse. The volcanoes are presented as important because they are Auckland’s volcanoes. This cumulative process draws on and re-iterates pre-established connections such as the 1915 Act, the AVCS and the Mount Roskill “battle” itself. Through various strategies, logics and events, within advocate articles and echoing into the wider
news coverage, the volcanoes are equated with each other as inherently valuable, and the concept of “Auckland’s volcanic heritage”, whether explicit or not, is performed.

Looking to the future, Auckland Council has promised increased attention to the volcanoes’ upkeep, signified by the repaving of the long-neglected Mount Albert/Owairaka summit road late 2012 (Whittaker 2012). Ngā Mana Whenua o Tāmaki Makaurau’s settlement has been signed, granting ownership and co-management of a number of volcanoes. Chairman Paul Majurey has indicated a desire for protection that surpasses current “ad hoc” engagement (Tahana 2011b). In late 2011, the National Government also gave indications of interest in pursuing World Heritage status for the field (Tahana 2011b). This continues to be worked upon. It may be that the characteristics in my period of study, and the remnant wildness and neglect that have only just started to be challenged on Maungawhau, are starting to come to an end.
7: Raising Maunga: volcanoes and contemporary Māori

In the previous chapter, argument for the heritage status of volcanoes was seen to draw on the charismatic visibility of some volcanoes to invest the whole with affective significance. Similarly, the “iconic” familiarity of Maungakiekie/One Tree Hill is shown below to add emotional valence, and both physical and media prominence, to politically symbolic acts such as the felling of the “lone pine” on its summit. The persistent visual presence of this volcano, and many other cones, underscores the importance of their articulated meaning. This is particularly the case in a context, as in Aotearoa, where political disharmony is so frequently minimised or denied.

Throughout the period of this study, more than any other change, there has been an increase in the portrayal of the volcanoes as aligned with contemporary Māori interests. The millennium began with the felling of the “One Tree” of One Tree Hill/Maungakiekie, an “icon” of the city and recent national symbol of ethnic disharmony (Kearns and Collins 2000). Here, intense coverage illustrated a number of traits identified in other studies of Pākehā media and identity-creation that promote the hegemony of Pākehā interests and interpretation (Moeweka Barnes et al. 2004, Rankine et al. 2007). Yet this period also saw the formation and establishment of Ngā Mana Whenua o Tāmaki Makaurau (“the Tāmaki Collective”) as the future legal owner and guardian of the majority of Auckland’s volcanic cones. This has served as a powerful impetus for change in presentation. I argue below that this is most clearly demonstrable through the dramatic increase in “maunga” to refer to volcanic cones from 2010.

This chapter is written from a Pākehā perspective, in the context of prolonged engagement with the volcanoes that for years has been subject to the “amnesia” noted in relation to white identity, and engagement with place, within settler societies (Bell 2006, Sayers 2011). Blair highlights that the majority of visitors to Maungawhau have no idea as to the history and traditions associated with each pit and curve; yet ‘Every speck of land in Tāmaki has a story’ (White 2009, New Zealand Herald 2008, pt 1, 14). As discussed in chapters five and eight, to Pākehā eyes, there are multiple facilitators of the volcanoes as aligned with “natures” that contrast this deeply cultural landscape. The imagination of geological forces and futures has a remarkable persistence in contemporary writing (see chapter 8), while their pastoral skins resonate with images of a quieter nature, recreation, and the “countryside” (Reid 2007),

87 See below. This came into effect with the Ngā Mana Whenua o Tāmaki Makaurau Collective Redress Act 2014, passed 31 July 2014.
Yet this same landscape can speak forcefully of Māori presence and centuries of agency. Mike Davis, cultural critic best known for his analyses of Los Angeles (e.g. Davis 1998), is struck by the history evident in these hills:

What Davis sees with his sharp, attuned eyes skimming over the Queen St McDonald's sign to the volcanic cones beyond, is the strong Maori imprint on the hillsides, an indigenous marker stronger than he's seen in any American city. "This is still a Maori city in many ways," he says (Thomson 2001).

The amnesia is practiced, reflecting a hegemonic assumption of Pākehā normalcy. It is also fed by racial politics that has acquired particular emotionality in previous decades (West-Newman 2008). Aotearoa was, relatively uniquely, founded on a Treaty between colonisers and indigenous Māori peoples that, to Māori, promised continued sovereignty (Walker 1996a). This was swiftly disregarded by settlers who alienated Māori from their land through exploitative purchase and, following Land Wars of the 1860s, confiscation. Māori became also increasingly alienated from their culture through the dominance of settler legal and educative systems, and policy such as the banning of te reo Māori (the Māori language/Te Reo) (Rankine et al. 2007) and the Tohunga Suppression Act 1907. Subsequent attempts to amend these injustices have been resisted as threatening by many Pākehā. Resistance is most clearly portrayed during this period through 2003-2004 debate around the Foreshore and Seabed Act (e.g. Phlean 2009, West-Newman 2008). This was brought to a head by the “Orewa Speech” made by then-opposition leader Don Brash, decrying a perceived “grievance industry” and apparent “racially divisive” Māori privilege.88

The portrayal of Māori/Pākehā relations within New Zealand media has been the focus of extensive scholarly attention (e.g. Abel 1997, Matheson 2007, Phlean 2009, Phlean and Shearer 2009, McCreanor 2005). This includes recent projects by the Whāriki Research Centre and associated scholars including the “Kupu Taea: Media and Te Tiriti” and “Media, health and wellbeing in Aotearoa” (e.g. Moeweka Barnes et al. 2004, Moeweka Barnes et al. 2013, Rankine et al. 2007, Moeweka Barnes et al. 2012, Rankine et al. 2011, Rankine et al. 2009). Mainstream media has been consistently found to speak to a Pākehā assumed reader/viewer, presupposing and reinforcing a Pākehā worldview in which Māori understandings are often absent or positioned as alien or threatening. While Abel (1997) underscores that there is no “conspiracy” to minimise Māori concerns, news media

88 See Matheson, who argues this debate changed New Zealand journalism by making racial inequality explicit (Matheson 2007, 92).
nonetheless tend to operate as ‘hegemonic agents of the dominant Pākehā culture’ (Phlean and Shearer 2009, 220). Studies have tended to underscore structural pressures towards this (Rankine et al. 2007). These include requirements of “newsworthiness”; constraints in time and space dissuading the presentation of cultural context (Abel 1997, Matheson 2007); use of Te Reo restricted by expectations of reader familiarity (Matheson 2007); and a tendency toward regional publications orientated towards perceived (Pākehā) mainstream rather than nationwide alternatives with different political alignment (Phlean 2009). Matheson’s interviews show a number of journalists as conscious of the inadequacy of the portrayal of Māori issues: ‘on the whole, reflective, critical, concerned to be non-racist and dissatisfied’ (Matheson 2007, 95).

These representational tendencies reflect and propagate a wider discursive context. A number of repertoires have been identified that minimise Māori actions and culture perceived as threatening to Pākehā identity, and these have remained remarkably consistent from earlier studies in the 1980s (McCreanor 2005) to recent evaluations of news journalism (Moeweka Barnes et al. 2012, see e.g. Wetherell and Potter 1992, McCreanor 1995). Research from the Media and Te Tiriti Resource Centre delineates thirteen themes that draw on McCreanor’s earlier analysis (see also e.g. Rankine et al. 2007, McCreanor 2005, Moeweka Barnes et al. 2004). These include: the presentation of Pākehā as normal; rhetoric of “one people/nation”; minimising Māori concerns as separatist; distinguishing between “good Māori” and “bad Māori”, including denouncement of those who challenge the social order as “stirrers”; and portrayal of the Treaty as ‘a historical document of little relevance to the contemporary setting [and] a barrier to development’ (Moeweka Barnes et al. 2012, 198). Many of these have been useful in analysing discussion relating to Māori and Auckland’s volcanoes. Phlean (2009) further uses Laclau and Mouffe to trace the logics of equivalence and difference made in editorials regarding the Foreshore and Seabed Act, and Phlean and Shearer regarding “activist” and “radical” (Phlean and Shearer 2009), resonating with my own interest in discursive articulation of place with politics, understanding, and experience.

The broader representation of issues relating to Māori within Auckland, including the formation of Ngā Mana Whenua o Tāmaki Makaurau, is beyond this chapter’s scope. It is underlain by considerable depth of negotiation and political concern, touching on concerns and complexities that have reformulated Treaty negotiations on a national level (Waitangi Tribunal 2007). Where relevant, I have discussed the ways this is related back to the volcanoes within the Herald. Similarly, Tāmaki iwi and hapū relationships to these volcanoes

89 Feature articles enable more in-depth discussion, as illustrated below.
are only starting to be explored and documented in-depth (Waitangi Tribunal 2007). Others have highlighted the importance of maunga, or mountains, within Māori culture. A 2007 Waitangi Tribunal report into Auckland Treaty settlements illustrates this. In emphasising that attempts to establish “predominant” interests is “always the wrong question where there are multiple interests in maunga”, it notes:

That is because maunga are iconic landscape features for Māori. They are iconic not because of their scenic attributes, but because they represent an enduring symbolic connection between tangata whenua groups and distinctive land forms. Sometimes, these land forms are the physical embodiment of tūpuna [ancestors]. Thus, associations with maunga are imbued with mana and wairua that occupy the spiritual as well as the terrestrial realm. Maunga express a group’s mana and identity. This connection and expression is an integral part of Māori culture. Great caution must be exercised in dealing with such places simply as land assets, or in accordance with any determination of predominance not generated by those who hold the interests (Waitangi Tribunal 2007, 95-6).

In a passage partially quoted by Sir Douglas Graham within the Herald (Graham 2010), Dame Whina Cooper further explains,

...we have been taught by our ancestors to talk to the mountains because the bones of our ancestors are up there. And we talk to those mountains because we know that our ancestors are all buried up there. They all have their mana there. At any big hui that’s called at our maraes you find that when anybody comes there they talk to the mountain first.....To link from the people who have died back to the living (Cooper in Walker 1996b, 126).

Representations of the importance of Auckland’s volcanic maunga further appear briefly within the Herald on occasion, as discussed below.

In contrast to the current unplanned tourism on Maungawhau, former Ngāti Whātua heritage spokesperson Ngarimu Blair notes a visitor centre palisades or a gateway ‘could be a powerful symbol: this is a Māori place’ (Cumming 2005a). This term encapsulates what I am most interested in capturing within this chapter: the presentation of Auckland’s volcanoes as unproblematically articulated with contemporary Māori. Here it is not an historical “spice” to Pākehā experience (hooks 1992), dismissed as Māori “stirring” or irrational interpretation, but articulated into the very identity of the volcanoes. The volcanoes as “Māori place[s]” are
potentialities that I argue are increasingly present within the Herald over my study, but also resisted. These currents converge upon the summit of Maungakiekie, a central spindle on the isthmus around which threads of hope and protest collect and tangle. Fuelled by its iconicity, it has become a symbol of broader politics of race relations within Aotearoa, alongside volcanic ownership. I also note the use of Te Reo to link the volcanoes to a Māori worldview and context, framing them as Māori entities; a de-articulation from the dominant “volcanic”. The increasing use of Te Reo, I argue, implies a tacit performance of the volcanoes as “Māori Places”, echoing the political shift in ownership and potentially foreshadowing the increased centrality of Māori to their ongoing presentation.

Maungakiekie

Discussion of Māori-Pākehā relationships in the context of the volcanoes can be seen to repeatedly circle back to Maungakiekie/One Tree, and this volcano’s summit has functioned as a symbol of racial tension within Aotearoa/New Zealand more broadly (Kearns and Collins 2000). Kearns and Collins emphasise its literal and symbolic presence,

…a key element in the city’s human geography – a site of considerable historical and archaeological significance by virtue of Māori occupation, a reference point for urban commuters, a set of political controversy, part of the archetypal tourist’s image of the city…and an icon brought to international attention by the U2 song “One Tree Hill”…visible throughout much of the Auckland urban area, contributing to the legibility and imageability of the city…and to residents’ sense of place (Kearns and Collins 2000, 174).

In noting the “iconic” status of this volcano, they reference “iconography” within “New” Cultural Geography (Cosgrove and Daniels 1988), underscoring multiple “readings” of the volcano in the context of contested monumentality. I am further pointed towards the near-synonym between “iconic” and “charismatic”, underscoring the ways Maungakiekie’s visibility and presence underwrite its use as symbol. As Kearns and Collins note, it holds a central location within the isthmus, seen from SH1 and SH20, for Aucklanders including myself, a sign one is again nearing “home” (Gower and Orsman 2000). In addition to its location, a great deal of its ability to be identified from a distance relates to its “jizz” or distinctive form, distinguished by its prominent summit-top obelisk, lit at night, in the decades up to 2000 joined by a lone windswept pinus radiata. Its slopes are preserved from suburban intrusion, its obelisk granting the illusion of a perfect cone when seen from a distance, a surprising contrast to its jigsaw-piece configuration from above and the summit’s winding path.
The pine was not the source of “One Tree Hill”, in Bell’s words, ‘a misfounded belief that had become central to community memory or imagining’ (2006, 107). The lone tree for which John Logan Campbell named the mountain (Hinton 2000, Kearns and Collins 2000, 178) was likely a pōhutukawa (Stone 2007). The historic tree more frequently honoured, however, is Te Tōtara-i-āhua, “the tōtara that stands alone”. Its traditional origin was a staff planted above the whenua (afterbirth and umbilical cord, also meaning “land”) of Koroki in the 17th century, which sprouted and grew in tribute to the chief he would become (Stone 2004). The “lone pine” seen in the late 20th century was one of a grove planted in the 1870s intended to protect the reinstatement of native trees atop the summit (Stone 2007). The monument itself was erected at Campbell’s request, ‘atowering obelisk in memoriam to the great Maori race’ (see 1906). Kearns and Collins observe the memorialising intention as reflecting the prevalent turn-of-the-century belief that Māori were inevitably to die out, ‘an opinion supported by demographic trends as well as by prevalent Social Darwinist beliefs’ (2000, 180). In contrast, Bell emphasises the active role of Māori in its creation three decades later. He highlights the approval of Ngāti Whātua and Tainui authorities and the Akarana Māori Society (Stone 2004, 133), iwi influence upon the form taken by the statue of the warrior at its base, and the centrality of King Korokī and Māori dignitaries at its unveiling.

While Stone underscores the respect Campbell intended by using ‘the most admirable of monuments’ (Stone 2004, 132), Ranginui Walker notes imperial implications in the obelisk itself, modelled after those from the Egyptian temple of Kanarch of which half were ‘looted by imperialists… it stands as a symbol of European domination alongside the lone pine that replaced the native totara’ (Walker 1995, 140). Hope was expressed at its unveiling that it would stand as a symbol of future unity between the two races. However, media coverage of this ceremony was sparse (Stone 2001b), an implied dismissal of the importance of this endeavour (Bell 2006). The notable exception to otherwise widespread iwi approval was prominent politician Sir Apirana Ngata, who Stone observes as ‘obviously uneasy about what he thought was a certain ill-founded complacency in Auckland about the state of racial harmony… [which], he feared, might well become reinforced by the imagined message of the monument’ (Stone 2004, 133).

---

90 He further notes the delay of this unveiling until 1948, after WWII in which many Maori were fighting. Additionally, Stone (2004) highlights the role Auckland’s centenary celebration in fostering interest in the project in the late 1930s, and the convenience that the delay until after the war offered to the cash-strapped project.
In 1994 the summit was abruptly re-equated with Māori-Pākehā relations within popular consciousness through a chainsaw attack on pine by Northland protestor, Mike Smith. This was a protest against the National government’s proposed sale of state-owned assets and plan to settling all outstanding claims within 10 years out of a limited “fiscal envelope” totalling $1 billion (Stokes 2004, Macdonald 1995). This limited “envelope” can be read as part of a longstanding desire to place the country’s colonial past behind it, under terms deemed unacceptable and indeed insulting by many Tangata Whenua (Bell 2006, Kearns and Collins 2000, Walker 1996). While unsuccessful in felling the tree completely, and earning him 6 months’ periodic detention, the summit’s iconic status, visibility and familiarity made Smith’s statement a potent one (Bell 2006, 114). This was exacerbated by a second attack by four protesters in 1999. Within the year the tree developed a dangerous lean. Its removal was carried out, with ceremony, on the 26th of October 2000.

Throughout this, both summit and pine were emotively equated with Auckland and Aucklanders. Attention on the pine was intense and markedly anthropomorphic, from the efforts made to keep it alive until “disconnect[ing] the life support” (Rudman 2000d) of the “fatally butchered” tree (Gower and Orsman 2000, Stokes and Bartlett 2007 respectively), to the honours surrounding its removal, a “funeral for friend of the city” (Gower and Orsman 2000), “the tangi of a great and wounded warrior” (Calder 2000). An official obituary followed on the 28th (Hinton 2000), written by a consultant arborist in honour of the “Lone Pine”. While this anthropomorphism exploits obvious resonances between trees and human bodies (Bloch 1998), the Lone Pine also possessed a perceived character that resonated with myths of (masculine) Pākehā identity, the name itself conjuring frontier imagery coherent with the Kiwi “Man Alone” (Bell 1996, 163). While its repeated presentation as a “125 year old Monterey pine” could be understood in the context of the general “facticity” of the news (Allan 1995), it also indicates an extensive history with the land, if brief compared to many trees, in human lifespan, venerable (e.g. Lowenthal 1961): other alternative “facts”, such as its height (Calder 2000), were seldom used. As Rudman (2000c) further notes, “Monterey” is an exotic alternative to “radiata”, mass-grown across the country and synonymous with inexpensive timber (Kearns and Collins 2000). The charismatic, anthropomorphic individuality of the Lone Pine is reaffirmed through the less-common title. An editorial of the *Waikato Times* embodies these implications. It characterises the pine as “Auckland’s symbol of rugged individuality…attacked for being … the wrong species – read race” (cited in Kearns and Collins 2000, 182).

The symbolism within discussion of the tree’s replacement reinforces this, backgrounded by the knowledge, explicit (Larkin 1999b) or read into the death of previous native plantings
that another pine may have a higher chance of survival than the proposed tōtara, pōhutukawa, or pūriri. Its portrayal occasionally echoed the social Darwinism of a century beforehand, affirming the naturalness of Pākehā/pine dominance as the surviving fittest. One regular columnist claimed:

It was just there, a happy accident of nature. The cold winds and poor soil of the highest peak on the isthmus [sic] had left only one tree standing of several planted more than a century before. Nature selected the pine over natives planted at the same time, and sculpted it to a form that could not be contrived and probably cannot be replaced (Roughan 2000).

If a replacement tōtara grew, it suggests, this will in contrast look artificial, “incongruous”. Yet broader discussion of the tree’s replacement seemed to favour a pōhutukawa, the flowering “New Zealand Christmas Tree” noted as the hardiest of native replacements, although Rudman sniped, ‘for reasons of political correctness immigrant pines were out’ (Rudman 2001g).

Meanwhile, care and security for the original was revealed a having cost over half a million dollars (Rudman 2001b) and the anticipated security for its replacement $40,000 a year, a financial echo of the cultural regard for a common pine made exceptional through “icon status”. Characterisations repeatedly returned to this iconicity, with calls for treatment with ‘ceremony and dignity befitting its icon status on the Auckland skyline’ (Orsman 2000b). One letter to the editor, apparently “set[ting] the tone” for others, argued ‘Mr Smith has committed treason against an icon of the people... and he should face the appropriate penalty for that offence’ (2000a). These characterisations placed an inherent weight on the “iconic” designation and frequently interwove visibility with affect and value, implying the tree was familiar and therefore loved by the surrounding city: “the tree just holds so many memories for us ...”, “When I go away, I come back and see that tree and know that I'm home. It is Auckland” (Gower and Orsman 2000). The city’s “most famous and most visible tree” is saluted by then-mayor Christine Fletcher as a place Aucklanders had "come to frolic as children, or as teenagers when our mothers didn't want us to" (Calder 2000). Personal memories are seamlessly tied to conspicuousness from a distance, and the affective weight

---

91 The caption for an image in the online version of this when accessed 9/5/2012 was an unsubtle ‘The lone pine has survived where natives have failed’. Hinting at an ironic alternative reading, Stone notes *pinus radiata’s* aggressive root system and tendency to acidify soil have been shown elsewhere to work to the detriment of nearby native flora, and suggests these likely contributed to the failure of Maungakiekie’s native plantings (Stone 2007).

92 The explicitly miraculous origins of Te Tōtara-i-āhua are never mentioned.
of “icon” is underscored. Roughan’s opinion article spelled this out: ‘The council said the pine tree had become an icon to the city. Its witnesses may not have used the word sacred but they ought to have done. The tree was sacred to generations who grew up in sight of it, played around it, married beneath it and took their children to see it’ (Roughan 2000). In an otherwise insightful op-ed Belgrave portrays people’s previous reluctance to venerate the tree up-close as proof that it was not really valued (2000). However, as Fletcher observes, the ‘public held the landmark in deep affection’ (Gower and Orsman 2000); experienced from a distance but loved nonetheless93.

Yet if many people’s sadness stemmed from affection, Belgrave’s op-ed also offered biting criticism of the potential for “white backlash” inherent in the “hysteria” surrounding the tree’s removal, allowing ‘white Auckland’s chance to act the injured party, for once…’ (Belgrave 2000). With the exception of the wounded op-ed (Roughan 2000), this “backlash” was seldom directed at Māori in general but drew on what McCreanor identifies as the “good Māori/Bad Māori” distinction. Early characterisations (McCreanor 1995) emphasise the shifting, undetermined nature of this distinction, but later explanations list a number of common tropes. McCreanor argues, ‘Bad Māori are those who reject, resist or fail to meet Pākehā norms or standards. They are mainly young, urban, aggressive, lazy, unemployed and shiftless. Good Māori are dignified, polite and mostly passive….’ (McCreanor 2005, 56). This is echoed in Abel’s (1997) journalist informant’s “Wild Māori/Tame Māori”, a contrast between “radical activists” and sensible, normal and average Maoris’ (Wetherell and Potter 1992, 155, Phlean and Shearer 2009). Similarly the “stirrer”, a subsection of the “Bad Māori” who upsets the order of things, can be related to the well-worn trope of “Māori Activist” or “Radical”, both disproportionately articulated with Māori, and positioned in opposition to “us” as readers (Phlean and Shearer 2009).

The portrayal of the 1999 protestors markedly contrasts that of Ngāti Whātua o Ōrākei. The protestors were vilified, appearing almost a caricature of McCreanor’s Bad Māori. They were portrayed as sullen and unemployed (1999); their motives were incoherent and irrational, from ‘something to do with the closing of a school or a church in Northland’ (Larkin 1999a) to wanting “to bring attention to the spirituality of people” (2000b); their behaviour was childish (e.g. Collie 2000, Larkin 1999a, Leader-Williams and Dublin 2000). Damningly, they “giggled uncontrollably” as they watched footage of their attack on Auckland’s beloved symbol.

93 Years later, in response to the attempted sale for charity of the chainsaw used by Smith, a “horrified” Fletcher’s explanation for her feelings centred on the tree’s “iconic” status (Trevett 2007).
(2000). Similarly, the well-established “Māori activist” trope (Phlean and Shearer 2009) was readily used to characterise both the 1999 attackers and Smith.

Ngāti Whātua were, contrastingly, a source of Māori authority condemning the activity alongside “us”. Kaumātua Sir Hugh Kawharu aligned the hapū with the damaged tree; “Ngati Whātua feel part of this tree and were sad to see the taonga damaged in this way” (Larkin 1999b), further distancing the protestors from both Ngāti Whātua and Māori protocol more generally: “If anyone wants to make a political statement involving the mana of Ngati Whātua there is a clear protocol. Take it to Orakei, the marae…To take unilateral action of that sort…without discussing it with Ngati Whatua is an insult” (English 1999). The hapū played a central role in the “funeral” ceremonies, and received the largest part of its trunk for carving (Gower and Orsman 2000). Ngāti Whātua were temporarily articulated with both iconic tree and with Auckland, united in opposition to “wild” Māori Activists from the North. However, this articulated unity was soon challenged.

The formation of Ngā Mana Whenua o Tāmaki Makaurau

Discussion turned to the tree’s replacement from the very first reporting of the 1999 attack (Larkin 1999b)94. It was a fruitful subject generating over 500 reader letters (George 2001), eleven dedicated articles, and almost inevitable mention in any coverage of the maunga. Despite discussion situating the replacement in the context of “the will of the people”, Ranginui Walker’s 1995 words were surely ringing in the ears of council officials: ‘If Maungakiekie/One Tree Hill is to have symbolic meaning in our own time replacing the tree before it dies must be a joint enterprise between the Tangata whenua and city fathers’ (Walker 1995, 140). In the midst of this, nature itself seemed to smile upon the reader tree of choice when six pōhutukawa seedlings were found upon the Lone Pine. As Fletcher said over a decade later, ‘it was like nature’s way of stating what should be following that pine’ (Howie 2012), echoing 10 year old Mikayla Fairweather’s letter, “I am speaking on behalf of the tree. As there was pōhutukawa tree shoots at the bottom of the pine on One Tree Hill, I believe there should be a pohutukawa tree there to replace it because nature would like a pohutukawa” (Orsman 2000c). The city’s most fraught symbolic decision seemed to have been offered an easy “out”. The combination of the seedlings and Maungakiekie-sourced tōtara described later as ‘uncontroversial and generally accepted’ (Rudman 2002c), offering an ideal combination of native flora without the charge of pandering to non-mainstream interests (see Orsman 2001a).

94 A local politician noted, following Smith’s attack, that a contingency plan ‘had been in place for some time should the tree ever need to be replaced. As well as a mature totara, the tree could be replaced with a pohutukawa or another pine’ (McDonald 1994).
Despite this, the path towards planting was convoluted. A planned springtime ceremony was postponed after it was highlighted as both arboreally unsuitable and suspiciously close to the local body election (Rudman 2001g, Orsman 2001b); then cancelled indefinitely as new mayor John Banks declared the replacement’s maintenance too expensive (Orsman 2001c). A midwinter planting was eventually scheduled for 2002. The anticipated ceremony was heavy with symbolism: a dawn ritual overseen by Ngāti Whātua and Banks together, with the strongest of the six seedling pōhutukawa to be later joined by three tōtara (Milton 2002). The planting promised a growing emblem of racial harmony that would be visible across the city, blessed by nature, Tangata Whenua and Pākehā municipal authority. Then, apparently unexpectedly, the pageantry was halted as Ngāti Whātua announced they would not attend (Orsman 2002). The council was granted permission to go ahead, but, as Rudman notes, ‘a bit like continuing the wedding after the bride had done a runner’ (Rudman 2003j). Trees may be planted, but the desired symbol of unity, the “new beginning” (Orsman 2000c) would not be established.

The reason given was the impeding negotiation of Ngāti Whātua o Ōrākei’s Treaty Settlement, to include Maungakiekie, Maungawhau, Puketāpapa, and selected other sites (Orsman 2002). Negotiations between the hapū and Crown officially began 2003 and continued until 2006, with the signing of an Agreement in Principle (AIP) including the cones’ vesting and other redress including right of first refusal within Auckland’s CBD and an arrangement regarding naval land in Devonport (Waitangi Tribunal 2007). The maunga were to be co-managed by the hapū and the council, in a system similar to that used around Bastion Point since the mid 90s (Paterson 2009). A number of iwi groups contested this AIP in an urgent hearing of the Waitangi Tribunal held March 2007. The subsequent report by presiding Judge Carrie Wainwright criticised the Crown process by which the Agreement was reached, particularly the prioritising of one iwi group over others with regard to the maunga. This criticism related to the intricate history of Tāmaki Makaurau (Stone 2001a, Waitangi Tribunal 2007), but also the importance of these “iconic maunga”. The report recommended that settlement with Ngāti Whātua be halted until more appropriate engagement with, and redress offered to, all Tangata Whenua groups in the area (Waitangi Tribunal 2007).

95 The AIP is a formal stage in the Treaty settlement process generally outlining intended settlement conditions, followed by a more detailed Deed of Settlement that is initialled by Cabinet and mandated representatives of iwi groups, called ratification, before a final Deed of Settlement is signed. It is then typically implemented through legislation (McGuinness and White 2010).
Within Tāmaki, former Minister for Treaty Negotiations Sir Douglas Graham was invited to act as a facilitator in March 2009. His proffered suggestion involved the creation a group comprised of Auckland iwi and hapū, the vesting to it of 11 of Auckland’s maunga, with a shared administering body for their management. The resultant formation was a radical move, noted by Graham as “requir[ing] considerable courage, a generosity of spirit and a desire to work together in the common interest” by those involved (Graham 2009, 5). From June 2009 this was developed via negotiation into a Framework Agreement between the newly named Ngā Mana Whenua o Tāmaki Makaurau and the Crown, signed on 12 February 2010; a Record Agreement signed 5 November 2011, and a Collective Deed initialled 7 June 2012 and signed 8 September 2012. The process was finalised with the Ngā Mana Whenua o Tāmaki Makaurau Collective Redress Act, passed July 2014. Over the course of development, the settlement has expanded to include the permanent vesting of 14 maunga, including Matukutūruru/Wiri Mount and Rarotonga/Mount Smart, both heavily quarried but the sites of a scientific reserve and sports stadium respectively, and the vesting of four motu (islands) including Rangitoto. These are to be gifted back to the Crown after a brief period of ownership, albeit with certain sites including Rangitoto’s tihi (summit) retained. The Tāmaki Collective are also to develop a conservation plan for the inner islands of the Hauraki Gulf, including Motukorea, and the names of twenty locations are officially changed, including many of the volcanic maunga. Iwi and hapū are then able to carry out their own negotiations with the Crown, secure that these important sites will not be allocated to one group to the exclusion of the others.

The emotive complexity of this nationally significant settlement was reflected in its extensive coverage, including a number of lengthy Saturday feature articles, and op-eds by iwi involved (e.g. Barton 2006a, c, b, 2007a, Barton and Young 2007, Barton 2007c, b, 2008, Hawke 2006, 2007, 2008, Majurey 2007, 2008), often focusing on wider issues of inter-tribal relations, the role and accuracy of history, and the process itself rather than the maunga specifically. In adherence to the media dictum of underscoring relevance to the readers (Benz and Liedmeir 2007) reference to the volcanoes was based on their familiarity as “landmarks” (Stokes 2006, 2007, see also Tahana 2009a). Barton’s introduction to the settlement similarly began on the summit of Maungawhau (Barton 2006a)\(^96\). Yet this complexity could be further distilled into a single image, a question repeatedly returned to: when will there be a tree on One Tree Hill/Maungakiekie?

\(^{96}\) Barton erroneously characterises the deal as concerning “all the mountains”, suggesting the volcanoes for him were a peripheral interest.
Maungakiekie’s summit remained a constant touchstone throughout this process, an increasingly conspicuous absence of what Hubbard had promised would ‘symbolise a new beginning’ (Eames 2005a). The 2006 signing of Ngāti Whātua’s AIP was greeted with “Fresh hope sprouts for One Tree Hill” (Orsman 2006), portrayed almost entirely in the context of replanting. An editorial days later suggests ‘It might permit agreement at last on a replacement tree’ (2006a). A NZPA article following the progress of the Tāmaki Collective does so in terms of a “new tree for One Tree Hill” (NZPA 2010), echoed soon after by McCraken (2010), covering the Prime Minister’s “beyond grievance” Waitangi Day speech. The speech, which essentially repeated verbatim the Treaty Minister’s preceding coverage of the Tāmaki Collective (Finlayson 2010), criticises the previous deal and notes, ‘while we’ve been waiting for the issue to be resolved, we’ve had a situation where no new tree could be planted on One Tree Hill’ (Key 2010). McCracken’s summary of the speech, entitled “High hopes for One Tree Hill”, allowed the summit to symbolise change of national relevance, where ‘the first sign the ambitious task [of Treaty settlement] is on schedule will be replanting on One Tree Hill - left bare since 2001’ (McCraken 2010). The focus continued (Orsman 2011a) after Finlayson briefed the council on the settlement, while 2012 concluded with an update, “no tree just yet” (Howie 2012), explaining the absence as forestalling until the settlement was passed into law. While generally couched as informative, quoting Blair extensively, this update also hinted at frustration: ‘Hopes for a tree planting on the barren summit of One Tree Hill have been dashed again’; the “hopes” unattributed, presumably widely shared bar those in a position to “dash” them, the Tāmaki Collective. This frustration, illustrated also by the 2006 editorial’s “at last”, was naturalised as belonging to the hill itself in a response to a reader question, ‘No Tree Hill’s long wait likely to drag on’ (Falconer 2007).

Embodying Sir Apirana Ngata’s prescient reluctance, the summit of Maungakiekie continues to act as a symbol of incomplete resolution. Following the 1994 attacks it has also been appropriated in drives to foreshorten Treaty negotiations, echoing policy that prompted Smith’s attack and drawing on well-established tropes of “one New Zealand” and “equality” (Wetherell and Potter 1992, Moeweka Barnes et al. 2012). Scant days after the proposed replanting was delayed by Ngāti Whātua, and tellingly announced within an article entitled “Claim stalls planting atop One Tree Hill” (Orsman 2002), ACT leader Richard Prebble used the site to launch his party’s “One Law For All” campaign (Middleton 2002); revisiting the minor political party’s similar gesture in 1999 following the second attack (Daniels 1999). It reiterated the 10 year cut-off for Treaty settlements and called for claims to be filed within six months (NZPA 2002a), and was symbolised by a pōhutukawa in a terracotta pot, ostensibly to underscore the party’s “zero tolerance for crime”. A further vigilante pōhutukawa was
planted near Waitangi Day 2005, its tag inscribed “one nation”, although unclear as to whether this was a sentiment or reference to the political party of this name (Eames 2005b)\(^97\), and swiftly followed by another pōhutukawa from broadcaster Paul Holmes, promoting his new television show (NZPA 2005c). In contrast, the summit was also used as a site for the “Māori Flag” for Waitangi Day 2007, with overt permission by Ngāti Whātua following Transit’s refusal to allow it atop the Harbour Bridge (Stokes and Bartlett 2007, Ihaka 2007b). Situated in the annual intensified coverage of Māori-Pākehā politics surrounding the day, that year focused on the flag (Rankine et al. 2007), this permission articulated the mountain to the hapū and to Māori politics more broadly.

While immediately called out as a publicity stunt\(^98\) (e.g. Rudman 2005a), Holmes’ mountaintop gesture was made in the name of a pervading sentiment backgrounded references to the hill, ‘it was time for Auckland City Council and Ngati Whatua to decide what would replace the 125-year-old Monterey pine’ (NZPA 2005c). A NZPA article about a guerrilla swingball set on the summit the following day similarly contrasted the limitations seemingly imposed by Ngāti Whātua with the waiting healthy saplings and resource consent (NZPA 2005b, see also Eames 2005a)\(^99\). Throughout these Ngāti Whātua are predominantly portrayed as an obstacle to the broader interests of the city. This was most strikingly expressed in an editorial arguing both Smith and the hapū had needlessly politicised the otherwise neutral tree and its replacement:

> It is more than 10 years since an angry young man\(^100\) stole up the slopes of One Tree Hill with a chainsaw and did the ultimately fatal damage to an Auckland landmark. Until that morning the elegant solitary pine that had featured on so many depictions of the city had been free of any political associations. But from the moment it was vandalised in the name of Māori protest its fate, and eventually the matter of its replacement, acquired an unfortunate and quite unnecessary political taint (2005d).

As Phlean (2009) notes, these anonymous editorials represent the voice of the newspaper and carry particular weight. Here, Ngāti Whātua are explicitly taken from alignment with the city, ‘as aggrieved as non-Māori at the insult done to its skyline’ to opposition to the good of

---

\(^97\) A “One New Zealand Foundation” has existed in the late 1980s, and were quoted in the Herald regarding ACT’s 1999 proclamation (Daniels 1999).

\(^98\) A council arboriculture manager notes that the summit is “periodically” subject to similar unauthorised “replantings” (NZPA 2005a).

\(^99\) A satire days after the swingball set further highlighted the convoluted legal protection of the site and RMA negotiations in general (Beston 2005b).

\(^100\) As Smith was 36 at the time, this fits more closely with McCreanor’s ‘young… aggressive, lazy, unemployed and shiftless’ than his actual age.
city and volcano, both of which would be otherwise politically neutral\textsuperscript{101} if not for this “stirring” (Moeweka Barnes et al. 2012).

This editorial, and other presentations of iwi interests and the volcanoes can be usefully understood through the lens of articulation (Laclau and Mouffe 1985), charting the articulated alignment of iwi interests against or alongside the volcanoes and/or the city itself. It also resonates with a wider trope positing Māori interests, and Treaty Claims in particular, as irritations that hold up the smooth running of mainstream endeavours (Abel, McCleanor, and Moeweka Barnes 2012). This is echoed with relation to the Māori objections to the proposed reforming of Puketutu Island with biosolids (treated human waste) from the nearby sewerage plant. Rudman explicitly dismisses objections relating to the biosolids’ origin, stating ‘[t]he only winner is the Māori spirit world’ (Rudman 2009f), while the scatological resonances of the conflict meant that explanations of the island’s sacredness, “mana”, “wahi tapu” and their tie to the island, were placed alongside reference to “poo tax”—an issue raised, named and denied over the space of two \textit{Herald} articles (Gibson 2009b, a).

The theme of iwi interest as opposed to volcanic welfare is also seen regarding the tentative nomination of Auckland’s field as a UNESCO site (see chapter six). The announcement of the field’s inclusion on the tentative list was planned for a 2007 ceremony on Maungawhau, postponed, the Herald claimed, on the advice of an ‘annoyed’ Ngāti Whātua (Tahana 2007a) who ‘suddenly decided they had not been sufficiently consulted’ (Rudman 2007e). The actions of the hapū are positioned in opposition to the volcanoes’ wellbeing and the interests of Auckland itself. Rudman claims, ‘surely if there is anything every Aucklander can see eye to eye on it’s the need for every extra bit of protection and recognition our mountains can get’. This intended tentative nomination was strikingly juxtaposed with iwi politics, due to be put forth within days of the release of the Wainwright report (Waitangi Tribunal 2007). Such timing allowed Rudman to re-envision Wainwright, from acknowledgement of multiple iwi interests to articulation with the supposed universality of UNESCO listing (Warner 2008) and idea that the sites belonged “to no tribe” (Rudman 2007a) in particular. While Ngāti Whātua soon expressed support for the tentative listing (Tahana 2007b), no news of the nomination was given until 2011, presented as ‘reignited work that was stalled by Treaty negotiations’ (Tahana 2011b)\textsuperscript{102}.

\textsuperscript{101} Smith (cited in Macdonald 1995) recounts how he heard others discussing the tree in terms of Pakeha oppression prior to his 1994 attack: this “neutrality” was not universal.

\textsuperscript{102} The language of this last article was largely celebratory, however, referencing ‘the maunga’ (see below), while Finlayson notes that “For iwi [nomination] would increase the mana of the cones.”
Rudman’s disapproval of the Tāmaki Collective settlement, while noting the separation of the 11 raised cones from the wider field (Rudman 2010a, b see discussion below) also paints this as a separation of the volcanoes from everyday Aucklanders. It is characterised as “handing over” the volcanoes into “private hands” in a manner that would “spit on” those who had donated them to public ownership. In contrast, an op-ed response from Sir Graham (2010) posits a shift in those who hold the cones in “trust” for all Aucklanders. This echoes other official reference to the Tāmaki Collective settlement in underscoring that Aucklanders would have continued access to sites involved. Finlayson (and Prime Minister Key following him) states, ‘What effect would this change have on the public? None. Public access remains the same, and that’s an important bottom line’ (Finlayson 2010).

This distinction can be read in the context of the Foreshore and Seabed conflict, which West-Newman notes tapped into Pākehā nostalgia for beachside experiences and pervasive topophilic love of these spaces, but transformed and inflamed by fear at their imagined loss (West-Newman 2008, 171). This resonates with Laclau and Mouffe’s (1985) identification of antagonistic conflict as stemming from the prevention of some aspect of identity, such as visiting a much-loved space or the perception of ownership. In Graham’s summary the volcanoes remain explicitly unseparated from Pākehā activity, an invitation to expand understanding of existing identity rather than a zero-sum transfer of ownership. He uses two charismatic volcanoes to illustrate this: concluding a history of Maungakiekie with ‘It is hardly surprising there are 12 iwi/hapū who today regard Maungakiekie as their maunga’, and presenting the tradition of “Te Ipu a Mataoho” at Maungawhau. A Pākehā worldview that accepts co-existing Māori understandings is presented as attainable and even normal to the Herald’s readers: ‘[m]ost of us appreciate that indigenous peoples see land as part of their very existence and it gives them a right to belong to that area’.

In general, once signed, the agreement was met with support from many Herald writers. An editorial (2010b) celebrated the deal as a credit to tribes’ leadership, recalling a similar editorial (2006a) praising Ngāti Whātua’s leaders for their “finesse” “skill and goodwill” in 2006. Contrasting Rudman, (Rudman 2010b) the 2010 editorial begins by equating Māori ownership with the wellbeing of the cones, which ‘have not always enjoyed the protection and respect they are likely to be accorded now…’. The following Saturday edition was celebratory, particularly two special features: “Summits of achievement” (Barton 2010) and “a voice to move mountains” (Tahana 2010a), focusing on Paul Majurey of Marutūāhu and Ngarimu Blair of Ngāti Whātua respectively. Both utilise humorous, colloquial language that puts relatable faces to these political struggles, while the importance of the volcanoes is presented in similarly personal ways, such as Majurey’s "I told them with some frustration,
'We'll do whatever it takes to make sure Maungawhau does not go into the exclusive ownership of one tribe.' It was heartfelt." Subsequent portrayals of the settlement itself tend towards supportive, including Tahana’s ‘Tribes get islands back, then give them away’ (Tahana 2011a), a remarkable contrast to the fear of Māori gaining exclusive access to the familiar (Rankine et al. 2007). Articles around the initialling of the Deed of Settlement were similarly positive, and Treaty Minister Chris Finlayson is quoted, 

"This will be the first time Auckland’s iconic volcanic cones will have had an integrated management plan, which will benefit the people of Auckland and build on the work already done in investigating the possibility of the maunga being designated a Unesco World Heritage site" (Bennett 2012).

The Māori ownership of the cones is now equated with the wellbeing of the cones and of benefit to Auckland itself.

More broadly, has the Tāmaki Collective settlement resulted in a change in the presentation of the volcanoes? While its signing occurred towards the end of the period studied, there seems some shift in the use of iwi sources in relation to volcanic protection. In particular, quotes from Māori not immediately countered with statements from other sources are rare prior to the Tāmaki Settlement. Māori struggles in the Environment Court in relation to Matukutūreia and Te Motu a Hiaroa/Puketutu, for example, include quotes from iwi representatives regarding the significance of the sites concerned, but this is in the context of conflict (Gibson 2009a), including between iwi (Gibson 2009b). It is often countered with opposing statements from other sources (Gibson 2009c, Thompson 2001) including, in the former, the authority of the Judge concerned (Gibson 2004). They are difficult to read as an alignment of iwi sources with the site; instead, iwi are presented as one voice amongst many and sometimes explicitly challenged.

When they have occurred it tended to be in “lifestyle” articles or special features, or when the connection between iwi and a site had been already officially recognised. Where iwi sources are aligned with the volcanoes it is often following official recognition. Unsurprisingly, then, Ngāti Whātua was most frequently used as a source regarding the cones. Ngāti Whātua o Ōrākei kaumātua Sir Hugh Kawharu was an established and respected spokesperson regarding Maungakiekie until his death in 2006. Later, Ngarimu Blair represented the hapū with regard to the landscaping of Puketāpapa’s cycleway a project with the hapū’s direct involvement (Dearlaney 2009a), and the removal of cattle from Maungawhau (Tahana
Blair, who lived on the old caretakers hut at Maungawhau, was heavily involved with activity relating to the maunga. This included work with FOM and MAG, and “stakeholder” meetings regarding Project Maungawhau, some of which I attended.

While rare, the proffered statements were frequently used to good advantage in re-envisioning the volcano or issue concerned. Blair notes the cattle on Maungawhau as “trampling over the layers of our heritage for too long” (Tahana 2009b); re-presenting the site as “heritage”, while in the Saturday special he characterises himself as “the first Maori back on the pa for two centuries” the maunga as “like our Stonehenge, our pyramids” (Cumming 2005a), and notes “All of these places are our marae” (2005b); equivalence with sites of established heritage value, as discussed chapter six, but with a particularly Maori cast.

As celebratory as these are, coverage of Turei’s hīkoi included pointed reference to ‘the Maori still buried on the hill, once called Ohuiarangi. And those whose bones were uncovered when quarrying greatly reduced the volcanic cone’s bulk’
Following the initial Tāmaki Collective signing, Māori are more commonly used as sources for the news articles concerning the cones’ protection. Majurey chastises the delay in the bus ban on Maungawhau, backed by FoM, though in the context of controversy with tour bus operators (Dearlaney 2011b); Malcolm Paterson, Ngāti Whātua heritage manager, explains during Love Your Mountain day, ‘It’s been open slather on the top for a long time…The bus ban is acknowledgment that the mountain is more than just a cheap commons for commercial tour operators to bring tourists to at no charge for a quick stop, quick view and a cigarette, and move on’ (Thompson 2011b). An article regarding the installation of judder bars on the mountain does not quote iwi but, notably, a future bus ban is discussed by a Council sports and recreation manager in the context of the Tāmaki Collective’s impending governance (Dearlaney 2011c).

Contractor damage to several volcanoes explicitly aligns the mountains with Māori concern, drawing on Blair’s “horrific” (Davison 2010) and quoting his denouncement of the two weeks ‘between the work happening and us finding out’, an implied statement that what happens on the volcanoes should be relayed to Māori interests106. Blair criticises the damage in a further article, accompanied by Street from the AVCS, an apologetic culture and recreation committee chairman, and a representative from the Historic Places Trust: authorities aligned in condemnation (Koubaridis 2010). Coverage of the eventual fining of the Council over the damage emphasised the importance of the archaeological sites and significance to iwi. It concluded with a victim impact statement from Ngāi Tai Ki Tāmaki Trust spokesman Dave Beamish, arguing ‘the battle sites were as sacred to Maori as Gallipoli was to the Anzacs or Culloden to the Scottish’, and Blair, who ‘said the maunga (volcanic cones) were of profound significance to local iwi. Their human-made features were a tangible reminder of the industry and innovation of ancestors’ (Orsman 2011b).

**Te reo Māori in Herald presentation of the volcanoes**

This recent use of iwi authorities regarding volcanic damage can be potentially contrasted with previous lack, where spokespeople from groups such as the AVCS were the immediate and sufficient sources with relevance to the volcanoes. The Tāmaki settlement seems to offer a context in which the welfare of the volcanoes is aligned with Māori concern, with iwi operating as officially legitimised sources rather than marginalised political spokespeople. Given its lateness in the period studied, and the nonlinear occurrence of preservation-
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106 Under the Protected Objects Act 1975 uncovered artefacts are the property of the Crown until their correct owners are determined. The question of “treasure hunters” therefore does not relate to the cone’s iwi ownership; its presentation, I argue, may.
In a context where Te Reo Māori is treated as dependant on and “appendix” to New Zealand English (NZE) (Degani 2010, 192) its presence or absence in NZE, and in news media particularly, is political (e.g. Macalister 2007b, Kennedy 2001). This is situated in wider history of language within Aotearoa. While some new colonists made an effort to learn Te Reo, borrowing a number of words into English that mostly encompassed flora, fauna and objects specific to Aotearoa, the use of “borrowed” Te Reo remained static for over a century after this. During this time the health of Te Reo among Māori decreased, facilitated by deliberate restriction through changes to the education system; Pākehā monopolisation of crucial domains such as justice, health, and commerce (Rankine et al. 2009, 175); urbanisation, and the breakup of established communities (de Bres 2011). From the late 1970s a revitalisation of Te Reo began, this time as a result of Māori initiatives and pressure (e.g. Rankine et al. 2009, Macalister 2006a, 2007b). In 1986 the newly strengthened Waitangi Tribunal supported a claim that the Crown had not sufficiently met its Treaty obligations to maintain the welfare of Te Reo. This prompted the Māori Language Act 1987; Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori/The Māori Language Commission (MLC); the belated recognition of Te Reo as the second of New Zealand’s official languages (Macalister 2006c); and increasing government work through the MLC and Te Puni Kökiri/Ministry of Māori Development (TPK) towards goals including increased use of Te Reo by Māori and a broader valuing of the language with Aotearoa (Rankine et al. 2009, de Bres 2009).

Despite this, recent attention to Te Reo still notes it as “in crisis” (Kawharu 2014), particularly with the ageing of many fluid speakers. Its existing usage is infrequent. Rankine et al (2009) study “deliberate” use of Te Reo in New Zealand newspapers: terms and place names where an English alternative is available. They focus on “Māori news” articles, often containing considerably higher use of Te Reo than other articles (Degani 2010, Macalister 2007b), but found an average of only one or two uses per article. Many articles had none, (Rankine et al. 2009, 187), and nearly a third of this limited use was either “iwi”, “marae”, or “Pākehā”. 

Degani (2010) additionally emphasises increased celebration of te reo Māori within NZE as part of national identity, a point of difference in a global context.
The deliberate use of Te Reo therefore functions as a signifier of the language itself in addition to its denotation. Macalister (2007b) lists a number of potential reasons why Te Reo may enter into a given NZE text. These include economy or clarity of expression, particularly when no easy synonym is available; expression of identity as Māori (e.g. Kennedy 2001, Ngaha 2014) or New Zealander, with borrowed Te Reo a distinctive feature of NZE; to impact upon the audience, including political effect or humorous hybrid neologisms; “cultural reference”, including marked preference for Te Reo when concerning Māori cultural context, suggested as motivated by “referee design”, shifting language to meet the perceived audience (Macalister 2007b, 502, Bell 1991), and “displaying empathy”, signalling a favourable attitude toward Māori or Māori causes (see also Berg and Kearns 1996, Kearns and Berg 2002). Use of Te Reo may also indicate support for the revitalisation of the language itself (Kennedy 2001), while as Irirapeti Ramsden notes, ‘It is possible to estimate the level of political consciousness of people by the way they use and apply names’ (Ramsden in Berg and Kearns 1996, 292-3). The use of Te Reo can, I argue, therefore itself be articulatory, with the potential to tie an object and the claims made about it with Māori concerns, culture and worldview.

**Naming**

Berg and Kearns (1996) emphasise the importance of naming as “norming”. This creates an environment filled with specific semiotic presence that can pass as simple description, background, just as Wakefield felt that place names contributed to “the moral atmosphere” of a country (Macalister 2006b, 42). The re-naming of places has long been recognised as part of a colonial process (e.g. Carter 1987). In Auckland, many volcanoes were renamed following a ‘limited range of obvious motivations’ (Macalister 2006b, 51) common throughout the new nation: honouring significant colonial figures, after features of geography, and the limited and often anglicised adoption of Māori names. Those near initial settlement areas were often named for patrons (Hayward, Murdoch, and Maitland 2011), such as Mount Victoria, Mount Albert and Albert Park, Mount Hobson, Mount St John and Mount Wellington108. Mount Richmond is named after the general who selected the area for a defensive village of retired soldiers (Fowlds 1964), and Panmure Basin for the family name of a British Secretary of War. Volcanoes further out, and some volcanic basins and islands, were designated for or by their new colonial owners. This includes Taylor Hill, McLennan Hills, Mount Roberston, Styaks Swamp, Mount Gabriel, and Brown’s Island. Some have

108 “Mount Roskill” is unknown, although a local story places it as “Mount rascal” after rumoured sheep hustlers (Craig 2005).
since been superseded by Māori, for example Puketutu (Weekes’ Island) and Maungataketake (Ellett’s Mountain). Mount Māngere was listed by Hochstetter as Mount Elliot, but renamed for a Māori name for the area, not the cone itself. With the exception of the reigning monarch, then, many of these were typical of a trend that was both colonial and masculine (Berg and Kearns 1996). Of the second category, North Head, Three Kings, and Little Rangitoto can be linked to features of geography, while Pigeon Mountain is thought to be named for the kererū who flocked there.

Cameron et al. emphasise the significance of what these colonial designations replaced:

> The hills and mountains of the region were dominant features in a landscape which was intimately known by its inhabitants, and in which every feature was named. These names, which lay over the land in an intricate mosaic, reflected a millennium of human occupation. They described the topography of the land, its natural resources and their usage. They also commemorated specific ancestors and traditions... To those familiar with them, these names and their historical associations act as “tohu” or symbols that are central to the identity of the region’s tribal groups and reminders of the past. In conjunction with tradition they bring the natural and archaeological landscape to life (Cameron, Hayward, and Murdoch 1998, 77).

While “Rangitoto” is frequently interpreted as reflecting volcanic origin, the “bloody sky” used so ominously in Under The Mountain, alternative meanings “Te Rangi-i-Totonga-a-Tamatekapua” and “Ngā Tuaitara-a-Taikehu” references significant ancestral figures. Ngāpona-toru-a-Peretū/“the three knuckles of Peretū” is also ancestral, recently officially acknowledged as the name for the island’s triple summit (2013). The very names of Auckland’s “icon”, then, are intertwined with complex cultural background and contemporary identity (2012a, Thompson 2012b). The recognition of these names has frequently been an important part of postcolonial restitution (Macalister 2006b), and is part of the Tāmaki Collective settlement and the Ngāti Whātua settlement before this, facilitating a change of 18 official names and creation of two others (2013).

Within media, there are well-established grooves into which indigenous place names can be slotted. Harlow (2005, 140) notes a broader tendency to assume ‘the Māori name is the real name for a place because of chronological priority, so it should be borrowed into English’. He critiques this tendency as characterising indigenous use as irrelevant until adopted. This temporary invocation of authenticity is used in travel articles, including within the Herald, where the writer reveals a Māori name alongside other interesting facts or features (Moore
In line with Macalister’s observation of Te Reo used “for effect” (Macalister 2007b), it may further be utilised to provide gravitas: Rudman’s (2006b, see also 2006b) use of “Rangipuke” instead of the more familiar Albert Park re-presents an historical site worthy of protection beneath the familiar flowerbeds and statues.

Despite this, in-text use of the volcanoes’ Māori names is comparatively rare and markedly uneven. As a rough indication, a search for these across all digitised Herald content showed “Maungawhau” and “Maungakiekie” with 139 uses in 84 articles and 83 in 68 articles respectively. These considerably exceeded the third most present, Maungarei, used 21 times over a dozen articles, many of which were quotes from the Stonefields redevelopment court cases. “Maungakiekie” was often used in articles relating to the politics surrounding its summit, echoing observations of more frequent use of Te Reo for “Māori Issues”, and on one occasion incorrectly glossed as “the tōtara that stands alone” (Orsman 2000a, see also NZPA 2008a). “Maungawhau”’s use, in contrast, can be related to the charismatic volcano’s high official and local attention, including Hubbard’s “Project Maungawhau”. Its broader use is boosted by local business endeavours and community work (see chapter five), including an annual arts festival and activity by the “Friends of Maungawhau” and the “Maungawhau Advisory Group”, the names of which add an additional eighteen uses within the Herald.

Although Maungawhau and Maungakiekie are “iconic” volcanoes with frequent coverage, and Rangitoto’s official name-change a focus for change across the entire field (Thompson 2012b, 2012a), use of Te Reo does not simply reflect the result of a number of articles concerning a volcano. The meagre use of Puketāpapa demonstrates this: four uses in the dozens of articles directly concerning its preservation, the first within a quote from MP Phil Goff (Young 2003). Despite the mountain being the subject of such intense media coverage, and also used to name the local council board, “Puketāpapa” was never present without some form of gloss or explanation. Indeed, the attempted renaming of a nearby shopping centre as “Puketapapa Village Centre” was explained as being after the local board itself, not the overlooking mountain (Thompson 2010). Given that Māori names have historically been given to suburbs or townships on the margins of society, physically and economically (Berg and Kearns 1996, Macalister 2007a), it is interesting that the suburbs surrounding
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109 As such excluding the City of Fire inserts. The sections within these that describe individual volcanoes almost all include some form of name in Te Reo.

110 Berg and Kearns (1996, 104) compare place-names ‘such as Mission Bay, Parnell, and Remuera’ to ‘Mangere, Otahuhu, or Papatoetoe’, arguing the former as ‘associated with elite landscapes of wealthy, ‘white’, Pakeha (heterosexual) families; the latter with landscapes of marginalised poor, working-class, Maori and Pacific Islanders’. Suburbs such as Takapuna and Kohimarama are notable
Maungawhau are relatively central and wealthy (e.g. Crampton, Salmond, and Kirkpatrick 2004), hinting at revitalisation of this particular use of Te Reo gaining class-based overtones.

Use in official and organisation communications echoes the tendency, also noted below in relation to “maunga”, for Te Reo to be used in professional and advocate circles before its adoption into media. Use of Te Reo in council and community groups matches my experience speaking to members of Friends of Maungawhau and other advocates, where “maunga” and “Maungawhau” are markedly more common. Indeed, I notice my own limited use of Te Reo shifting throughout the writing of this thesis with repeated contact with advocates and academic literature, old drafts appearing almost artificially monolingual. “Correct” use of Te Reo may be de rigueur in some professional circles. As a magazine columnist told Macalister (cited in De Bres 2010, 3), correct pronunciation of Māori words ‘can make the difference between being taken for a Neanderthal bozo and getting on a polytech payroll’. Newspaper linguistic conservatism has been tied to their traditional self-perception ‘as guardians of correct English’ (Davies and Maclagan 2006, 74), and can further be interpreted as matching idioms to anticipated mainstream readership (Hall et al. 1978, Matheson 2007).

In contrast to generally meagre use, Te Reo names were frequently presented in the context of Auckland’s Treaty settlements. The majority of the 15 uses of “Puketapapa” stemmed from its inclusion in Ngāti Whātua’s planned settlement, then that of the Tāmaki Collective. Some were almost exclusively used in these articles, such as “Te Kopuke” to reference Mount St John111; “Matukutururu” (Wiri Mountain) and “Takarunga” (Mount Victoria); while Ohinerau and “Ohuiarangi” (Mount Hobson and Pigeon Mountain respectively) each only appeared once in digitised articles outside this context. Interestingly, on the occasions that Māori names appear with a gloss, this almost always linguistically prioritised Te Reo: the first in a pairing or with the European name offered in brackets. Yet, their presence in these articles is ritualised, appearing in list-form, often with Māori and European pairings in uniform format. This occurred for the three maunga in Ngāti Whātua’s settlement (e.g. ‘Three of the cones - Maungakiekie (One Tree Hill), Puketapapa (Mt Roskill) and Maungawhau (Mt Eden) - are included….’ (Booker 2007, see also Falconer 2007, Tahana 2007b, Barton 2006b, Tahana 2007a), but became more obvious in relation to the much greater Tāmaki settlement, in-text (Thompson 2012b) or below the body of the article (Bennett 2012, Tahana 2010b, 2011b). As Davis and Maclagan note, the presence of a gloss for a term implicates it

exceptions to this, and Remuera is itself an Anglicisation of “Remu wera”, commonly referring to Mount Hobson (Hayward, Murdoch, and Maitland 2011).

111 Digital Herald text typically does not utilise macrons. “Titikopuke” further occurred once, in a list-form regarding Plan 192 (McKenzie-minifie 2007).
as potentially unfamiliar (2006); marking it as “other” from the imagined community of readers. List-style portrayal is similarly removed from the flow of article text, formal recitation with an air of abnormality. The Tāmaki Collective Settlement has altered the presence of some names, then, but thus-far in a minimal way.

The use of “maunga”

The Tāmaki Collective also facilitated the use of “maunga” in relation to the volcanoes. Stunningly, in the 42 Herald articles using this over the period studied, 31 of these were from 2010 onwards. “Maunga” can be understood as a synonym for “mountain, mount [or] peak” (Moorfield 2014), as with all Māori nouns encompassing the plural. It comprises parts of the names of several volcanoes such as Maungawhau, Maungakiekie, Maungataketake and Maungauika, where “puke” can be seen in others, meaning “hill” (Moorfield 2014). This is glossed in around half of the articles studied, consistent through time, suggesting it may be unfamiliar to some readers but not wholly unknown. This is borne out by Macalister’s studies of New Zealand high school and retirement-age “University of the Third Age” (U3A) students, where “maunga” was correctly identified by 51.5% of U3A respondents and 61% and 63.4% of high school students in 2002 and 2007 respectively (Macalister 2007c, Macalister 2008), suggesting it as “likely to be familiar to a majority of speakers of New Zealand English”.

In relation to Auckland’s volcanoes, its early use in the Herald is also almost exclusively quotes from specialist use by officials, council documents or the environment court. Its first appearance seems almost to ridicule it as “jargon”: ‘The jargon just flows. "With the pine gone, there is a perception of an imbalance between the natural and built form of the maunga"…but enough of being mean’ (Rudman 2001g, see also Rudman 2003a). A 2004 article (Gibson 2004) barely paraphrases an Environment Court ruling, itself a summary of evidence given by Tuherea Kaihau, Chairman of Ngāti Te Ata, while a travel article presents it as an etymology of “Maungakiekie”: an interesting and exotic fact (Jeffrey 2004). It is not until 2007 when “maunga” is used in a journalist’s own voice (Rudman 2007d). The term seemed to add gravitas to this advocate article, written a month after the Wainwright report was extensively quoted by the same author (Rudman 2007a). The next use of “maunga” by a Herald writer, outside of quotations or paraphrase, is by Tahana in 2009 (Tahana 2009a) with reference to what will become the Tāmaki Collective negotiations.

112 U3A students were exclusively Pākehā, so Macalister compared their results to Pākehā students, exhibiting 59% recognition in 2002 and 62.8% in 2007. Maori and Pacific Island students were more likely to recognise words in Te Reo, with 88.5% of the 2007 Maori and 77.4% 2007 Pacific students recognising “maunga”.
The term is evidently in use in official circles as well as amongst others who speak and promote Te Reo, most frequently and naturally in guest articles - eleven times by Sir Douglas Graham (Graham 2010), seven by councillor Glenda Fryer (Fryer 2010), and Glenday from FoM (Glenday 2011). Professional and advocate use frequently appears natural, such Janneen Love (2012) from the Auckland War Memorial Museum’s presentation of Maungawhau as her “happy place” - ‘when I’ve been homesick in the past I’ve headed up the maunga with my daughter’ - or Councillor Coney’s criticism of “intensification” as ‘the Holy Grail before which everything has to bow down, heritage, maunga, whatever ...’ (Coney 2007b). Aside from guest articles and places where a source’s language is used in quotes or paraphrase (2012c), the term is used almost exclusively in connection with the Tāmaki Collective settlement process. Many these articles are written by Yvonne Tahana, in many cases explaining the term initially in an article with subsequent uses unglossed. This represents a process of normalisation of “maunga” in relation to the Tāmaki Collective, culminating in passing mention of ‘the Tamaki Collective maunga deal’ without further explanation (Tahana 2012).

The presence of a gloss offers an opportunity to chart a changing explanation that reveals “maunga” gaining increasingly specific usage as “volcanic cones”. In this it is akin to “hīkoi”, meaning “to step, stride, march, walk” (Moorfield 2014) but which became quickly popularised as a loanword more specifically in relation to peaceful protest, particularly after the 1998 Hikoi of Hope (Davies and Maclagan 2006). Very early explanations of “maunga”, including an op-ed by Majurey (2007), gloss the term as “mountain” or “mountains”. The one exception (Barton 2007a) can be read as a demonstration of unfamiliarity, ‘Auckland’s iconic sites or maunga' presumably drawn from a nearby quote from legal representative for Te Kawerau ā Maki, ‘cross claims are not limited to the iconic maunga’. From 2009 some describe maunga as “volcanic cones”, including a press release by Treaty minister Paul Finlayson (2010) and the Prime Minister’s Waitangi Day speech that echoes this (Key 2010). After the February 2010 special features that followed the initial signing of the settlement, all subsequent explanations were “volcanic cones” (Thompson 2012b, Bennett 2012, Thompson 2012a, Tahana 2011a, Orsman 2011a, b, Tahana 2010c) or “volcanic peaks” (Tahana and Orsman 2010).

This is particularly significant as a digital Herald search beyond references to Auckland’s volcanoes returned only 20 additional in-text uses 2000-2012, only five of these not quotes,
pepeha\textsuperscript{113} or the names of events\textsuperscript{114}. This is not simply a synonym working its way into the language of the press, then, but predominantly used in the context of the Tāmaki Collective settlement, and presented in a specific way. Repetition of this distinct usage may be facilitated by a drive towards factual correctness (Allan 2010, 1995), with evident degree of sharing between articles. For example, ‘The Government agreed two years ago that 14 maunga or volcanic cones, including Maungakiekie/One Tree Hill, Maungawhau/Mt Eden and Mt Albert’ was shared between Bennett (2012) and Thompson (2012b), and “11 volcanic cones or maunga in Auckland” (Tahana 2011a, Thompson 2012a). As such, it reflects Macalister’s (2007b) point that Te Reo may be used with regard to “Māori issues” partly because it may more accurately represent subtleties destroyed in translation. It may also indicate an unfamiliarity or discomfort with the words on the part of writers. This drive for factual correctness is not exclusive to news media, however, and the equivalence between “maunga” and “volcanic cones” has is made in other notable sites. “Maunga” is defined in the Ngā Mana Whenua o Tāmaki Makaurau Collective Redress Act 2014 for the purposes of the act as the list of volcanic cones involved; while a recent journal article on the governance of Auckland’s volcanic risk notes the importance of “volcanoes (maunga)” to whakapapa soon after its reference to the Tāmaki Collective settlement (Murray, McDonald, and Cronin 2015, 451).

In the broader discussion of the volcanoes, “Maunga” articulates volcanic cones with Māori interests even as these interests are simultaneously increasingly acknowledged officially. As detailed in the following chapter, “volcano” as a signifier is heavily and often vividly loaded. Auckland’s volcanic cones, similarly, are familiar forms within the landscape, the site of numerous memories and with an officially acknowledged connection with “urban nature”. In both instances “maunga” is a “breaking of the chain” (Hall 1995, 19) that allows for the articulation of these sites with a different network of meaning. This occurs swiftly, through a near-synonym that, in a 21\textsuperscript{st} century New Zealand linguistic context, also signifies “Māori” by its very form.

“Maunga” as a variant of “mountain” does not inherently encompass all volcanoes. Rudman’s criticism of the settlement highlights attention to the raised, “elite” volcanoes without accompanying incorporation of other volcanic features (Rudman 2010a). This occurs in a context where concern has previously gravitated towards charismatic volcanic cones,

\textsuperscript{113} Tribal sayings (Ngaha 2014).

\textsuperscript{114} One of these is in a feature regarding the Hauraki Collective (Cumming 2012), a group developed simultaneously with and overlapping with Ngā Mana Whenua. Two others concerned Hikurangi, one the burial of the Maori Queen at Tāupiri maunga, and another explaining pepeha at a Kohunga Reo in the context of “Salvation through racial pride and self-awareness”.
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with Rudman's own media campaign focused on preservation on the basis of volcanic origin as a counter to this (see chapter six). This does not inherently limit the impact of the contemporary shifts, or volcanic protection. As seen with regard to “volcanic cones” and the 1915 Act, such technical limitations need not be prohibitive. As with the use of sublime thrill to promote risk minimisation, discussed in the following chapter, articulated emotion need not strictly follow logical channels (Williamson 1978). The present and future articulation of Tāmaki Collective ownership with World Heritage Status for the field may, for example, encompass other features within this building equivalence between volcanic cone and Māori interest, as may future additions to integrated management. However, with the Tāmaki Collective settlement having barely passed into law as this is written, the future trajectories of the shifts illustrated above remain to be seen.

**An undetermined conclusion**

The portrayal of the volcanoes in relation to Māori has shifted throughout the period studied. Discussion of Maungakiekie’s summit around the turn of the century embodied a number of the rhetorical tropes noted in wider criticism of media portrayal of Māori, the summit itself becoming an overdetermined symbol of Māori-Pākehā relations more broadly. The symbol of a “new tree” on the hill is a preoccupation within the period that is tied to Māori-Pākehā relations in general, but also settlement regarding volcanic cones within Auckland in particular. The vesting of the cones themselves is used as a powerful symbol for Treaty settlements within the country. Physically, this is seen on the summit of Maungawhau with the presence of Tāmaki Hīkoi members (see chapter six), but it is also indicated in increased use of Tāmaki Collective members as sources with regard to issues impacting volcanic maunga. This realignment is most vividly seen in the abrupt increase in “maunga” within the newspaper emerging in frequent use in the context of the Tāmaki Collective settlement and often glossed as “volcanic cones” rather than the traditional “mountain”. Unlike “volcanic cones”, it situates the volcanoes within a Māori framework. This tendency may increase as legislation is passed and formal ownership and management entered into.

Of all representations of the volcanoes throughout this thesis, then, articulation with contemporary Māori has been most subject to change, with structural factors in place that suggest it is likely to change further within the future. Given the cones’ visual prominence throughout the city (see chapter five), their continued articulation with Māori concerns may act as a powerful daily indicator of Māori identity, with time facilitating Aucklanders and visitors to the city to, like Davis, see “a Māori city in many ways”.
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8: Volcanoes that threaten: the imagination of disaster

“Many people who have not been up a cone think that they are just hills. I was blown away to get to the top and see a real crater. Auckland is so lucky…—Ian (Kerikeri), commentary (2011d)

The new utilisation of “maunga” is so important in part because of the very strong alignment of the volcanoes with “nature”. In chapter five I discussed this in terms of resonance with natural signifiers. Here I note the other element of this – geological origin, and the persistence of an image that it itself deeply tied to the charisma of volcanic fire.

While ascending Mount Māngere in March 2012, after hours of walking Ihumatao Stonefields and along the Watercare Coastal Walkway, my companion advised me on the content of my thesis. I travelled with my niece, Geraldine, eight years old at the time, and her counsel was to focus more on explaining volcanic eruption. It was a valid point: Auckland’s volcanoes are, after all, volcanoes, and volcanoes erupt. Throughout much of this thesis I resisted fixating on what seemed the obvious. As places they are complex, many things to many people, and this multiplicity fascinated me the most, especially in what seems so solid and familiar. Yet, when mention my project to others, academic and otherwise, the fiery eruptiveness of new volcanoes is so often what captures their imagination. Green and pastoral as many are, by virtue of being volcanoes, Auckland’s volcanoes are haunted by the imagination of fire. The ghosts of eruptions past, future and present-but-elsewhere inhabit them and their representations, and walking upon Māngere my niece did not ask me about what grew here, who lived here, or about any specific feature, but fiery events long ago concluded.

The imagined origin of volcanoes is well-practiced, spectacle so often experienced prosthetically in movies, documentaries, international news. An image of “volcano” has built up, overlaying the diversity of Auckland’s volcanoes with imagined form and process. At first sight, my highlighting of this volcanic ideal may seem out of place in this thesis, written as it is with a focus on embodied physicality within media text. Yet the persistence, and use, of this ideal fits remarkably well with the lens of nonhuman charisma that I use throughout this thesis. The spectacular charisma of eruption fuels fascination with these images, also facilitating their spread through image and cinematic portrayal. The popularisation of the volcanic ideal has been further facilitated by a sublime aesthetic that is intimately tied to consciousness of human bodily frailty in the face of an overwhelming world.
Duffy (2013) further notes a “poetics of depth” to volcanoes. Fed by contemporary scientific understanding of volcanic process, and combined with bodily limitation, this fosters a brooding fear of “what lies beneath”, but also a pleasurable frission to the imagination of disaster. In a seemingly more sober manner, both coverage, and the institutional context for the scientific discovery itself, relates to the volcanoes as signifiers of and sources of information about volcanic risk. This framing is increasingly ubiquitous in contemporary Western society and a recurring preoccupation in academic discussion of both Western culture and the volcanic. Volcanic danger resonates with understandings of risk, including Beck’s influential theory. It also deviates significantly from it, notably in the extreme imbalance of agency and influence between human and non-human. Such imbalance burns through the ambivalence with which other scientific authorities are often held. Volcanic danger instead takes on a clarity of struggle reminiscent of an action movie; and indeed its presentation is overlaid and blurred with tropes of cinematic disaster. This is not limited to mass media. Within official attempts at public education, such as the Volcanoes! exhibition at Auckland museum, this expansive sublime thrill is paired with a message of risk containment and mitigation. It acts as an illogical articulatory spice that attempts to capture public imagination and bring the invisible, underground volcanic hazard into the realm of experience and plausible imagination.

The volcanic sublime

On the journey Geraldine and I took, from the beginning at the Stonefields, we were tricked. A day-trip to a new part of Auckland, I resisted studying its history beforehand lest my encounter be dominated by confirmation of the anticipated. This enforced semi-naïveté bore fruit as we entered Otuataua’s crater, where I scanned for signs of quarrying. I was unaware the entire “crater” was an artificially landscaped construction shaped as quarrying drew to a close. Originally 64 metres high, the walls of this volcano’s “crater” now curl around a ground-level entrance. A small hill lies near the middle, an homage to the basalt “plug” of nearby Māngere Mountain (Hayward 2001). From satellite the teardrop form of quarrying is recognisable, its point trailing towards the road on which Otuataua’s scoria was removed, but on the ground it seemed to bear all defining signs of the volcanic. While the rebuilt central scoria hill in nearby Māngere Lagoon simulates its predecessor, “decapitated” for the sludge ponds115, Otuataua cuts to the hyperreal essence of “volcano”. Formed from the
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115 The island’s edges are artificially flattened to provide nesting for birds, to Hayward’s disapproval. The geologist has argued a number of times for “restoring the lost volcanic heritage” in the recreation of Puketutu, Three Kings, and others (Hayward 2001), a project that has found some support within the Herald (Rudman 2007f, 2009f) and elsewhere (Rudman 2007g).
model of cone and crater, the site becomes more apparently volcanic than many of the city’s remaining hills. While sensibly lacking eruption, the “lava plug” towards its centre seems a source-point, a reminder of its subterranean origin.

This persistent idea of what volcano should be haunts accounts of the volcanic within wider culture, including the Herald. It is seen in the line of 11 “volcanoes” that top the subterranean Britomart train station, truncated black cones topped with glass that allows visitors to peer into the caverns beneath. It is seen in the quote by “Ian”, opening this chapter, and in Rudman’s argument for the preservation of Ōrākei Basin, emphasising the modest tidal lagoon as really volcanic:

After all, isn't Orakei Basin every bit as much a part of Auckland's unique volcanic field as Mt Roskill? Didn't it belch out gas and magma like its dozens of bigger brothers? Didn't it leave a tell-tale crater once it died down, like the others? (Rudman 2004d, see also Rudman 2007i).

It is also seen in the repeated imagination of eruption, and the synonymity of the volcanic with eruption even if that volcano is “dead”. As one article opens, significantly, “we’re standing on top of a volcano” (Wright 2012b, see also Hoffart 2007, McIntyre 2011, Thomson 2010). The “joke” is that these visits are perfectly safe, and I find myself indulging in it also: springing unexpected volcanoes on family members as we drive across dull-looking Te Hopua basin or overlook the familiar cricket grounds of the Domain. I read incongruities into the scientific reality of studying volcanoes long dead and, sometimes, buried (NZPA 2011, 2008b, Harper 2011b): the strangeness of discovering “new” volcanoes apparently hidden in or under the mundane landscape; the delightfully vague figure of “around 50” volcanoes suggested as the city total (Hayward and Kermode 1994). The latter neatly encompasses debate over eruption points and the possibility of others buried beneath lava flows or ocean, but is bewildering in its suggestion that something as catastrophic as a volcano can be hidden or misplaced (NZPA 2011). Rudman illustrates this through a depiction of imagined tourist responses: ‘City of Sails, ho-hum. World Heritage City of Volcanoes - "Wow. Let's don the hard-hats and go”’ (Rudman 2005c).

This image has a history to it, particularly tied to an artistic and scientific fascination with Etna and Vesuvius that blossomed in the 18th century. Popular interpretations of these stratovolcanoes cemented an image of the volcanic that is particular among the myriad forms that vulcanism can take. Travel accounts often fixated upon the distinctive otherness
of their craters, noting their depth, stench, vastness, and otherworldly terror (Duffy 2013). They also focused on spectacle. The reawakening of Vesuvius into frequent activity from the 1730s further fed the desire for representations of its eruption, including as souvenirs for those who may have witnessed this on their Grand Tour. Sigurdsson (2000) argues that this created a stock formula that continues to influence representations of volcanic eruption more generally. He describes this formula, pioneered by Claude-Joseph Vernet:

…the fiery glow of molten lava is shown silhouetted against the night or ash-darkened sky, with the steely blue cool light of the moon in strong contrast. In the foreground, relatively tiny human figures gesticulate toward the eruption in a mixture of wonder, terror, and admiration (Sigurdsson 2000).

A lithograph in Auckland War Memorial Museum shows the same formula used in representing the 1886 Tarawera eruption, and it is even utilised by Andy Warhol. As Sigurdsson notes, ‘the hallmark of Andy Warhol's Pop Art was to take a mass-media image out of context… An erupting Vesuvius is such a well-known artistic icon that it too approaches a mass-media image.’ Kilauea, the frequent artistic subject of Jules Tavernier, was a less vertiginous shield volcano but contained areas of still-bubbling magma within its caldera. These became features in its frequent representation. Efurt-Cooper (2010b) notes active “lava lakes” as “very rare”, with permanent crater lakes of molten rock especially uncommon. Yet such bubbling cauldrons are part of the quintessential image of volcanoes. Popular sources, such as Willard Price’s Volcano Adventure delve straight into this representation, four in the first 80 pages, including descent into a bubbling crater within a modified diving bell (1973).

This image also as an affective viscerality to it that underlies its persistence. It exploits the ecological charisma of the volcanic, discussed in more detail below. Yet its popularisation can be attributed to a growing fascination with the “sublime” (Sigurdsson 2000). This affect-laden aesthetic has been summarised as an ‘idea of transcendental immensity or greatness… [a] feeling of being overwhelmed [that] dislocates the rational observer (Bell and Lyall 2002, 4). Volcanic eruption was considered by many its incarnation (Duffy 2013) or “stock” image (Hart 1995, 19). Although the concept of the “sublime” has been reworked over centuries (Ray 2005, 3, Bell and Lyall 2002), one of the more persistent and influential interpretations is detailed by Burke in 1757. This intimately tied to human bodily frailty in the face of an often hostile and overpowering environment:

The passions which belong to self-preservation, turn on pain and danger; they are simply painful when their causes immediately affect us; they are delightful when we
have an idea of pain and danger, without being actually in such circumstances… Whatever excites this delight, I call sublime (Burke 2015, 43).

Burke’s text explores situations and places that, to him, provoke these sublime passions. Subsequent philosophical engagements with the concept modify this focus. Kant’s 1790 Critique of Judgement, for example, acknowledges the terror of these situations but emphasises the triumphant ability of reason to encompass and therefore overcome even terrifying worldly situations (Shaw 2006). Yet Clark suggests that even Kant’s transcendental focus endeavours to deal with his own stunned, embodied, response to 1775 Libson Earthquake, a ‘hint of desperation in the canny attempt to redeem dignity from disaster’ (Clark 2011, 92, see also Ray 2005). More recent scholarly interpretations distance the “sublime” even further from the empirica (Ray 2005). However, the seeking out of the sublime in places and physical experience (Duffy 2013) remains popular today (Bell and Lyall 2011).

The physicality behind the imagination of disaster

The viscerality of the sublime experience, strengthened through centuries of practice and reiteration, underscores the affective charisma of volcanic craters and eruption. This is underlain and compounded by the intense ecological charisma of volcanic activity: the strangeness of volcanic centres and the dramatic spectacle of eruption. Such ecological charisma assists and is promoted by mediated representation. It is illustrated in the subjects favoured by Vernet’s stock formula: otherworldliness and the spectacle of fire. The fiery distinctiveness of eruption is further readily simulated through pyrotechnic displays (Daly 2011), needing little explanation or story to indicate their referent. These pyrotechnics share with volcanoes the fascination of fire; hypnotic sources of heat and light that are not only visible but rush insistently into consciousness (Bachelard 1964).

---

116 I follow Wetherell (2012) in eschewing a dichotomy between “social construction” and universality of affect, and the once-popular preoccupation with attempting to determine the status of affective states, such as those associated with the sublime, in terms of the two.” Such attempts serve little purpose if one does not equate “cultural” with “artificial”. Lorimer’s model instead distinguishes between immediate “aesthetic” charisma, and “corporeal” charisma built up over prolonged engagement. Aesthetic charisma acknowledges tendencies towards bodily certain responses but does not artificially separate these from cultural influence. One may be immediately impacted upon by an imposing site, such as a vast crater, without the need to distinguish between cultural predisposition towards such a response and a claim for universal inherency. Other understandings of the relation between “cultural” and “natural” emotion, such as argument for cultural emphasis upon particular affective responses, or alteration of the forms universal responses may take, may equally be accommodated by this understanding.

117 Despite noting a number of historically specific elements to early fireworks performances and plays, Daly notes, ‘...the incendiary pleasures of the eighteenth-century fireworks show never entirely disappear (Daly 2011, 280). Indeed, they returned to Auckland in 2013 with Breath of the Volcano by pyrotechnic artists Groupe F, an explicit reference to the volcanic field beneath.
Volcanic processes are the easiest of geological tales to comprehend, observed or imagined in a timeframe akin to ours (Campbell 2011). While this seems a truism, those interested in pedagogical elements of the earth sciences have long fought against this bodily distinction. This is particularly so regarding immensity of geological time or scale (Jacobi, Bergeron, and Malvesy 1996) where previous bodily experience provides little intuitive footholds and may even form “conceptual barriers” that block comprehension of scientific account. Students frequently explain geological processes through human or animal intervention, volcanoes or earthquakes, ‘catastrophic events’ and not gradual wear over millennia (Kortz and Murray 2009). Yet operating with animalistic speed, volcanoes take on elements of human and animal agency and the impression of dynamic “life”. The language of eruption is itself agentic (e.g. Rudman 2006g, Moore 2001), while biomorphic terms are readily applied to volcanic processes and through them, the earth itself: when “Auckland’s sleeping volcano will awake” (New Zealand Herald 2008, pt 3, 3)118, erupting or exploding “into life”(2004c, New Zealand Herald 2008, pt 1, 3) volcanic “birth” (Gregory 2005, New Zealand Herald 2008, pt 1, 4-5), “belch[ing]” (Rudman 2004d), “spew[ing]”(Moore 2001, Eagles 2007), or more malevolently holding cities such as Auckland in their “line of fire”(Morton 2012b).

Even unmediated, such unfathomable forces are most safely, but satisfyingly, experienced as spectacle. Susan Sontag’s novel The Volcano Lover explores this:

Of course we can regard it as a grand pyrotechnical show. It’s all a question of means. A long enough view. There are charms made only for distant admiration, says Dr. Johnson; no spectacle is nobler than a blaze. At a safe distance, it is the ultimate spectacle, instructive as well as thrilling. After a collation at Sir’s villa we go onto the terrace, fitted out with telescopes, to watch. The plume of white smoke, the rumbling often compared to a distant roll of timpani; overture. Then the colossal show begins, the plume reddens, bloats, soars, a tree of ash that climbs higher, higher, until it flattens out under the weight of the stratosphere (if we are lucky we’ll see ski runs of orange and red start down the slope)—hours, days of this. Then, calando, it subsides. But up close, fear churns the guts… Even those who designate themselves as spectators cannot escape an onrush of revulsion and terror, as you’ve never known them before (Sontag 1992, 6).

118 The City of Fire special feature is replete with references to “life”.
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These experiences can be injected into cinema, documentary, museum exhibition and websites (as in Auckland’s Volcanoes!), “instructive as well as thrilling”, entertaining while being factual.

As Gomel notes, it is through overblown and lovingly detailed cinematic destruction that many contemporary “junkies of the sublime” now “get our fix” (Gomel 2010 119). An erupting volcano is a fortuitous fit with dramatic blockbuster movie format, as King explains: ‘the perfect vehicle for the delivery of an excess of the kind of flame and fireball effects so beloved of the contemporary action format’ (2001, 161). Cinema provides a socially acceptable stage for what Daly refers to as ‘the pleasure... in destruction – of people, of property, of hopes’ (2011, 255). The classic text on this is Sontag’s own ‘imagination of disaster’ (2006 [1976]). This argues that the ‘sensuous elaboration’ of the cinematic visual spectacle accentuates this ‘aesthetic of destruction... the particular beauties to be found in wreaking havoc, making a mess’ (Sontag 2006 [1976], 319), enabling the viewer to more immediately enjoy this ‘suffering’ and destruction, up to and including ‘the fantasy of living through one’s own death and more, the death of cities, the destruction of humanity itself’ (Sontag 2006 [1976])119. The physicality of the cinema itself, then, does not merely convey the sublime but is part of its experience: ‘an idea of pain and danger, without being actually in such circumstances’.

In a similar manner, the hint of bodily terror enjoyed from a safe distance underscores the continued popularity of the imagined superimposition of volcanic disaster to the physical. This ready imagination is repeatedly exercised in the Herald’s touristic, evocative articles as well as in more explicit presentations of history. Such accounts are vivid, using evocative language and storytelling format: ‘it was quiet - unlike the day that the island was blasted from the sea, sending ash to neighbouring shores” (Hart 2001). Lava flows are animated (Chapple 2004, Christian 2012, Warner 2011, Wright 2012b), augmented with description of how and where they “oozed” (Moore 2001). Craters, too, are imaginatively spiced: ‘It took some imagination to realise that we were in fact in a volcanic crater... You just have to blur your vision to envisage how this part of our landscape once looked’; ‘Only the inner tuff ring survives and of all the volcanoes we visited, it was perhaps the one that needed the most imagination to see where a volcano had once bubbled up’ (Clement 2011b).

119 Such an argument seems to draw on Freud’s “death drive”, rooted in the biological drive to return to a previous, less differentiated state that for us, he argues, is mitigated and tamed through processes of civilization into a number of lesser forms (Freud 2005 [1922]), remnants which Sontag notes can be acceptably exercised through consumption of cinematic destruction (Freud 2005 [1929]).
The central crater, and “what lies beneath”

The literal presence of volcanoes within Auckland invites and lends an authenticity to this imagination. Of all sites for superimposition, ‘ground zero, the crater itself’ (Campbell 2011, 35) is perceived to afford the closest intimacy with volcanic terror, of ‘seeing into the belly of the beast’ (Hart 2001). They are also the most distinctively volcanic. As hinted by Rudman’s “tell-tale” in the quote above (see also Clement 2011b), what is fascinating about these forms is that they are unusual, visible indices of previous violence. Volcanoes are not the same “natural” forces that slowly shaped New Zealand’s rolling hills or Auckland’s undulating sandstone ridges. They do not form gentle shapes but blast exceptions into the landscape. In Hochstetter’s words, this is “a scar of the fiery combat in the bowels of the Earth” (Smith 2010a). “Crater” itself is a word infused with remnants of trauma: if not a volcano then an impact, such as Meteor Crater in Arizona, or an area hewn by explosion. Volcanic landscapes are most prized for tourism when they appear blasted, out of the ordinary, redolent with signs of violence and heat (Erfurt-Cooper and Cooper 2010).

No surprise, then, that the violent exceptionality of volcanic craters is a focus of volcanic appeal. Craters are noted approvingly for their size (2012d, Wright 2012b, Moore 2001) (e.g. Rudman 2007i, Orsman 2008b, Rudman 2008a). In Clement’s (2011b) tour, while Pukaki is “very large indeed’ and Tank Farm an “enormous crater”, upon seeing Te-Pane-o-Horoiwi/Glover Park, ‘the first words that came to my head were unprintable. Beneath me lay a massive crater, so huge I wondered how I could have never heard of it before. Te Pane-O-Horoiwi is a magnificent sight.’ As Burke argues, vastness itself can be sublime, but the inherent violence of volcanic craters hints at something further. Collins illustrates the power that can be read into this, ‘a massive explosion with the force of an atomic bomb… creating a huge crater up to 80m deep’ (Collins 2004b).

The distinctive strangeness of this exception, its jizz, is celebrated. Several craters are praised for their geometric “perfection” (Clement 2011b, 2012, 2011c) and circularity (2012b). Pukaki, for example, is “gobsmackingly circular, like a moonscape among market gardens” (2012b) 120. This “moonscape” highlights the otherness of Pukaki, a contrast to 120 In contrast, craters that are not circular scarcely warrant a mention. An assault on ‘seven Auckland summits in seven hours’ (Moore 2001) notes Mount Albert’s historical depression, the surprise of the “large crater” atop Mount St John and the lava-filled one of Three Kings, but not the horseshoe crater of Mount Hobson or Maungakiekie’s three — two breeched, one kidney shaped — despite spending considerable literary time at its summit. Clement’s (2011b) tour similarly notes that
surrounding countryside and wider Auckland. Rangitoto is similarly a “moonscape” (Eagles 2007), resonating with the “lunar” landscape of Kirishima, Japan (Erfurt-Cooper 2010a, 149) and, closer to home, a recently erupted Mount Albert (Scott 1983 [1961]). Rangitoto is further endorsed as ‘eerily different from the mainland, comprising bare lava fields’ (2011c), ‘blackened scoria wastelands’ where, a tour guide informs us via journalist, “on a rainy morning, steam rises from the scoria and it looks jurassic’ (Wright 2012c). The sublime other (Edensor 2001) is prized here, a celebration of unsettling appearance.

Indeed, while fiery strangeness is celebrated in this context, the familiar greenery celebrated in chapter five can at times work almost counter to its appeal. Burke foreshadows this, arguing that beauty and the sublime are antithetical. Like a wild animal domesticated, for some, a hint of the pastoral ceases to evoke the “delight”, or fear, of the sublime. My own reassurance by Maungawhau’s pastoral surface is echoed by Rachael in Under The Mountain, who muses from within Maungawhau’s ‘perfectly shaped’ crater, ‘Grass grew down its sides and over the bottom. It was hard to imagine it blowing out lava’ (Gee 1982, 30). A business article posits a volcanic crater as an “unlikely” site for a vineyard despite the afforded microclimate (Thomson 2005), while for Hart (2001), ‘Hopes of seeing into the belly of the beast were dashed by the large population of trees’ in Rangitoto’s crater. Eagles sums this up emphatically when he concludes his journey to the island volcano’s summit:

...the crater, which in my youth was so bare you could easily imagine it had erupted only a few months before, is now a green shrub-lined bowl. In fact, it's now disappointingly benign. I had to agree with 4-year-old grandson Geoffrey, who had been eagerly anticipating a sight of the crater which once spewed forth red-hot destruction, but looked down into the tranquil verdant basin and said contemptuously, "That's not a 'cano" (Eagles 2007).

Yet if the volcanic ideal is fostered by the spectacular, it is also defined by invisibility; lurking danger beneath the perceptible, promised disaster in the not-quite-future. The volcanic has long afforded metaphors both for impending catastrophe and underlying potential. To be “a volcano” is to have explosive capacity (Duffy 2013), representing impending doom and destruction, as in Nietzsche’s endorsement to ‘live dangerously’: ‘build your cities on the slope of Vesuvius!’ (Pearson and Large 2006, 229). Here, the volcanic symbolises

Te Hopua, bisected by SH20, ‘took some imagination” to recognise, while clover-shaped Kohuora is also acknowledged as hard to distinguish, but ‘if you're interested in ticking off Auckland's volcanic craters, it's worth a short stop'.
unpredictability, the apparent calm that can snap in a heartbeat, as in one Auckland play, ‘simmering tensions’ that may one day explode (Budd 2000).

This potential danger is also exciting, re-envisioned through historical use as hidden energy. Daly argues for the link between the volcanic narrative and the fires of political revolution (Daly 2011, 256), while Duffy notes that 18th century volcanic imagery is used ‘almost to the point of cliché, to provide a potent, pre-Freudian vocabulary forfiguring a range of existential and psychosexual topoi for exploring concepts of repression, creativity and mental Illness’ (Duffy 2013, 72). It is therefore a long line of historical precedent that David Malacari, the director of the 2007 Auckland Festival AK07, invokes when he likens volcanic energy to artistic energy (Herrick 2007). Searle’s evocative observation that "Auckland is a city nurtured in a nest of volcanoes - a thriving striving bustling city uniquely founded on a site of natural turbulence" (Searle 1981, viii) is similarly, triumphantly, cited by the city council (Auckland City Council 2007). It at once notes potential danger and yet celebrates a vibrancy somehow linked to and fostered by this, a city granted metaphorical vigour by the heat below.

Volcanoes’ “poetics of depth” (Duffy 2013) reach down, beneath, and into the dangerous unknown. With volcanoes now often defined as literal conduit between deep-down magma and surface of the lithosphere (Borgia et al. 2010), narrative links between volcanoes and the interior of the Earth, be it Verne’s fantastical “centre of the earth” or Hell itself (Campbell 2011). This is seen also in the frequent anthropomorphism of crater as “mouth” of the volcano (e.g. Sontag 1992, Gregory 2008a), “spewing” forth volcanic product (Dearlaney 2005a, Rudman 2006g, Eagles 2007, Moore 2001). This is illustrated in Kircher’s Mundus Subterraneus (Kircher 1669), not only the “Fire-vomiting Mountains” of its English translation, but wider cosmology positioning the volcanoes the “chimneys” of a greater interiority (Campbell 2011). This portrayal of interior/surface dynamic continues in contemporary science. Mundus Subterraneus was historically notable for lithographs offering early diagrammatic cross-sections of the Earth’s interior, to prove influential in later scientific illustration (Campbell 2011) and echoed by the near-ubiquitous cutaway diagrams in contemporary geological depiction, repeated extension of the visible volcanic to an underground that exceeds it.

121 Similarly the use of the volcanic sublime as a symbol of New Zealand national identity is well established, and Lyall notes the coding of the North Island as a “volcanic or thermal sublime” (Lyall 2004, 104 see also Clark same volume).
As with Malcari’s statement, this hidden potential for disaster is ambivalent, joked about and toyed with. The *Herald*’s humour column, Sideswipe, plays with felicious images that could be read as eruptions of Rangitoto (Samways 2007a, 2008). More dramatically, local TV personality Marc Ellis simulated an eruption of the island with fireworks, “guerrilla marketing” for his online company.

Jim Eagle’s account of Rangitoto’s lava caves shows imagined disaster as part of the fun to be had *in situ*, the facilitated images a feature of visiting:

"Is this where the molten lava came through?" asked the mother of the family. "It must be," replied a daughter.

"Ah," said mother, "then I keep wondering what happens if the volcano erupts again while we are down here."

"Well," I said, always happy to ease the gloom with a little sunshine, "volcanoes seem to occur in Auckland every few hundred years, and it’s about 600 years since this one went off, so we’re about due another eruption."

"Perhaps we should hurry then," the mother said cheerfully. "Shine the lights over here so we can see where we are going."

With the aid of the many lights which suddenly shone in our direction we were able to get out of the cave before the next surge of magma from the middle of the earth (Eagles 2007).

Indeed, while Hebdige argues that scholarly discussions of the sublime privilege ‘the solitary confrontation with the irreducible fact of limitation, Otherness, ‘différance’... ’ (Hebdige 1987, 67) this more banal sublime is used as a basis for connective moments, a grinning acknowledgement of shared vulnerability. Myriad volcanic jokes appear: Beston ends her statistical “snapshot” of Auckland with the “good news” that ‘there is only one chance in 1000 that one of the city's 50 volcanic cones will erupt this year’ (2003), Rudman suggests we “relax” regarding seismic threats, ‘it’s only volcanoes we have to worry about’ (Rudman 2011c). “Only” volcanoes. Shaw notes the pleasure taken in repeatedly conquering the volcanic sublime:

“the volcano is judged not to be a threat to life and is perceived again as an example of the awesome destructive power of nature. Through repeated exercise, the meeting with the sublime strengthens our powers of conception; we become, as it were, equal to the powers we survey’ (Shaw 2006, 6).
Despite its vivid and fiery nature, this imagination is firmly connected to physical Auckland. Its tangible features vouch for the authenticity of the vision. Visible volcanoes become lightening-rods for premonition, foreshadowings, ‘dozens of dead cones all around us… daily reminders’ (Rudman 2011a), particularly Rangitoto, ‘sitting at our front door, a silent reminder of its violent arrival in two eruptions 600-700 years ago’ (Rudman 2011d). The invisible threat of the unknown is anchored to Auckland’s most visible point. It is repeatedly revealed as the youngest of the volcanoes, factual statement or shadowed with “only” (Rudman 2011a, Duncan 2011); from a distance, the largest and most obviously triangular-volcanic in form, up close, blasted, “Jurassic”. At times the island is a simple warning (Gibson 2001), or a comparison point for anticipated eruptions (Masters 2005), yet at others an anticipated culprit for seismic activity (Beston 2005a). As with Ellis, and Eagles, the promise of disaster is played with: a jovial reassurance after a small earthquake that ‘chances of a son of Rangitoto popping up any day are, from all accounts, good’ (Rudman 2007j), inspiring art founded on unsettlement: “… I look out my window and there’s Rangitoto Island. I say ‘excuse me, that island only appeared 600 years ago. The whole place could turn into a volcano tomorrow”’ (Malacari in Rudman 2005b).

This mistrust of Auckland’s underside can be seen in the classic Kiwi novel Under The Mountain (Gee 1982). Its 1981 TV adaption terrified a generation of New Zealanders (e.g. Kara 2008, Gee 2012), and a 2009 feature film well-celebrated within the Herald (Baillie 2008, Kara 2008, 2009, Lang 2009, Baillie 2009). Within this story it is not only volcanic forces lurking under Auckland, but the terrifying alien Wilberforces: muculent monsters aligned with cold, wet and darkness, linked with enormous brainless entities under seven prominent volcanoes. The hero twins Rachel and Theo literally descend under Auckland’s volcanoes through subterranean tunnels. They scale two iconic summits as the “poles” and keystones of their magic - Rangitoto and Mount Eden. The fiery power of their twin stones is unleashed by casting them into the craters. And then, eruption.

Under the Mountain blossomed from subterranean danger underlying the familiar. Gee explains, ‘One morning on my way to work I passed Mt Eden, brooding, half-seen in a mist, and I thought: I wonder what is living under there. The story grew from that question’ (2012). Conrich (2012) characterises the story as part of the subset of “New Zealand/Kiwi Gothic” he identifies as “what lies beneath”, noting ‘reminders of the tremendous primal forces that shaped Auckland are everywhere, with the visible volcanic cones and craters prompting the question of what lies beneath’ (2012, 395). Despite the magical and alien components the link remains with the disquieting land, and the director hints at wider cultural tropes of volcanic depth:
"Auckland is quite a scary, eerie place with strange and sinister undercurrents. Auckland is a city built on a ring of volcanoes. So we wanted to make that an aspect of the film and that is something that appealed internationally about the story" (Baillie 2008).

Herald coverage underscores the familiar, “Just when you thought the scariest thing about Auckland was the traffic …”, delighting in the re-imagination of “Auckland's cratered geology” (Baillie 2009): ‘Zooming in on Auckland's volcanic ring, especially the brooding presence of Auckland's youngest volcano Rangitoto Island, the film led many people to look at our topography anew” (Lang 2009).

The spectre of subterranean danger is therefore, to a degree, pleasurable; the substance of a “summer popcorn movie” (Kara 2009). It is repeatedly imagined, invoked, and toyed with. This pleasure recalls the characteristic of Burke’s “sublime” that differentiates it from pain itself – a “long enough view”, the perception of safety. Kant puts this more succinctly: “it is impossible to like terror that we take seriously” (Kant 1987, 120). As scholars interested in geological risk know too well, direct experience, and that inherited from one’s predecessors, often offers a wealth of inductive evidence that reassures inhabitants of their environment’s stability. Both Davis (1998) and Clark (2011) note the betrayal people feel upon disaster: devastating psychic damage precisely through its jarring contrast to the perception of stability in dwelling. This playfulness can be understood as borne from a backgrounding sense of safety, the frission of danger from a distance - 80km of lithosphere or an unknown chronological period.

**Scientific risk**

Auckland’s invisible underbelly and uncertain future is, at the same time, presented through discourses of scientific risk management. This is a containment, and not a celebration, with an urgency to the reimagining. The threat of volcanic eruption is rarely mentioned simply as a possibility, but with efforts to minimise the danger through research and/or planning and the encouragement of readers themselves to “be prepared”.

This may seem commonsensical, but it did not always. It is now unusual to see a publication regarding the volcanoes that does not include questions of "where and when will the next one be?" (e.g. Auckland Regional Council 2010b, Hayward, Murdoch, and Maitland 2011, New Zealand Herald 2008), yet such questions were largely absent from earlier publications.
Searle’s seminal *City of Volcanoes* (1964) mentions briefly the prospect that ‘new volcanoes will erupt in the Auckland district and perhaps build another Rangitoto’ (Searle 1964, 96), contextualised by a retrospect emphasising Earth’s continual transformation and reminder that ‘man’s tenure may be short’ (Searle 1964, 97). Searle’s account is undergirded by volcanic fascination, expressing a desire to ‘reconstruct something of the drama enacted on this small part of the earth’s crust’ (1964, xiii). Similarly, the text accompanying the 1994 museum exhibition *Volcanoes and Giants* (Hayward and Gill 1994, 4) acknowledges the possibility of future eruption in a single sentence. While the contemporary *Volcanoes!* exhibition is sponsored by the Earthquake Commission and emphasises preparation for volcanic threat in Auckland (see below), its predecessor’s unlikely combination of volcanoes and “giants” – dinosaurs - stemmed from fascination: the top two results of a user survey about what people would like to see in their museum (Hayward 2013).

Similarly, almost all *Herald* articles concerning geological discovery and research in the Auckland field explicitly refer to risk prevention. Graham Leonard, from the government-owned GNS Science, explains drilling into the Domain not simply as discovery, but part of ‘understanding the volcanic hazard facing Auckland’ (Thompson 2006). In an authoritative extension of the imagination of volcanic disaster, such explanations articulate existing cones and craters with ongoing subterranean hazard, highlighting the volcanoes as windows into future volcanic risk. This emphasis on risk prevention also repeatedly manifests within the *Herald in* more general articles about civil defence and volcanic threat. Geologists and other authorities are called to alleviate a sense of danger, reassuring voices in relation to minor earthquakes within the city (Kiong 2007, Perry and McNaughten 2007), but they are also invoked to promote it. Lengthy features about geophysical threat, often prominently featuring the Auckland field (Masters 2005, McCracken 2009b, Morton 2012a), emphasise volcanic imagining in the context of tangible action driven by concern.

The drive towards articulation with risk mitigation is linked to broader historical trends, but these historical influences manifest in particular ways with regard to the unstoppable inhuman characteristics of volcanic threat, as detailed below. Both articles about civil defence, and geological research, also have a particular affinity with the news format itself. Portrayal of volcanic news is backgrounded by incentives for the newspaper to produce a steady stream of articles that capture reader interest. Volcanologists and civil defence authorities provide trusted authoritative sources of information (Manning 2001), while the explicit drive for public outreach within government agencies (see below) is also a fortuitous fit. Geological research on Auckland’s volcanoes similarly meets this need for both novelty and interest, with scientists often available and willing to provide authoritative commentary. A
recent analysis of news values relating to “science news” suggest that classical news criteria remain relevant but should be augmented with features such as “scientific influence” and “astonishment” (Badenschier and Wormer 2012). Yet these additional values, although readily applicable to Auckland’s volcanoes, seems almost superfluous to the news value of volcanic threat here, its area of impact almost perfectly coexisting with the target audience (down to a focus on the central city), its import instantly imaginable.

**Contextualising contemporary risk focus**

Both research and attempts to communicate volcanic danger occur within an international historical context of disaster mitigation though preventative measures. This was notably seen in the UN's declaration of the 1990s as the International Decade for Natural Disaster Reduction (IDNDR). Contrasting previous attention on disaster *response*, governments were called to work towards decade goals that included filling knowledge gaps; public education, with particular attention to the role of media; and work with relevant organisations and local government (United Nations 1989). These were further codified in the 1994 “Yokohama Strategy”, promoting risk assessment as “a required step for the adoption of adequate and successful disaster reduction…” (UNISDR 1994, 8). Its text hinted at the context of international scrutiny, noting some entities’ failure to implement this ‘to the extent possible and desired by the General Assembly’ (UNISDR 1994, 10). This international consideration has only intensified following the conclusion of the IDNDR, with the launch of the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction in 2000, and the 2005-2015 Hyogo Framework, placing strong emphasises on information gathering and expertise (Donovan 2010). The 2004 Indian Ocean Tsunami further generated ‘a strong desire for anticipation’, providing graphic emphasis to previously advocated policy (Donovan 2010, 152). As expressed in the 1989 resolution for the IDNDR, ‘fatalism about natural disasters is no longer considered justified’ (United Nations 1989).

A 1993 report from New Zealand’s Ministry of Civil Defence listed a number of projects associated with the Decade’s goals, including a series of booklets relating to volcanic hazard (Moore 1993). In 2002 the Civil Defence Emergency Management (CDEM) Act emphasised attempts to foster public involvement in disaster prevention, and increased responsibility of local bodies. These aimed to ‘encourage and enable communities to achieve acceptable levels of risk’ (my emphasis). Although some focus on public communication had been present in New Zealand since at least 1985 (Ministry of Civil Defence 1990), this new Act increased it significantly. Media communication from the Ministry of Civil Defence and Emergency Management (MCDEM) now includes Disaster Reduction Week/Get Ready.
Week, held since 2006. While communication shows a persistent effort to alleviate complacency, it also establishes the public in a responsible relationship to threat, encouraging them to “Get Ready” for disaster to reduce reliance on public services if emergency occurs. As ARC chairwoman Gwen Bull cautions, "Gone are the days when an emergency response meant a soup kitchen at the end of every street in time of a disaster" (NZPA 2002b).

At a broader level, it is commonly observed within social sciences that “risk” holds a privileged place in contemporary discourse. This is most famously seen in Beck’s characterisation of contemporary global society as "risk society": a new modernity where a focus on wealth production is overshadowed by a focus on risk production, driven by the maxim “I am afraid” and an intense awareness of the uncertain and destructive consequences of modernisation (Beck 1992, 13). Donovan and Oppenheimer (2014) apply Beck’s theory to volcanic danger. They argue that Beck erroneously disregards natural disasters as “pre-modern”. They instead note that volcanic danger is in some ways enhanced by modernity, including added pressure stemming from increased population. The chaos inflicted by Eyjafjallajökull’s modest eruption similarly illustrates vulnerabilities of a world increasingly reliant on fragile international connectivity (Donovan, Oppenheimer, and Bravo 2012).

Donovan and Oppenheimer nonetheless underscore that ‘risk is a major organising concept’ (2014, 90) within Western society, and argue that characteristics of Beck’s “risk society” remain valid in relation to the volcanic. In particular, governments have taken on increasing responsibility for risk management and the safety of their citizens, even in the face of what was previously an “act of God”. They similarly observe that ‘many citizens expect their governments and insurance companies to prepare for and protect them from large-scale disasters’ (Donovan and Oppenheimer 2014, 90). They also illustrate entanglement of scientific research with social interests. Beck argues that risk society is characterised by political influence exerted upon the scientific realm through systems such as advisory structures, implemented to hold science to public account. Reflexive modernisation” is rife with scepticism extended ‘to the foundations and hazards of scientific work’: ‘science is both generalised and demystified’ (Beck 1992, 14). The risks that characterise this period are catastrophic but often invisible, requiring scientific expertise to delineate. Yet frequently they are also anthropogenic, runaway side-effects of attempts to influence the world. Such

---

122 Beck uses "danger" to refer to "natural" threats, reserving “risk” for those with an anthropogenic cause. I do not limit myself to this, and “risk” is often the dominant term used in policy (CDEM 2002) and research (Daly 2009; Donovan and Oppenheimer 2014) concerning natural disaster.
attempts are given vastly greater scope through advances in science and technology. Scientists are therefore situated ambivalently within risk society as both originators of disaster and potential rescuers.

However, volcanic hazards are evidently not caused by technological tinkering with the nonhuman world. Instead, a defining feature is the overwhelming imbalance of power between the nonhuman earth and its surface inhabitants (Clark 2011). While the potential destruction or contamination of the nonhuman is a predominating concern both within the sociology of nature and wider societal discussion (Clark 2011), the volcanic remains an arena where the nonhuman is not only unmenaced by human activity but threatens to effortlessly overwhelm it. Humans do not cause volcanic eruption and can do nothing to prevent its occurrence. Rather, we struggle to know as far as possible in advance to try and minimise its impact (Donovan 2012, 2010). Even the tenuous agency granted by forewarning is remarkably recent and uncertain. Systems of volcanic prediction remain contested, particularly given the rarity of new eruptions in monitored spaces (Donovan 2010). Auckland’s own systems for early volcanic monitoring are also remarkably recent (Scott 2013). At present, these networks are expected to give from two weeks’ warning of impending eruption to a mere 14 hours for response, including evacuation of an area up to 5km in diameter (MCDEM 2008).

This imbalance of power means that volcanology carries none of the moral ambiguity of other sciences. Perhaps unusually among disciplines, earth sciences may benefit from the entanglement of social concern with scientific endeavour, as social interests require not a curtailment of research but its increase. This is underlined by a neoliberal framework in which research is increasingly funded on the basis of perceived utilitarian outcomes (Donovan, Oppenheimer, and Bravo 2012). In New Zealand, Hodder notes restructuring from the mid-1980s has fostered ‘a commercial model’ for scientific research that focuses on

---

123 The BBC documentary “Volcano Hell” dramatised dispute over predictive methods and their relation to the death of six volcanologists and three tourists in the 1993 eruption of Galeras. Bernard Chouet was cast as the hero of this documentary, having successfully predicted the eruption through identifying the significance of “long wave” seismic events. Chouet was directly drawn upon as an inspiration for the protagonist in the Auckland-based made-for-TV Eruption! (2010). The very real fraught decisions surrounding evacuation, as risk is balanced against the certain financial costs of the procedure, also drive a significant part of the plot of Eruption!, as they do with Dante’s Peak. This uncertainty and lack of consensus can be readily aligned with that classic plotlines within action and science fiction movies: the protagonist who alone recognises the impending danger that, as audience members, we are aware will inevitably bring disaster (Daly 2011).

124 This is reflected in the markedly positive portrayals of geologists in cinema, enjoying ‘an unchallenged image of trust’ and depiction as “good”/“benevolent” (Weingart, Muhl, and Pansegrau 2003, 283). Such portrayal makes a marked contrast with that of medical research, physics, chemistry and psychology, potential threats to the natural order of things.
definable and readily justifiable outputs (Hodder 2010, 336). Internationally, Donovan et al. report concern among some of the volcanologists they interviewed that “risk” and “hazard” had become “buzz words” exploited by academics to obtain funding and justify research (2012).

Yet in noting a number of large transdisciplinary projects funded by the EU that are based on probabilistic risk assessment, Donovan et al. also highlight that such massive endeavour is unlikely to supported without an underlying driving concern. This is reflected in New Zealand through DEVORA and Exercise Ruamoko, both multidisciplinary endeavours of unprecedented size. Each facilitated engagement with the volcanoes that connect them to geological risk. Ruamoko was a national-level exercise in 2007-8 that tested scientific, emergency and organisational responses to a simulated volcanic eruption. Over 1,500 participants from 125 institutions were involved, with authorities expected to respond to Information about the size, location, and timing of the mock event following a sequence analogous to a true eruption (MCDEM 2008). Ruamoko informed subsequent public discussion on volcanic hazard (McCracken 2009b), provided graphics for envisioning this (e.g. Morton 2012b) in addition to articles directly concerning the exercise (Eriksen 2007, Falconer 2008). The 3-part City Of Fire special feature was published in the lead-up to the event and was listed as an outcome of the exercise (MCDEM 2008). This engaged thoughtfully with a number of facets of the volcanoes, including Māori tradition and pa construction, but in both qualitative and quantitative terms the overall focus was geological. Risk, particularly, was prominent, and the series ended with extended discussion of future eruption. Also of unprecedented scope and scale (Daly 2009), DEVORA (DEterming VOIcanic Risk in Auckland) was a 7-year collaborative project launched in 2008. Major contributors include the Crown-owned GNS and the University of Auckland, and a number of significant studies are incorporated under its auspices. While comprised of “geological”, “probabilistic volcanic hazard” and “risk and social” components, the overarching aim is risk mitigation (DEVORA 2014). As Lindsay explained: “It’s not a matter of if, but when, and the more we know about volcanoes and the impact an eruption would have on our city, the better prepared Auckland can be” (Gregory 2008b).

In observing this fortuitous demand for studies associated with risk mitigation, I do not discount the genuine desire that scientists may have to undertake such socially beneficial research. For example, when interviewing Jan Lindsay, one of the heads of DEVORA, I was struck by her evident commitment to research that benefits the wider public. Yet she also noted that many researchers in the study may not be aware of how their projects fit into its wider risk-reducing agenda. This echoes Donovan and Oppenheimer’s (2014) assertion that a considerable variety of research can be incorporated under the rubric of risk mitigation, even if a researcher’s primary intent lies elsewhere.

The neoliberal utility of this project was underlined in the same article by the CEO of GNS: “It is important to understand how the volcanic field might erupt in the future, so Auckland can continue to develop as a major economic hub in New Zealand and the Southwest Pacific”.

---

125 In observing this fortuitous demand for studies associated with risk mitigation, I do not discount the genuine desire that scientists may have to undertake such socially beneficial research. For example, when interviewing Jan Lindsay, one of the heads of DEVORA, I was struck by her evident commitment to research that benefits the wider public. Yet she also noted that many researchers in the study may not be aware of how their projects fit into its wider risk-reducing agenda. This echoes Donovan and Oppenheimer’s (2014) assertion that a considerable variety of research can be incorporated under the rubric of risk mitigation, even if a researcher’s primary intent lies elsewhere.

126 The neoliberal utility of this project was underlined in the same article by the CEO of GNS: “It is important to understand how the volcanic field might erupt in the future, so Auckland can continue to develop as a major economic hub in New Zealand and the Southwest Pacific”.
The risk-oriented foundations of these contemporary projects is indicative of a wider emphasis, and underlies their presentation by researchers in these terms (Gregory 2008a, NZPA 2007, 2008b, 2011). Notably, the two exceptions to this come from when discovery stemmed from the extension of the museum car park (Collins 2004a)\textsuperscript{127}, and discovery of new explosion craters in South Auckland (Harper 2011a). This latter discovery was made by Hayward’s own Geomarine Research, inexpensively using LIDAR from Auckland Council’s online GIS viewer to identify the contours of potential craters (Hayward, Kenny, and Grenfell 2011). Their articulation instead reflected Hayward’s own long-term interests: they were presented in the context of preserving “Auckland’s rich volcanic heritage”.

This ongoing research affords a comparative frequency to geological characterisation within news articles. With the notable and limited exception of military remnants on Maungauika, there are no similar archaeological studies to bring the volcanoes to attention in an archaeological light. As Furey explains, adequate archaeological research into even one cone is currently prohibitively expensive, and unlikely to be a funding priority (Furey 2014). Additionally, the manner in which the volcanoes are articulated with risk differs from that of other disciplines. Volcanology enjoys a perceived a-political objectivity that can be related to its comparative position within the well-established hierarchy of scientific disciplines. This separation from reader evaluation is echoed in the online format of the \textit{Herald} through much of the period of study: while geological discussion occurred in the context of “news” or special features, discussions about heritage concerns and even Ngā Mana Whenua were placed within “opinion” columns that explicitly invite reader comment and weigh-in.

This, too, is can be understood as fostered by the alignment of the subject with potentially hostile nonhuman nature. Evans (1995) argues that the hierarchy of sciences is related to the perceived distance from human activity and entanglement with areas on which readers are likely to hold opinions, politics in particular. This backgrounds potential discipline-related articulations of the volcanoes. The archaeological record has been a subject of public debate in New Zealand: the myth of pre-Māori “Moriori” lingers long after its dismissal from archaeological orthodoxy (Walter 2002, see also Carter 1992), while the date of first Māori settlement is similarly loaded with perceived political implications. Ecology is similarly intertwined with politics. The potential ecological damage to Rangitoto caused by Ellis’ stunt was criticised, but in the newspaper’s humour column (Samways 2007b), while readers were invited to discuss whether or not “we”, as Aucklanders, should “just laugh it off?”. Ecology was largely absent from the discussion, with over half of the 95 responses expressing

\textsuperscript{127} Although including consideration of when the next volcano was going to “blow”.
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support for the stunt, or actively dismissed. One not entirely unrepresentative reader opined, "it's great to see that the good Kiwi bloke still has a sense of humour, not like the stuffed up politically correct farts (She's & He's) [sic] in departments like DOC!". Ecological work on Rangitoto was also fraught with controversy, both within the Herald and documented by it, as delays in poisoning pests such as rats, and then the potential consequences of poison, were subject to debate (e.g. Rudman 2007h, Morrison 2007, Gregory 2008c). Articles based on volcanological investigation, in contrast, drew on scientists as unquestioned authoritative figures, while statements such as “scientists say”/"experts believe" imply an authoritative coherence.

The comparative perceived objectivity of volcanology is underpinned by the importance of what seems to be at stake, underlain by the well-practiced imagination of volcanic disaster. Volcanology works towards mitigation of readily-visualised, unambiguous destruction. Although geological concern is continually articulated with contemporary human action, in particular hazard planning, this is left unquestioned128. Scientists and civil defence authorities may even be cast as heroes, such as CDEM group controller O’Rourke. His name fortuitously reminiscent of the hero civil defence coordinator in 1997 movie Volcano, O’Rourke will make “the big calls” in an emergency and “doesn’t answer to mayors or politicians” (McCracken 2009b). If scientific portrayal of volcanic disaster takes on the drama of an action movie, as discussed below, the unequivocal and easily imagined menace means that they also partake of the purity of the Hollywood blockbuster, the potential for what King calls the “frontier experience” (2001), as the political complications of everyday life are cut through by the rush of direct and indisputable threat.

**Communicating risk through entertainment**

Despite the prevalence of a risk mitigation message in official communication, a considerable part of the popularity doubtless still rides on the charisma of imaged volcanic eruption and profits from the excitement of disaster. The language used to discuss volcanic threat within the Herald moves smoothly between the scientific and the imaginative, and it is not always easy to discern which is which. This is particularly so in special features, where reins are loosened on brevity and the exclusive presentation of facts. These can be several pages long (Blackstock 2012a, McCracken 2009c) and heavy with evocative imagery. Seemingly unpolished information is dramatic: ‘Scenario plans assume buildings and

---

128 A potential exception may be read into recommendations for potentially extremely costly earthquake reinforcement debated after Christchurch’s earthquake disaster. This was repeatedly countered in Rudman’s column through comparison with the vividly expressed volcanic (Rudman 2011d, c, a) and invocation of the generalised authority of “scientists” reassure that Auckland is not an “earthquake zone”.
infrastructure within 3km of an erupting vent would be destroyed by an initial surge of hot gas, steam and rocks and ash would fall over most of the greater Auckland area - up to 10cm thick near the vent’ (Morton 2012a). A lengthy Sunday Special blends the almost absurdly catastrophic with scientific quotes. ‘Worst case scenarios for the city include Rangitoto Island blowing apart, vapourising everything in its path, or cones the size of Mt Eden bursting out in Queen St, uprooting buildings and destroying infrastructure’, juxtaposes Lindsay’s equally dramatic, “Imagine if a volcano the size of Rangitoto popped up in downtown Auckland? That could happen, because it has happened in the past” (Blackstock 2012b).

Fig. 8.1: Infographic accompanying Morton (2012a)

Articles are not immune to added titillation, as “500,000 people in lava’s line of fire” suggests (Morton 2012b). This seemingly misinterprets a study using existing lava flows to gauge
potential flow within the field, turning this into a destructive reimagining of contemporary volcanoes. Despite actually explaining what “monogenetic” means, the article lovingly depicts future ‘lava streaming down Mt Eden or One Tree Hill and into surrounding valleys and basins, laying waste to everything in its path’. The disaster is made deeply relevant to Auckland, promising to reveal ‘which areas of volcano-rich Auckland would be obliterated by lava flows in an eruption - and a wide spread of major suburbs are in the firing line’. The accompanying graphic (fig. 8.1) illustrates potential “worst hit suburbs” with ring around each cone. Quotes from scholars and actual scenarios only add to the drama, such as Cronin’s explanation that lava “would just set fire to things and push everything over like a big bulldozer” or actual scenarios potentially affecting ‘Auckland's hotbed of 55 volcanoes’, including ‘rocks being hurled 1.5km, surges of fast-moving lava 3km long, toxic gases settling in low-lying areas, ashfall, and 500,000 people needing evacuation’.

Despite the contrasting dynamics of risk containment and the enjoyment of destruction, the charismatic drama of volcanic eruption has been similarly articulated with volcanic risk mitigation. Even when the message is "be prepared", it may be fuelled by a sublime aesthetic of disaster that celebrates its imagination (McCracken 2010).

This is seen in the Auckland War Memorial Museum’s Volcanoes! exhibition129, a popular feature of the museum since its opening in late 2005. Its overall focus is geological, reflecting its assistance from the Earthquake Commission, with an emphasis on ‘disaster management/impact’ (Visitor Solutions 2006). The format is multisensory and experiential in a manner consistent with international trends in museum presentation (Harvey 2008, Hodder 2010, Schiele 2008). In circumnavigating the giant volcanic cone at its centre, visitors are taken from a journey from volcanic Auckland and New Zealand, to more general volcanology and volcanic disasters, before returning firmly to Auckland. Visitors are greeted by familiar newscasters from a state channel warning of a simulated volcanic Auckland alert, an exploitation of the ubiquity of mediated senses used also in Volcano! (Keane 2006, 84). It ends with the possibility of an eruption here through a fabricated living room that one can enter for a 12 minute ride/display. Inside, two couches face a glass “ranch slider” – actually an enormous screen – looking down the “street” towards Waitematā harbour and Rangitoto. Media is integrated with these supposed “real” senses. A television shows coverage of evacuation and discussion with a volcanologist, and wisps of steam that appear in the visible “ocean” are reported in real time.

129 The stand-alone excitement of its one-word title is a succinct reminder of the interest of the volcanic.
The television cuts off with a jolt of the room. Lights flicker and dim. An explosion crashes from where the steam was a moment ago, throwing layer after layer of smoke and ejecta. A billowing black cloud begins to flood from its base along the surface of the water: the “base surge” we had just been told about in the newscast, far too swift to escape. The many seconds it takes to rush towards the living room indicate its enormity, its churning wave-front more and more massive before enveloping vision with a crash. For a long moment, all is dark. Then, the immediacy of the fantasy is gently alleviated by writing on the television, “The Aftermath”. Smoke lifts and we see our surroundings drastically changed, coated in thick ash and beaten down. A new volcano smoulders beneath a dark sky. Incredulously, fully breaking the illusion, television news presenter Mark Sainsbury appears clean, calm and larger-than-life through the window of the “sliding door”. He informs those in the room, now an audience, about the importance of preparation. “Be prepared” appears in large writing, and visitors are encouraged to take a MCDEM pamphlet. The exiting audience walks past the “veranda” of the now-blasted house towards information boards on civil defence.

An exhibition that starts with excitement ends with a caution, discourses of risk management articulated with the experiential sublime. Such articulation is not logical: the very enjoyment of the eruption discouraged by the communications is their greatest selling-point. Yet articulation need not be logical, as famously illustrated by Williamson’s (1978) advertising analysis. The eruption is most fully enjoyed to the implicated of the death of the viewer, literally enabling Sontag’s posited “fantasy of living through one’s own death and more” (Sontag 2006 [1976], 319). This experience adds a sublime spice that works to make the message of volcanic preparation memorable. In Bell and Lyall’s words, while other concepts are used to describe and engage with the geological elements of the volcanoes, most notably the discourse of “risk” that is said to characterise the contemporary age, ‘they are not so firmly sited with the populist words or sympathies’ (Bell and Lyall 2002, 6) as the sublime. They do not have its history or charisma, the longstanding articulation with experience, place, imagery, practiced enjoyment of bodily frailty.

**Conclusion**

Auckland’s dead volcanoes comprise a number of forms –diversity singled out and celebrated by Hochstetter - but these are frequently subsumed by images of an ideal-type volcano and the imagination of eruptive disaster. A superimposition of Etna, Vesuvius, and subsequent imaginary volcanoes has spread through centuries of practiced appreciation for non-immediate fear. Throughout this, a confluence between volcanic form and medium has
facilitated the spread of this image: the spectacular charisma of eruption itself drawn on in imagination, touristic accounts, but also to promote aversion of the very danger celebrated.

Recent scholarly attention has focused on contemporary society as “risk” society, and in many ways volcanic threat is presented in relation to this. Most explicitly, news articles concerning research and discovery around the volcanoes tend to explicitly present them in the context of risk management, scientific windows to future disaster. I illustrate how this tendency is facilitated by an international drive towards risk mitigation through prior planning, and the funding of large multidisciplinary endeavours, such as DEVORA and Ruaumoko, based on discourses of risk and hazard. Yet volcanic danger is in other ways atypical of Beck’s theory in particular, a “pre-modern” risk that continues to hold the threat of significant impact, in some ways augmented, and characterised by an overwhelming imbalance of power between incalculable subterranean forces and human endeavour. I note how this can be seen in the unambiguous portrayal of volcanology and its scientists both within the Herald and cinematic representation, fora that share surprisingly in form and content. Attempts to interest the population in volcanic risk mitigation and the importance of “be[ing] prepared” draw on these earlier, well-practiced understandings of the volcanic sublime, an attempted articulation of fascinating fire with logically inconsistent, sober risk aversion.

In Auckland, discussion of volcanic threat tends to return to Rangitoto: from the “ranch slider” in the Volcanoes! ride to two of three covers of the “City of Fire” special editions. The island forms a central location in Gee’s Under the Mountain, even more important in the 2009 cinematic adaption, and is used as an overt illustration of volcanic threat, and the punch-line of volcanic humour, including Ellis’ staged eruption. In a theatrically appropriate manner, until 2013 this suspicion regarding Rangitoto could be eased and contrasted with scientific reassurance that the volcano is monogenetic. This is no longer the case. Recent study of buried tephra beneath Pupuke (Shane et al. 2013) has implicated that the island may have erupted multiple times – not a single event spanning 50 years as previously thought, but potentially separated by a millennium (see also Seven Sharp 2014). While Rangitoto acts as a visual signifier of uncertain-but-inevitable volcanic threat for Aucklanders more broadly, for geologists it had already unsettled the order of the world in other ways. The most recent eruption was also anomalously large, containing over half of the extruded material in the field, a coincidence or beginning of a new trend? The possibility of a long period of eruption from one source dramatically changes the possibilities for hazard planning, previously modelled on a new, and short-lived eruption centre (Shane et al. 2013, 182). Shane et al. conclude with the troubling insight that ‘the tempo and style of volcanism in the volcanic field has undergone a dramatic change in the last ~2ka’ (Shane et al. 2013, 182). Like the action
hero-scientist’s Cassandra warning, Aucklanders’ visceral mistrust of Rangitoto may be revealed to be well-founded.
9: Conclusions

The writing of this thesis began with Maungawhau, as did my experience of Auckland’s volcanoes more generally, but it seems more fitting to conclude it on the slopes of Puketāpapa. Part of this is personal. Both my perceptions and life have changed over the course of writing, as is no-doubt typical of lengthy research projects. This included a physical move westwards, walking distance from Puketāpapa. Although nowhere near as close as Maungawhau was, it backgrounds my local supermarket and is part of the fabric of daily life. It is also appropriate to end with Puketāpapa because of its prominence in recent volcanic history. Puketāpapa misses many of the obvious features that make Maungawhau so immediately appealing to so many. In the language I have been using throughout this thesis, it is less charismatic. It is of considerably smaller stature than Maungawhau. Its summit a car park. Yet the “battle” over the motorway that now curves past its northern face sparked the ongoing media “campaign” regarding all of Auckland’s volcanoes. Its sculpted foothill sets it apart from many other maunga, containing layer after layer of deliberately crafted meaning that resonate with themes I have seen emerging over the course of my study. In a number of other ways, this volcano embodies the trends that I have described within the chapters preceding.

The road to its summit is gated by recent cattle-stop despite the cows’ removal with the cycleway project. Their unexpected removal was a surprise decision that is illustrative of other volcanic achievement, including cattle removal from Maungawhau: by persistent force and seized opportunity rather than official design. The reservoir is topped with mown grass, but the surrounding slopes hold the shaggy disorder I realise signifies “volcanic cone” to me: peaks and troughs, leg-tickling grass, desire lines to the terraces, and the surrounding city, still changing. Yet unlike previous wanderings on Maungawhau, I cannot align Puketāpapa with wilderness. Even the unmown slopes are too overlooked and overlooking for this, too interspersed with car parks and structures (complex-looking things to do with the reservoir beneath, and an over-sized cross drenched in high-voltage lights). This is also because illusion of wilderness has been lost for me through study, and even the nostalgia this loss once provoked. I cannot write “nature” without scare-quotes, and I cannot visit a volcano without a messy spiders-web of associations, conflicts and experiences draping onto its surface, tangling and sticking.

These conceptual, affective sticky webs also cling to textual mediations of the volcanoes, dragging the agentic volcanoes themselves into the text. In contrast to attempts to polarise between the two, the physical is still present, still influential, within mediated forums. I use
the concept of “nonhuman charisma” throughout as one pointer to ways in which this physicality has agency within the text. This is explored through a discourse analysis that pays particular attention to the kinaesthetic metaphors of articulation, equivalence and difference. I placed this analysis in conversation with landscape phenomenology and autoethnography. This reflects the textual medium as tied to physicality, written for and by embodied, meaning-making animals within the city. It is also influenced by structural pressures that push for media content to include the expected familiar. This includes the charismatic cones, and also tropes established through ongoing presentation, most notably through the “battle” for Mount Roskill itself.

I began by offering a background to the contemporary volcanoes in chapter 4. I noted the contingency of their volcanic “birth”; the generations of Māori who shaped the isthmus with radiating systems of stonefield gardens from the terraced cones; but focused largely on the often-devastating transformation by the settlers to follow. The emergent city spread out from what is now the CBD, devouring “Albert Park” volcano and gnawing into others, but also setting aside some central summits as reserves. These patterns of reservation and obliteration broadly cemented those volcanoes charismatic in the mid 19th century as likely to be preserved in later years; the whittling away of foothills and the volcanic slopes left artificially isolated volcanic peaks. The visual prominence of these selected volcanoes was exacerbated from the late 1970s, as protective regulation preserved the visual prominence those cones whose appearance was understood as “regionally significant”. Again, these were predominantly large, raised volcanoes with visual and sometimes physical proximity to arterial transport routes. The ecological charisma of the already-charismatic was protected and enhanced.

Ironically, and a reminder that complex mechanisms of history and present are never entirely subjugated to smooth laws, the orgy of quarrying in early Auckland facilitated the preservation of Puketāpapa from the same. The hill fell into the ownership of George Winstone, whose fortune was largely sourced from quarrying other volcanoes. Winstone used it to graze the firm’s horses (Simpson 1965), and it was largely intact, partially landscaped in stately English tradition, when gifted to the city in 1928. Some of the phoenix palms planted by Winstone were retained as a tribute to this “European heritage” in the volcano’s 21st century landscaping, historic noxious weeds selectively preserved according to their relationship to the cycleway’s promenade and overall feel of the area. Selection and landscaping alike were performed in accordance with a landscape gaze that has become increasingly established in creation of the mountain and surrounding city. As I note in chapter five, the influence of this visuality and comparative “naturalness” has been extended.
during the time I studied, in council documents and enforced through court cases. It formed the basis of the preservation of other volcanoes, most notably through the efforts of the AVCS, including challenge through the Environment Court under the RMA 6(b).

In chapter five I also introduced the present volcanoes through offering experiences of Maungawhau/Mount Eden. In doing this I noted the enactment of “nature” and “otherness” from the city, before the visual presence of the volcanoes within the city, and the prosthetic predominance of volcanic imagery. This, too, is seen in the suburb of “Mount Roskill” itself, governed by the Puketāpapa Local board, surrounding schools-names (including my own Mount Roskill Grammar), and their symbolism. The “victory” of Mount Roskill was founded on visuality: the motorway was moved northwards, lessening but not preventing damage to the cone, but allowing the “natural form of the volcano” to be retained. Walking here with Richard Reid, who landscaped the area in conjunction with Ngāti Whātua, I gained a glimpse of the thought that went into every mown curve and basalt curbstone. Invisible until pointed out, the lower slopes themselves are whittled away to give the illusion of natural volcanic slopes; precision cosmetic surgery by bulldozer founded on the predominance of vision.

“Volcanoes under threat”, chapter six, gives more context to this, exploring the volcanoes’ presentation in the context of volcanic preservation. Particularly in what I termed “advocate articles”, there was an emphasis on all of Auckland’s volcanoes as valuable by virtue of being Auckland’s volcanoes. A number of these articles were written by one opinion columnist, Brian Rudman. As acknowledged by Smith from the AVCS, Rudman’s “campaign” played a significant role in the shifting of the motorway, including repeated publication and discussion of the “forgotten” and otherwise “enigmatic” 1915 Act. This Act seemed to influence Transit New Zealand where council, Environment and High Court processes had failed. Tactics included drawing on the authority of the “authorised heritage discourse” (Smith 2006), particularly World Heritage, but were also emphatically emplaced, tied to local identity and the familiar. The nonhuman charisma of certain “iconic” peaks was articulated with less charismatic volcanoes. This contagion of concern was infused into the broader volcanic whole, seasoned with affective charisma enhanced through anthropomorphic language. Reader identification with the “unique” volcanic field was encouraged, fostering an emotive tie to “Auckland’s volcanic heritage”. Articulation further compounded over time. Previous victories enabled the 1915 Act, AVCS, and Puketāpapa itself to be used as touchstones, pre-articulated reminders of the virtues of volcanic preservation.

Yet even this “famous victory” had to be won repeatedly. The cyclepath’s first design cut steeply into the mountain, then its surrounding landscaping was threatened with indefinite
stalling for financial reasons – both issues publically critiqued, neither eventuating. The 1915 Act was similarly “forgotten” and dismissed on other occasions. The continued presentation of the volcanoes’ value, in Rudman’s columns, editorials, op-eds and through advocates such as the AVCS as sources, is not only significant in terms of overall representation of the volcanoes, then, but has shaped the treatment of the volcanoes themselves.

Chapter seven, “Raising maunga”, notes the articulation of the sites with Māori, particularly with an eye to present and future identification of the volcanoes as “Māori places”. The summit of Maungakiekie is prominent in these discussions. Its obelisk-augmented visibility facilitated the “icon” status that made it both an embodiment of the nation’s racial problems, and anticipated site of symbolic resolution. This desire was thwarted by the monumental Treaty Settlement processes surrounding Auckland and its maunga. These processes lead to the establishment of Ngā Mana Whenua o Tāmaki Makaurau and the recent Ngā Mana Whenua o Tāmaki Makaurau Collective Redress Act 2014 that included the vesting and name-change of the majority of Auckland’s cones. Maungakiekie was returned to as a symbolic indicator of wellness and resolution throughout this. Indeed, at the time of writing the question of a replacement tree is still periodically raised. In addition to this charismatic site, I note linguistic anchorpoints that tie the volcanoes to each other in the context of Māori issues. I particularly emphasise the use of “maunga”. Given the scarcity of Te Reo in newspaper text, this disarticulates the cones from the geological-volcanic and associates them with a Māori frame of reference. Its use dramatically rose following the Tāmaki Collective settlement, and is increasingly glossed as “volcanic cone”.

This disarticulation and re-imagining is particularly important given strong ties between the volcanoes and the “natural”. In “threatening volcanoes”, chapter eight, I underscore Auckland’s volcanoes as haunted by the imagination of fire. This ideal-type “volcano” was nurtured by the sublime aesthetic. Its frequent invocation is itself founded on the pleasure taken in danger observed from a point of perceived safety. Auckland’s volcanoes are repeatedly presented as signifiers of risk within the Herald, but geology itself partakes of an imbalance between “nature” and human effort that separates its presentation markedly from Beck’s 1992 image of scientific ambivalence. While easily tied to contemporary discourses of risk identification and mitigation, attempts at public education simultaneously draw on older practices of sublime volcanic thrill, tied to spectacle, bodily fragility and limits of perception. These can be seen in the Volcanoes! museum exhibition. While explicitly advocating caution and risk-oriented prudence, this simultaneously exploits these affectual tropes, an articulation that enlivens these communication in a perfect storm of charismatic imaginings, scientific authority and public service through risk mitigation.
Puketāpapa hides its volcanic menace well, a modest, “dumpy” (Moore 2001) hill lacking an obvious crater even before reservoir installation. Yet the motorway that threatened it (and cuts unnoticed into Crater Hill tuff ring) is now branded the “volcanic highway”, adorned throughout with volcanic signifiers. Around Puketāpapa, “revealed” faux-basalt lines the score made into the landscape to accommodate the road, while striking patterns of fiery red, orange and yellow echo in the roadside planting and noise barrier walls: a celebration of eruption. At ground level, volcanism is incorporated into its redesign through material, notably dark, bubbly basalt.

More strongly, though, this landscaping speaks of Māori presence, past and potential. Stonefield gardening structures are represented by wide, low basalt walls, a cluster of circular basalt mounds, while hints of terracing echo in the mown, resculpted land itself. The planned written interpretation has not eventuated, and it is unlikely that all visitors would be aware of the significance of the walls and mounds. This is immaterial, however. The metal fence bordering the cycle path is reminiscent of palisade fencing, marked at points by wooden pou, some bearing faces that gaze watchfully northwards. The land nearby is planted with useful natives: a breed of harakeke especially suited to weaving, fluffy plumes of toetoe, taro. Most stunningly, visitors to the site from the south are greeted by a beautiful carved waharoa, or gateway, arching over the cycle path, visible from the arterial road. Despite aggressive weeds encroaching the path, then, Puketāpapa has become a space entirely unlike the imagined “wilderness” of Maungawhau or the other volcanoes, and unlikely to be subject to similar amnesia.

I cover this transformation, and the volcanoes more broadly, from a middle-class, female, Pākehā perspective. Further engagement with Māori relationships with these volcanoes constitutes an obviously valuable direction for future scholarly attention to the volcanic field. The recent formation of Ngā Mana Whenua o Tāmaki Makaurau and passing of many maunga into the ownership of this collective is of profound significance, and ongoing relationships of the Mana Whenua collective with these maunga will significantly shape the volcanoes, and Tāmaki itself, into the future (Murray, McDonald and Cronin 2015). This Act itself contains limited provision to collect and document the histories and associations iwi have with the maunga of Auckland, although it is unclear the degree or manner in which this may emerge into the mainstream of scholarly engagement.

Considerable further research is possible regarding Auckland’s volcanoes, and I believe this project could serve as a useful tool for much of it. It would be fascinating to compare the
discursive techniques detailed in the pages above with those from a different time period. The physicalities of city and volcano, and journalistic conventions and broader discursive resources, may differ but perhaps echo in other ways: the fascination of the volcanic sublime, and nature/culture distinction, in particular, are especially long-standing tropes within Western culture (e.g. Soper 1995, Williams 1980, Duffy 2013, Bell and Lyall 2002). Qualitative research with Aucklanders about their relationships with the volcanoes would also prove an interesting counterpoint to the findings of this research, particularly with a sensitisation to anthropomorphism and charisma as well as the interpretations, connections and dissociations proffered within this media forum.

I have found extended consideration of Lorimer’s “nonhuman charisma” valuable in examining the seemingly inherent appeal of some volcanoes, an application to place that has previously been comparatively unexplored. This may assist others seeking to more precisely articulate the appeal of places and nonhuman objects. It is also useful for examining the affective agency of physical entities within representation. Applying this to volcanic features illustrates some of the ways that charisma may change with time and circumstance. In particular, it reveals how it may compound. I demonstrate how already-charismatic volcanic summits reserved first physically and then, later, visually, while other sites were quarried away or built over. I similarly note how the summit road of Maungawhau facilitated visitors, and then political attention and funding, in the face of international visibility. I also further expanded upon the relationship of nonhuman charisma to mediation. I note how representation is aided and multiplied by distinctive jizz. I show how the tendency of media to focus on the familiar works recursively. The already-charismatic is subject to more attention, gaining familiarity in an ongoing and self-referential narrative that can facilitate new possibilities for interaction. Examples include aerial photography and cinematically-mediated intimacy with eruption. These insights may be useful to other researchers engaging the concept of nonhuman charisma, particularly with regard to its application to place or its relationship to media.

Attention to compounding charisma is not an argument for inevitability. The “campaign” for volcanic preservation particularly shows that locations low in ecological charisma can be brought to prosthetic and, potentially, physical prominence. The process is ongoing and ultimately undetermined. Puketāpapa, once a forgotten “working-class volcano” that placed second in priority to the intended motorway line, is now a landscaped and celebrated feature of the “volcanic highway”. As this highway makes its connection to the Northwestern Motorway, currently anticipated to occur in 2017, Puketāpapa will increasingly become a presence in the daily lives of many Aucklanders and a welcome landmark for those returning
from the airport. It, too, will be cemented as a charismatic feature for the city’s future inhabitants.
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