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Abstract

International heritage authorities have existed since only relatively recently, as has their policy that heritage needs to be authentic to be officially recognised. Critics argue the established way they define authenticity is inflexible and does not allow for culturally diverse understandings of the concept however. In contrast, open-air museums often use practices that depart from international heritage authorities’ criteria for authenticity, but they are places many people consider authentic and believe are heritage.

This thesis explores official and non-official understandings of authenticity and heritage using the open-air museum of Howick Historical Village in Auckland, New Zealand, as a case study. Like many open-air museums, it contains buildings that were relocated there and restored to the period when they were first built, as well as replicas. This study investigates whether heritage officials have the same opinion of whether the open-air museum is authentic and heritage as heritage non-officials. In doing so, it researches the viewpoints of heritage officials from Auckland Council and Heritage New Zealand, and heritage non-officials who are visitors and volunteers to Howick Historical Village, and Board Members of the Howick and Districts Historical Society. This thesis also investigates how the views of these groups compare to positions on authenticity and heritage in literature, both non-official discourse on open-air museums and official heritage texts.

Does something need to be authentic to be heritage? Is Howick Historical Village authentic? Does the presence of relocated, restored and replica buildings affect its authenticity? Is the open-air museum heritage, and what does heritage mean? What are the viewpoints of heritage officials and heritage non-officials, and how do they compare? This thesis studies these questions and others by using interviews and questionnaires.

This study shows that while the heritage officials think Howick Historical Village has limited authenticity and status as heritage, almost all of the heritage non-officials think it is authentic, and that it is heritage. Significantly, some of the heritage non-officials’ reasons for this, like the open-air museum giving the impression of a real place, contradict principles held by the heritage officials. Both the heritage officials’ and the heritage non-officials’ views have precedent in the literature, but there is a lack of official heritage guidance specific to open-air museums. These factors suggest the heritage officials’ opinions should not be assumed to prevail over the opinions of the heritage non-officials with regard to Howick Historical Village, authenticity and heritage.
I dedicate this thesis to my husband Stephen and daughter Laura.
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Glossary

Abbreviations:

ICCROM  International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property

ICOM  International Council of Museums

ICOMOS  International Council on Monuments and Sites

SPAB  Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings

UNESCO  United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organisation

Definitions:

Fencible: British Army regiments from the United Kingdom and its colonies for defence including during the American War of Independence, and the French Revolutionary Wars. They were usually temporary units, composed of local volunteers, commanded by Regular Army officers, and were frequently confined to garrison and patrol duties, which freed Regular Army units to perform offensive operations. Fencibles were sent to New Zealand during the New Zealand Land Wars to defend early settlers. They were stationed at outlying villages around Auckland, which was then the capital, including Howick. The word ‘fencible’ comes from the word ‘defencible’.¹

Heritage official: A representative of a central government or local government heritage authority.

Heritage non-official: A person from the wider community who is interested in or has involvement with heritage, but is not a heritage official.

Replica: A copy of an existing or former structure or place:²

Restoration: Returning a place to an earlier known form.³

Stylistic-restoration: The practice of restoration that involves changing a building to be like a universal form that was commonly used in the 18th century.⁴

³ ICOMOS New Zealand Charter, Definitions.
Introduction

For a long time I have been interested in authenticity and how it is a concept that many people seem to understand differently. Working as an architect in London I became aware that there are official requirements for authenticity in relation to heritage buildings, but found it perplexing that there could be for such a subjective concept. I wondered how this had been reconciled. Upon my return to New Zealand, I investigated the topic and found international discussion existed but little that reported the findings of primary research, or addressed New Zealand’s situation. I decided to investigate this and to conduct research into the opinions of people that are not heritage officials on the topic. I also resolved to use open-air museums as a vehicle to do so, because it seemed likely their authenticity and status as heritage would be regarded as problematic using official criteria, but be certain using other understandings from the wider community – such as those of their visitors. I thought it was possible I might discover ways authenticity and heritage are understood that are different to official criteria. I also was interested to see how New Zealand’s heritage authorities’ policies on the issues of authenticity and heritage compared to those of other countries. I identified Howick Historical Village as a New Zealand open-air museum which was suitable for this investigation.

Existing literature and research on this topic also provides the historical context for this study. A considerable volume of literature considers international official policies on authenticity and heritage. It shows authenticity became linked officially to heritage only recently, but the reasons go back further to the end of the 18th century when conservationists began advocating the protection of old, original and undisturbed buildings against perceived threats including stylistic restoration and urbanisation. This view became officially favoured, and in the early 20th century the first international heritage authorities emerged, embedding the view as official policy into their charters and guidelines. From 1964 and the advent of The Venice Charter, authenticity became an established official pre-requisite for heritage, with the concept being linked to official criteria that increasingly were advocated to be universally held. However, the literature shows criticism grew that these criteria were Eurocentric, favoured elite architecture, were inflexible and did not allow for culturally diverse understandings of them. This resulted in changes that were first expressed in the 1979 Burra Charter and then later in the landmark Nara Document on Authenticity of 1994. Heritage authorities have increasingly aimed to make their criteria for authenticity more
flexible and inclusive but some critics, such as Laurajane Smith in her book *Uses of Heritage*, argue this has not been to a great enough degree.

Almost as proof that authenticity and heritage can be understood in non-official ways, literature shows open-air museums have often not followed the established principles of international heritage authorities, yet a large number of scholars advocate they are places many people believe are authentic and are heritage. In addition to this, they present a large number of ways open-air museums can be understood to be authentic that differ from established official heritage criteria, such as being visually authentic. However, little literature I could find, with the exception of that by Laurajane Smith, considers how these non-official ways of understanding authenticity and heritage relate to official ways, or presents primary research into the views of heritage non-officials. Smith claims the research she did into the opinions of heritage non-officials at open-air museums is evidence that the way international heritage authorities define authenticity and heritage is too rigid and narrow.

I could not find much literature that focuses on New Zealand’s open-air museums and heritage authorities in terms of their relationship to the concepts of authenticity and heritage, aside from brief mentions in the country’s legislation and official charters. A small amount of criticism exists that New Zealand’s heritage authorities handle these issues in ways that favour elite architecture and tangible heritage, and do not acknowledge Maori understandings adequately, but the criticism is not recent.

Howick Historical Village is the most written about open-air museum in New Zealand and both official and non-official literature exists. However, this only contains occasional references to how this open-air museum corresponds to the concepts of authenticity and heritage. The bulk of it is also not recent and it is from a limited number of authors. No research exists on how different groups of people consider its authenticity and heritage, aside from an interview with Alan La Roche and two staff members included in a brief section of Lucy Schwaner’s Master of Anthropology thesis “Historic Howick: A Question of Place and Identity.”

My research therefore aims to fill these gaps in the existing literature and research by investigating non-official understandings of authenticity and heritage at a New Zealand open-air museum using primary research, and examining how the findings correspond to official requirements internationally and in New Zealand.
My research has the objective of gaining insight into ways authenticity and heritage are understood and approached by heritage non-officials at the open-air museum Howick Historical Village. It aims to analyse how these relate to official understandings of authenticity and heritage. Are they in conflict with each other? Are they able to be accommodated beside each other? The study seeks to find out if the non-official ways of understanding and approaching authenticity and heritage at Howick Historical Village are part of a tradition at other open-air museums. In investigating these questions, my study also has the goal of investigating how New Zealand’s heritage authorities relate to international policies pertaining to authenticity and heritage. It aims to provide a recent examination of whether they have the characteristics of being inflexible and non-inclusive of culturally diverse ways of understanding authenticity and heritage that international heritage authorities have been criticised for. The wider value and relevance of the research examining these issues is that it contributes to discussion of the important question of whether official controls reflect the understandings of the wider community.

Before I started this study my hypothesis was: Heritage non-officials understand authenticity and heritage differently to heritage authorities. This hypothesis remains, but as my research evolved and I identified open-air museums and Howick Historical Village as the vehicle to investigate this, I also developed the research question: How does Howick Historical Village relate to the concepts of authenticity and heritage from official and non-official viewpoints? Sub-questions to the main research question emerged:

1. What does authenticity mean?
2. What does heritage mean?
3. Does something need to be authentic to be heritage?
4. Is Howick Historical Village authentic?
5. Does the involvement of volunteers at Howick Historical Village contribute to it being authentic?
6. Is Howick Historical Village heritage?

The methodology the thesis uses is now described, ahead of the structure the thesis is organised around being outlined.
Methodology

This section outlines the methodology that was used for the research and identifies its strengths and limitations.

My research question and hypothesis required me to identify heritage officials and heritage non-officials who have a relationship with Howick Historical Village. I recognised the heritage authorities that have jurisdiction over the open-air museum as being Auckland Council and Heritage New Zealand, and sought representatives from these organisations. I decided the heritage non-officials with the strongest connection to Howick Historical Village are its visitors, volunteers, and members of the Howick and Districts Historical Society Board, which manages the open-air museum. These groups of heritage non-officials were also selected because it seemed likely they would include people with varying levels of experience and knowledge with regard to heritage. I gained approval from the Human Participants Ethics Committee at The University of Auckland and took care that all participants were informed about their involvement in the project.

I selected as a representative of Auckland Council George Farrant, its Principal Heritage Advisor (Central), and Robin Byron as a representative of Heritage New Zealand, who is the Heritage Advisor Architecture of its Northern Regional Office, because they both have a good overview of their respective heritage authorities and are familiar with Howick Historical Village.

Voluntary work supports Howick Historical Village in education, living history interpretation, cleaning buildings, gardening, archiving, building maintenance, conserving and maintaining, craft demonstrations and music performance. I selected volunteers in building maintenance for the research because they perform work which can be seen as affecting their authenticity. I also selected living history interpreters because some non-official literature asserts living history contributes to an open-air museum’s authenticity and it being heritage. Other types of volunteers were not chosen because they have less involvement with factors that can be seen as affecting the museum’s authenticity, or they were difficult to locate.

I selected Harry Allen and Alan La Roche of the ten board members of the Howick and Districts Historical Society for the research. I chose La Roche since he was involved in the founding of Howick Historical Village, he has had continuous involvement with it since then,
and to access his views that are more recent than his published writing. I picked Harry Allen because he would serve as a counter to La Roche as he became involved with the open-air museum relatively recently, and it was also an opportunity to access his views which are more recent than the literature he authored. While Allen and La Roche are not heritage officials, it is noted they both have had varying involvement with heritage authorities in the past. Allen, who is now retired, had formal training as an archaeologist in Australia, was Associate Professor in the Department of Anthropology at the University of Auckland where he has taught archaeology, and was also a member of Heritage New Zealand’s Maori Heritage Council. La Roche, who is also retired, has a long practical experience of dealing with historic buildings in Howick and at Howick Historical Village, and was also Chairman of the Auckland Regional Committee of the New Zealand Historic Places Trust at one point.

I chose questionnaires and interviews to investigate the views of the heritage officials and non-officials. Questionnaires were selected to research the views of visitors and volunteers because they would allow as many responses to be gathered as possible from the relatively large number of people. Interviews were selected to research the views of the heritage officials and the Howick and Districts Historical Society Board Members because of them being a smaller group of people, and to allow their views to be investigated in more detail. Using both questionnaires and interviews was also robust because it allowed two different types of responses to be gathered.

The questionnaires used both open-ended questions and questions with set answers, though a self-described option was able to be given too, in order to capture any responses I had not anticipated. I designed the questionnaires to be short enough that they could be completed by visitors and volunteers while they were at Howick Historical Village. The interviews were semi-structured with some questions given to the participants in advance. Time was allowed for spontaneous responses and deviation from the questions by the interview participants.

The questionnaires needed to be approved by the Howick and Districts Historical Society’s Board. They rejected the first draft I proposed, requesting it be reconsidered for reasons including some of the questions being “too leading.”¹ To avoid further rejection I revised the questionnaire to make the authenticity of Howick Historical Village less problematic: it included the word ‘authentic’ less, it stated its buildings would have been destroyed if they

¹ Darryl Pike (Previous Collections Manager, Howick Historical Village), email message to author, May 5 2014.
had not been moved to Howick Historical Village, and it explained its replicas are of buildings that may not otherwise have survived or could not be moved to the open-air museum.

I sought to see how respondents’ views related to understandings of authenticity and heritage in the literature through some of the interview and questionnaire questions. In the questionnaires, the question ‘what does authenticity mean?’ was given set response options relating to definitions of authenticity proposed by Edward Bruner in his article “Abraham Lincoln as Authentic Reproduction: A Critique of Postmodernism”. Bruner proposes four definitions of authenticity – historical verisimilitude, genuineness, originality and authority. These are respectively described in the questionnaire as ‘the convincing look of a time period’, ‘how a particular place or thing would have looked at a particular time’, ‘a place or thing that is original’ and ‘a place or thing that is certified as authentic by an official organisation eg. council.’ This afforded comparison to his research at New Salem open-air museum, and research by Jillian Rickly-Boyd at Spring Mill Pioneer Village which uses the same terms, and she presents in “Through the Magic of Authentic Reproduction’: Tourists’ Perceptions of Authenticity in a Pioneer Village.” However, using Bruner’s definitions also meant other definitions for authenticity, such as being a believable experience of the past, are not given, aside from the option of entering a self-defined response. This was catered for by the question “do you think Howick Historical Village is an authentic place” requiring the participants to respond by writing their own comments. I designed other interview and questionnaire questions to gauge participants’ views on some of Howick Historical Village’s buildings being moved, restored to a single time period, or being replicas, to gain insight on how they align with the criteria for authenticity given by official heritage literature.

In hindsight, the visitor questionnaire responses may have been affected by the way two questions were worded. These are the questions that were changed following the Howick and Districts Historical Society Board’s feedback. The first question asks whether visitors know most of the buildings were moved to Howick Historical Village from original locations where they may have otherwise been destroyed. The second question asks whether visitors know some of the buildings are replicas that may not have otherwise survived or could not be moved to Howick Historical Village. The wording may confuse whether visitors are being asked if they know there are moved and replica buildings, or if they know why. On reflection, it may have been better to have broken both questions into two parts, with the first
part asking the intended question, and the second noting why as a statement. The conclusions and implications stemming from these responses are therefore tentative.

I invited visitors to Howick Historical Village to participate in the questionnaire on 6, 7 and 21 September and 19 October 2014, some of which were ‘Live Days’ with extra living history interpretation and more visitors than usual expected to attend. I invited all visitors encountered, aside from those younger than 16 years old and who might have had difficulty giving informed consent on their own behalf, to participate in the questionnaire. All living history volunteers that were volunteering on 21 September 2014 (a Live Day) were invited to complete the questionnaire at their meeting before the museum opened to the public. The group of volunteers who perform building maintenance met at Howick Historical Village on 10 September 2014 and they were all invited to participate in the questionnaire. The interviews with Alan La Roche and Harry Allen took place in Howick Historical Village’s library on the 1 September 2014 and 9 September 2014, respectively. The interview with Robin Byron took place at Heritage New Zealand’s Auckland office on 8 October 2014, and the interview with George Farrant occurred in a meeting room at the Auckland Town Hall on 2 December 2014. The interviews took roughly one hour and were recorded and later transcribed verbatim.

I analysed the interviews and questionnaires by using statistical analysis, and by looking for common themes in responses to open-ended questions and other self-described responses. Comments that are representative of a common theme are quoted, along with remarks that provide particular insight. On a small number of occasions interviews collected no response to a research sub-question; in these cases responses are deduced from others during the interview, but this is noted.

To contextualise Howick Historical Village, the thesis included an overview of the open-air museum based on secondary sources, and a review of literature that discusses it in relationship to authenticity and heritage. I concluded, however, that this did not provide sufficient information, and it was necessary to supplement it to allow the reader to form an impression of the open-air museum and its relationship to authenticity and heritage. I provided this by using direct observations of Howick Historical Village from the field and information that is available to visitors: the visitor brochure and interpretation panels. The observations were informed by terms for authenticity and heritage taken from official heritage literature and non-official literature which discusses open-air museums.
The extent to which this thesis’s research can be transferred to other places may be limited to other open-air museums, for the reason that Howick Historical Village, as an open-air museum, has a history and set of reference points that are very particular to these types of places. I do not believe this should diminish this study’s worth however. Indeed, hopefully it indicates the distinctive characteristics of Howick Historical Village and other open-air museums.

**Thesis Structure**

The thesis has three parts. Part I investigates the wider context for this study, and is made up of Chapters One and Two. Part II presents the heritage officials’ and heritage non-officials’ views on Howick Historical Village, authenticity and heritage, and consists of Chapter Three. The final part discusses these findings and offers conclusions, and is composed of Chapter Four.

Chapter One presents a review of literature that addresses the wider area of this study. The first section of this focuses on literature about international heritage authorities and their policies on authenticity. It identifies an established policy which has existed since the mid 20th century, and has origins in 19th century conservation. The section also shows criticism of the established policy exists. The second section reviews literature about international open-air museums and how they correspond to the concepts of authenticity and heritage, and identifies there is a gap in official heritage literature that addresses this. This section finds, however, that non-official literature often considers open-air museums authentic, and to be heritage, and for a wide range of reasons. The third section of Chapter One concentrates on literature that addresses New Zealand’s specific situation in relation to the issues of authenticity and heritage. It focuses on texts about the country’s open-air museums, and regarding its heritage authorities. The section finds that New Zealand’s heritage authorities mirror international ones in many ways, but there is a paucity of information about its open-air museums.

Chapter Two concentrates more closely on the case study for this thesis: Howick Historical Village. Its first section provides background to the open-air museum. The second section reviews literature that discusses Howick Historical Village, authenticity and heritage. This shows that New Zealand’s heritage authorities judge the open-air museum to have
problematic authenticity and not fully be heritage, but the information is not recent, and the reasons why are not always clear. Non-official literature concerning Howick Historical Village is limited and varies in whether it considers it to be authentic, or to be heritage. The third section supplements the information available in the literature, by presenting direct observations of Howick Historical Village from the field.

Chapter Three presents the responses from the heritage officials and non-officials on Howick Historical Village, authenticity and heritage from their interview and questionnaire responses. A section presents the findings for each of the four groups researched – representatives of Auckland Council and Heritage New Zealand, members of the Howick and Districts Historical Society Board, visitors and volunteers to the open-air museum. This allows insight into the way these heritage officials and non-officials understand the issues of authenticity and heritage, and their relationship to Howick Historical Village, as is investigated by the research sub-questions.

Chapter Four, finishes by comparing the participants’ responses, and discussing them in relation to the literature. The chapter draws the findings and discussion together to offer conclusions to the over-arching research question.

Ultimately, this last chapter will show that, though Howick Historical Village has characteristics which mean the heritage officials judge it to not fully be authentic, or to be heritage, most of the heritage non-officials conversely do. It will also show conflict sometimes exists between the principles the heritage officials and non-officials use to consider this however. For example, the heritage officials believe restoring buildings to single period diminishes their authenticity and status as heritage because it removes significant changes that have happened through their life, but some of the heritage non-officials consider it improves it for the reason it helps them better imagine what the original Howick settlement was like. The presence of these differences of opinion, and a similar tension also being found within the literature, suggests the heritage officials’ view should not be assumed to take priority over that of the heritage non-officials with regard to Howick Historical Village.
PART I – CONTEXT

Chapter One: Literature Review

Chapter One has the objective of reviewing literature which discusses authenticity and heritage in terms of these concepts’ relationship to international heritage authorities, international open-air museums, and New Zealand’s heritage authorities and open-air museums. It reviews the literature in three sections. The chapter has the objective of investigating the range of ways authenticity and heritage are understood in relation to these organisations and places, and thereby of gaining insight into official and non-official understandings of authenticity and heritage.

1.1 Literature on International Heritage Authorities and Authenticity

This section aims to investigate whether international heritage authorities require heritage to be authentic and, if so, to find out more about the history of and criteria for this. It considers both official documents – largely charters and guidelines – and non-official texts. Only major pieces of literature are reviewed due to the large amount that exists on this topic. The literature is mainly arranged chronologically, but are also sometimes clustered to allow closer comparison between related texts. This section shows there is an official requirement for heritage to be authentic that is held by international heritage authorities, but it is relatively recent, and its criteria have gone through a number of changes. It also finds the criteria international heritage authorities use to judge whether heritage is authentic have attracted criticism.

Jukka Jokilehto’s book *A History of Architectural Conservation* traces the origins and development of modern conservation from antiquity to the late 20th century. While it is not the earliest piece of literature that addresses the international heritage authorities and authenticity, it is placed at the beginning of this section as it provides invaluable wider background to the subject. The book was published in 1999 and is a landmark as it was the first to provide a comprehensive historical survey of architectural conservation. Jokilehto has held roles within international heritage authorities as Assistant Director General at ICCROM
for over 25 years and since holding roles with UNESCO and ICOMOS. *A History of Architectural Conservation* was published in association with ICCROM.

Jokilehto explains in the Middle Ages authenticity related to the legal authenticity of texts and later this extended to objects “such as relics of saints”.¹ The end of the 18th century saw large changes in Europe in Enlightenment thought, advances in science and large parts of the population moving from the countryside to cities. Scientific proof rather than absolute and divine values were sought in history, art and cultural heritage. Differences in cultures and the uniqueness of individual works of art and cultural heritage were recognised.² There was a new relationship between people and “traditional buildings, settlements and land-use.”³

Jokilehto explains stylistic restoration was the favoured policy of Ecclesiologists in England and the French government from the 1830s. Its popularity was linked to positivism and to the development of the sciences, including archaeology. Initially the practice had aimed to protect monuments of the past, but some individuals became interested in restoring lost stylistic integrity through reconstructing an idealised and universal architectural form.⁴ “The absolute ‘idea’ of beauty in Classicism was now associated with the concept of style... an external reference to the object itself, an ideal scheme to be taken as a reference for ‘stylistic restoration’.”⁵ Eugene Emmanuel Viollet-le-Duc was a prominent architect who used this technique.⁶

However, the interest in history that emerged at the second half of the 18th century meant authenticity became linked to originality and oldness: “a new, critical appreciation of antiquity... urging the conservation of originals for their artistic value, and as ‘lessons’ for contemporary artists.”⁷ The patina of age was valued and in England ruins came to be appreciated.⁸ In turn, this meant there was “a growing criticism of stylistic restoration, and an emphasis on the need to conserve the genuine and original, the different layers and transformations of history... Being ‘authentic’ thus received a new meaning as a representation of ‘universal value’ in humanity”.⁹ This sentiment took form as the
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conservation movement at the beginning of the 19th century, with its interest in protecting original fabric.\textsuperscript{10}

Whether conservation or stylistic restoration should be followed was debated in England during the 1840s. John Ruskin, William Morris and the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings (SPAB) headed the anti-stylistic restoration movement and spread the message of modern conservation beyond England.\textsuperscript{11} The manifesto of the SPAB stated their requirements for historic buildings – that they “represented historic periods only so far as their authentic material was undisturbed and preserved in situ; any attempt to restore or copy would only result in the loss of authenticity and the creation of a fake.”\textsuperscript{12}

Jokilehto explains that \textit{The Venice Charter} of 1964 reflected this sentiment and “emphasised a respect for historical authenticity and integrity – considering there had been an overemphasis of stylistic restoration since the war.”\textsuperscript{13} He notes that authenticity was not the focus of discussion in the 1970s and 1980s, rather scientific development. However, the 30th anniversary of \textit{The Venice Charter} meant attention was again given to authenticity and to re-defining it to include contexts beyond Western society, particularly traditional cultures. The 1994 \textit{Nara Document on Authenticity} expresses this by emphasising cultural diversity as well as credibility and truthfulness of sources.\textsuperscript{14}

Despite the dominance of conservation, Jokilehto observes stylistic restoration continued to be popular in the 20th century in almost all areas of the world. He also calls the augmentation of tourism an “important ‘beneficiary’ of stylistic restoration.”\textsuperscript{15}

Jokilehto asserts that the term authenticity was used widely at the time of his book’s writing, but it was also interpreted differently by different groups. “Attempts have been made to define terms in international charters and recommendations... but substantial variations do remain.”\textsuperscript{16}

In 1931 \textit{The Athens Charter for the Restoration of Historic Monuments}, which is arguably the first international heritage charter, was adopted at the First International Congress of
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Architects and Technicians of Historic Monuments in Athens. *The Athens Charter* does not mention authenticity explicitly, but it contains resolutions which are pro-conservation and anti-stylistic restoration, noting “a general tendency to abandon restorations in toto and to avoid the attendant dangers... ensure the preservation of the buildings.... the historic and artistic work of the past should be respected, without excluding the style of any given period.” 17 Greater international collaboration and control of historic monuments is advocated and an inventory of them proposed18 but criteria for inclusion on it are not given. The *Charter* qualifies its resolutions by stating “they should be in keeping with local circumstances and with the trend in public opinion”. 19

The Second International Congress of Architects and Technicians of Historic Monuments in 1964 resulted in another charter, the *International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites*, or *The Venice Charter*. It was adopted by ICOMOS in 1965 and develops the themes of conservation rather than stylistic restoration and internationalism present in *The Athens Charter*. It has been highly influential and underwrites the established view of heritage authorities internationally. It is referenced by the ICOMOS charters produced in many countries to this day.

*The Venice Charter*’s first paragraph notes it is a common responsibility to hand historic monuments “on in the full richness of their authenticity”20 because there is more awareness they are a common heritage and their protection requires a coordinated international effort. The paragraph also explains that heritage is very important universally by describing “ancient monuments”21 as a “common heritage”.22 It explains *The Athens Charter* of 1931 articulated these concepts for the first time and “contributed towards the development of an extensive international movement which has assumed concrete form in national documents” and the work of international organisations such as UNESCO.23 It states the advent of more complex
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problems means “the time has come to examine the Charter afresh in order to make a thorough study of the principles involved and enlarge its scope”. 24

The Venice Charter does not define authenticity explicitly, but it cautions restoration should not go beyond “respect for original material and authentic documents. It must stop at the point where conjecture begins... any extra work... must be distinct... must bear a contemporary stamp.” 25 The charter states all periods of work present in a building should be respected “since unity of style is not the aim of a restoration.” 26 Moving a monument should not happen “except where safeguarding of that monument demands it”. 27

The themes of internationalism and conservation rather than stylistic restoration were further developed in UNESCO’s Convention Concerning the Protection of World Cultural and Natural Heritage (1972), which notes natural and cultural heritage was increasingly threatened. It appeals for cooperation from the international community to protect heritage of “outstanding universal value”, 28 establishing to this end a World Heritage Committee and a World Heritage Fund. 29 It states cultural heritage is of outstanding universal value “from the point of view of history, art or science” 30 but the term is not further defined.

However, the meaning of universal was developed by the 1978 UNESCO Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention. These amalgamate the guidelines adopted by the World Heritage Committee at its first session of 30 June 1977 and amendments made at its second on 20 October 1977. As a basis, the 1978 Guidelines define cultural and natural heritage as “priceless and irreplaceable possessions, not only of a nation, but of mankind as a whole”. 31 They note a function of the World Heritage Committee was to prepare a World Heritage List of cultural and natural history of “outstanding universal value” 32 but also observe:

The definition of ‘universal’ in the phrase ‘outstanding universal value’ requires comment. Some properties may not be recognized by all people, everywhere, to be of great importance and significance... the term ‘universal’ must be interpreted as
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referring to a property which is highly representative of the culture of which it forms a part.\textsuperscript{33}

However, it also states “outstanding universal value will be recognized when... found to meet one or more of the following criteria”\textsuperscript{34} which include representing a unique artistic or aesthetic achievement; being a masterpiece of creative genius; being unique, extremely rare, or of great antiquity; being characteristic of a type; being an example of a fragile tradition; or being associated with important history.\textsuperscript{35} As well as meeting these criteria, the 1978 Guidelines state that in order to be included on the World Heritage List, a cultural property must “meet the test of authenticity in design, materials, workmanship and setting”.\textsuperscript{36} Authenticity is not further defined however.

These international issues were again addressed at a national level by the 1979 Australia ICOMOS Guidelines for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Significance, or the Burra Charter. This adapts established international heritage guidelines to Australia’s conditions though it also “continues to respect and observe the Venice Charter as a document of international agreement”.\textsuperscript{37} The Burra Charter removes The Venice Charter’s references to monuments and replaces them with the term “places of cultural significance”.\textsuperscript{38} This had the effect of shifting the focus from tangible fabric to the meanings people assign to places.

The questioning spirit of the Burra Charter continued in the groundbreaking 1985 non-official book The Past Is A Foreign Country by David Lowenthal. Lowenthal discusses the variety of approaches people have taken to the past and focuses on their contradictions rather than advocating a set of principles. He explains authenticity has been understood in many different ways over time and gives as an example that copies only recently becoming less valuable than originals.\textsuperscript{39} Lowenthal observes the desire for things to be authentic is often inseparable from the desire for them to appear authentic.\textsuperscript{40} He also notes what authenticity is generally agreed to look like has changed over time, and is different in from one culture to another. To illustrate, he explains the patina of age was a mark of authenticity for 19th
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century British conservationists, but this differs from how items from the past looking new has become a mark of authenticity in the USA at the time his book was published.\textsuperscript{41}

Lowenthal’s attitude of enquiry continued, but in the official sphere, in the 1994 ICOMOS \textit{The Nara Document on Authenticity}, which was prepared at the Nara Conference on Authenticity in Relation to the World Heritage Convention, organised by the Japanese Government in cooperation with UNESCO, ICCROM and ICOMOS.\textsuperscript{42} It is a highly influential document and has not been superseded in the more than twenty years since its publication. It is arguably still less accepted than the established understanding of heritage that is expressed in \textit{The Venice Charter} however.

\textit{The Nara Document on Authenticity} aims to “challenge conventional thinking in the conservation field... bring greater respect for cultural and heritage diversity to conservation practice.”\textsuperscript{43} It notes authenticity “appears to be the essential qualifying factor concerning values”\textsuperscript{44} but “all judgements... may differ from culture to culture, and even within the same culture... not possible to base judgements... within fixed criteria.”\textsuperscript{45} The document notes “all cultures and societies are rooted in the particular forms and means of intangible expression which constitute their heritage, and these should be respected”\textsuperscript{46} and acknowledges “responsibility for cultural heritage and the management of it belongs, in the first place, to the cultural community that has generated it, and subsequently to that which cares for it.”\textsuperscript{47}

Three years after Jukka Jokilehto’s book, a non-official article looked at authenticity in more detail. Randolph Starn’s 2002 “Authenticity and Historic Preservation: Towards an Authentic History” emphasises how approaches taken to authenticity and buildings of the past have often been complicated and contradictory. Starn is Professor Emeritus of the Department of History at the University of California, Berkeley.

He notes there has always been debate over what is authentic heritage, yet authenticity is a fundamental concept of all modern heritage policy\textsuperscript{48} even though “it is no exaggeration to say
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that the concept of authenticity is fuzzy.”\textsuperscript{49} He explains discussion of authenticity in heritage is relatively recent, and though it is often described as relating to the 19\textsuperscript{th} century conservation versus stylistic restoration debate, as Jokilehto maintains, “in fact the line between conservationists and restorationists was often breached in the same architect or project”\textsuperscript{50} He states authenticity rarely was discussed in the literature of the time. “The principle of ‘conserving’... did not win out in any simple way over the ideal of ‘restoring’ them, and ‘authenticity’ was not an exclusive criterion or even a keyword in the rise of the preservation movement.”\textsuperscript{51} Around 1900, Starn explains, works that are important because they consider authenticity’s “conflicting values and complications” were done by theorist-practitioners including Alois Riegel and the Italian professor, architect and policy-maker Camillo Boito.\textsuperscript{52} He also notes the professionalised building conservation literature that emerged in Europe at the end of the 19\textsuperscript{th} century was characterised by its ability to accommodate the conflicting demands of restoration versus conservation in practical terms.\textsuperscript{53} Boito promoted an approach that was adapted to each specific project “while working within principles and procedures established by consultation among knowledgeable experts.”\textsuperscript{54} Starn states “This was the view eventually endorsed on international level in 1931”\textsuperscript{55} in the Athens Charter, a document he notes did not mention authenticity.\textsuperscript{56} Starn therefore posits “the Venice Charter’s declaration on authenticity did not rest on a long-standing tradition”,\textsuperscript{57} but explains this was understandable given the context of the Second World War’s destruction, suggesting it can be seen as “a challenge to take responsibility in the face of rapid change.”\textsuperscript{58} Starn notes debate on authenticity occurred in the early 1990s with many commentators including David Lowenthal. At the Nara Conference on Authenticity, he explains “The Venice Charter was roundly criticized... accused of pegging universal standards of authenticity to stone construction and a Western fetishism of the ‘monument’ and the
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material trace”. In keeping with this, he observes *The Nara Document on Authenticity’s Article 11* almost dispenses with the ‘test of authenticity’ from the UNESCO *Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention* altogether.

Discussions about authenticity since the Nara Conference “look like a balancing act” but Starn cautions they should not be considered worthless because they “represent a strain of measured and responsive professionalism that has gone on since the 19th century through the thick and thin of showier campaigns for or against historic preservation.”

Another text from around the same time to consider bias within international heritage authorities was *The World Heritage List: Filling the Gaps - An Action Plan for the Future* by ICOMOS in 2004. This was ICOMOS’s response to the World Heritage Committee’s request to analyse the World Heritage List’s “perceived ‘gaps’” and “make recommendations on how we can work towards a more credible, representative and balanced List in the future.”

*Filling the Gaps* notes since the 1976 meeting that pre-empted the UNESCO World Heritage List, when the term ‘outstanding universal value’ was first used, ‘universal’ has had the meaning of “a set of ideas or values which are universally recognized as important, or as having influenced the evolution of mankind as a whole at one time or another”. The report notes however that it has since been recognized cultural values often vary.

*Filling the Gaps* posits the World Heritage List “demonstrates considerable gaps....there is a strong predominance of some regions... certain themes are well represented, while others are absent or nearly absent.” It finds the most represented cultural heritage categories are architectural properties, historic towns, religious properties and archaeological properties and Europe has the largest number of occurrences.
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The 2005 UNESCO Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention indicate how the discussion of authenticity has developed since the 1978 Guidelines. The Guidelines have been revised roughly every year or two since 1978. For the first time, the 2005 Guidelines refer to The Nara Document on Authenticity of 1994, stating it “provides a practical basis for examining the authenticity” of nominated properties, and gives a summary of it for this purpose. The 2005 Guidelines however explain qualities such as spirit and feeling, which are referred to by The Nara Document on Authenticity, “do not lend themselves easily to practical applications of the conditions of authenticity,” but concedes they “nevertheless are important indicators of character and sense of place”. It also lists significant expert meetings following the Nara Conference that have developed the concept of authenticity such as the Inter-American Symposium on Authenticity in the Conservation and Management of Cultural Heritage at San Antonio, Texas in 1996.

The questioning of established international criteria for authentic heritage was taken further by Laurajane Smith in her 2006 book Uses of Heritage. In this she argues cultural heritage has been controlled by international heritage authorities and proposes a different way of considering it. Smith is significant for her questioning of established heritage practice and is currently Head of the Centre of Heritage and Museum Studies at the Australian National University, Canberra.

Smith argues “‘heritage’ can unproblematically be identified as ‘old’, grand, monumental and aesthetically pleasing” and that this definition is promoted by international heritage authorities. As background, Smith establishes that the conservation approach to cultural heritage started in Europe and was linked to Enlightenment thought and 19th century modernity, as does Jokilehto. She observes 19th century industrialisation and urbanisation eroded people’s security and new means were needed to give society cohesion and identity. Nationalist narratives were developed and “a new, more pointed concern for what we now identify as ‘heritage’ emerged.” Many European nations began conserving and managing historic buildings and artefacts. Smith notes monuments were important as they were
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considered to represent grand European history and people felt there was a duty to protect them as ‘inheritance’. This was expressed in the philosophy of Ruskin and the Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings (SPAB). Smith argues John Ruskin and the SPAB favoured buildings aligned with 19th century Romanticism – those that were Picturesque and built prior to the 17th century. She explains the European conservation movement and the American preservation movement developed alongside the significant social change of the 19th century and claims they chose to ‘save’ “the grand, the great and the ‘good’ as symbols of patriotism”. She notes that the 1972 UNESCO *Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage*:

confirmed ‘heritage’ as an international issue... further institutionalized the nineteenth-century conservation ethic and the ‘conserve as found’ ethos.... the European sense of historical monument as universally significant underwrites this Convention, which inevitably universalizes Western values....

Smith believes the concept of authenticity is significant in the 1972 UNESCO *Convention* and many ICOMOS charters because she concurs with Starn’s opinion that authenticity had not been a focus prior to *The Venice Charter*. And, in that *Charter*, she believes, like Starn, it was mainly a response to “the devastation caused to cityscapes during the Second World War and the runaway urban development of the 1960s.... a call for continuity”.

Smith discounts changes to acknowledge diversity by international heritage authorities as superficial, claiming that while they have “begun to acknowledge intangible heritage, this does not mean they are easy with it”. She instead argues heritage authorities actively control the definition of authenticity and use it “as a device through which heritage professionals may authorize and legitimize the past and its material remains as universal heritage.”

Some of Smith’s criticisms of international heritage authorities are shared by Pamela Jerome, as is apparent in her 2008 article “An Introduction to Authenticity in Preservation,” but Jerome believes the organisations have improved. Jerome is an architect, an adjunct
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professor at Columbia University and a board member of the U.S. National Committee of ICOMOS.

Jerome notes the meaning of authenticity is debated though it has played a significant role in many international heritage authority charters of the 20th century, an observation that echoes Starn. She questions contradictions between some built projects and The Venice Charter and UNESCO’s Operational Guidelines’ policies on authenticity, including the rebuilding of Warsaw following World War II, which was placed on the World Heritage List in 1980. She notes Warsaw’s reconstruction did not follow the 1964 Venice Charter’s principle that authentic heritage is not that which is mostly reconstructed using new materials or restoration which is based on conjecture. This gap between practice and policy echoes Starn’s observation that contradictions between conservation and restoration principles were common in the 19th century.

Jerome suggests The Venice Charter implied “acquired layers of history” have value and therefore are authentic and that it and early versions of UNESCO’s Operational Guidelines identified “cultural heritage as monumental architecture, a Western construct.” However, she notes:

In the post-modern era of preservation, the anthropological view of cultural heritage has gradually superseded the monumental. This shift has substantially broadened the definition of cultural heritage to incorporate a wide range of tangible and intangible expressions of authenticity.

Jerome notes ICOMOS and the Japanese government organised the 1994 Nara Conference to address the difficulty in defining authenticity and because the Japanese traditional method of rebuilding historic timber buildings did not satisfy the established requirements of international heritage authorities. In the resulting Nara Document on Authenticity “the need for flexibility when defining authenticity was recommended.... subsequently ICOMOS
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encouraged regional meetings to explore the context of authenticity”91, with Jerome reporting 50 meetings being held since 1994.92

Five years later, Miles Glendinning’s 2013 book *The Conservation Movement: A History of Architectural Preservation: Antiquity to Modernity* discusses the development of conservation and considers the topic of international heritage authorities and authenticity. The book is likely to be a landmark as it is the first in depth survey of the history of conservation movement since Jokilehto’s *A History of Architectural Conservation*. Glendinning is Professor of Architectural Conservation at the University of Edinburgh and Director of the Scottish Centre for Conservation Studies.

Consistent with Jokilehto, Starn and Smith, Glendinning explains “conservation as a concerted modern phenomenon only really emerged in the late 18th century, in the violent political, social and economic modernisations of Europe, especially the French Revolution of 1789.”93 He explains the conservation approach to authenticity and building of the past was a reaction to Enlightenment progress. Glendinning asserts that while the conservation approach has since been contested and changed by rival groups, it is tied to “the Western drive for a codified, rational and secular exercise of power and knowledge.”94 He adds there had been a nationalistic aspect to it, but by the early mid-20th century unifying modern elements took dominance, allowing the conservation movement to become an international approach.95

Glendinning states that in the period between the World Wars, the focus of the conservation movement changed from the authenticity of built fabric to national and political outcomes and storytelling.96 He explains the extent of World War I’s destruction - “not just vanished landmarks but entire vanished towns”97 - signalled a change in how authenticity was approached because conservative repair was often not a viable option. There was a change in public and official sentiment towards large scale reconstruction and replicas, with these approaches emerging as favoured over the preservation of ruins. Glendinning gives the examples of Ypres and the Campanile of St. Mark in Venice. At Ypres, its inhabitants’ quick
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return showed the public’s preference for the town’s “simplified, somewhat generic ‘Flemish Renaissance style’”,\(^98\) large-scale reconstruction and replicas.\(^99\) Glendinning also notes Nazi Germany’s National Socialists had heritage policies “emphasising propaganda image rather than substance”,\(^100\) as they allowed *schöpferisch* or creative freedom to be taken with existing monuments, old towns and newly created historically-styled monuments in order to deliver the Nazis’ ideology.\(^101\)

Nonetheless, Glendinning finds World War I strengthened support for conservation:

> Growing attempts at systemic internationalism, channelled through professional organisations: a strategic vision for definition and protection of the ‘common heritage’ in the light of the failure of the prewar conventions to protect monuments during World War I.\(^102\)

He describes the 1931 *Athens Charter* as part of this and notes it supported “an institutionalised Ruskinian position... repair-only formula, respecting styles of all periods, while exploiting modern technology and construction.”\(^103\)

Glendinning comments the 1964 *Venice Charter* was a combination of Italian and international conservation policies that “resoundingly affirmed heritage internationalism”\(^104\) and resolved the protection of ancient monuments was a concern for all humanity. Like Jokilehto and Starn, he acknowledges *The Venice Charter* was a response to the “somewhat cavalier freedom of many postwar restoration projects” that re-declared 19\(^{th}\) century conservationist beliefs but “in a more up-to-date guise, shaped by the Modern Movement’s preference for a contrast of old and new.”\(^105\)

On the other hand, Glendinning links Warsaw’s reconstruction to 19\(^{th}\) century stylistic restoration practice: “In true Viollet manner, the historic zone was restored not to its 1939 condition, but to an idealised state... the mid-/late-18\(^{th}\)-century Baroque townscape of the heyday of Polish independence”.\(^106\) Like Jerome, Glendinning explains the celebration of
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Warsaw’s reconstruction by international heritage authorities conflicted with their conservation-based policy on authenticity. He states, Warsaw was however “immunised from doctrinal criticism through the city’s martyr status”, and points out the reconstruction only became popular with international heritage authorities 50 years after it happened. At the time, the international criticism of the reconstruction was countered by Warsaw’s officials stating that authenticity resided in the city’s ideological function, rather than its material fabric.

Glendinning notes, like Jokilehto and Jerome, that in the 1980s, acknowledging cultural diversity became a new requirement for authenticity, and comments this was because the period saw a shift away from a European-based, Venice Charter-style approach to cultural heritage due to fractured and specialised conservation interests, and the influence of cultural post-modernism. The disjunction between established international heritage guidelines and the trend for cultural heritage to be diverse, “a social or cultural process rather than a physical product”, was highlighted and expressed in Australia’s internationally significant Burra Charter.

The 1990s saw the definition of authenticity becoming less stable, Glendinning maintains, with further breaking down of the “narrow definitions and narratives” of cultural heritage with The Nara Document on Authenticity being an expression of this. It defined authenticity with greater flexibility, supported post-modern relativism, acknowledged cultural context, and made both tangible and intangible expression valid. He explains this is significant as the established mid-20th century definition of authenticity still underpinned most international heritage charters and guidelines. However, Glendinning notes, The Nara Document on Authenticity’s sense of relativism has resulted “within the doctrinal corpus of conservation itself... a growing tension between the authenticity implications of tangible and intangible heritage”, a claim that echoes Smith.
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This section has investigated international heritage authorities and authenticity and found the existence of the authorities is fairly recent, as is the belief they share that heritage needs to be authentic. The section shows the basis of the official understanding that old, original and undisturbed fabric is authentic heritage goes back to the 19th century’s conservation movement, and that the belief was cemented by the destruction of the World Wars. These principles for authentic heritage were promoted through multi-nation charters. Since the 1964 Venice Charter, heritage and authenticity have been fundamentally linked and its definition of authenticity has been claimed to be universally held. Towards the end of the 20th century, this established international official view of authentic heritage has been criticised as being Eurocentric, privileging tangible expressions of elite heritage and inflexible. International heritage authorities have arguably addressed this through changes such as those outlined in ICOMOS’s 1994 Nara Document on Authenticity but some critics, such as Laurajane Smith, believe the changes have been superficial, and that international heritage authorities are instead controlling the definition of authentic heritage for their own reasons. Some critics, such as Pamela Jerome, do believe change has occurred however, and even though ICOMOS’s 2004 review of UNESCO’s World Heritage List found bias in it, such a review happening within international heritage authorities can be seen as evidence of change.

1.2 Literature on International Open-Air Museums, Authenticity and Heritage

This section aims to explore the ways in which international open-air museums can be considered authentic or to be heritage. It explores how they correspond to the criteria held by international heritage authorities, and how they are considered authentic or heritage in other, non-official ways. All of the literature reviewed in this section is non-official, as the international official heritage literature discussed in Section 1.1, such as The Venice Charter, does not refer to open-air museums. A related authority, the International Council of Museum (ICOM), however did make a declaration in 1957 which recognises them and stated it is “often not possible to conserve buildings in-situ... every country should have an open-air museum”.113 Official bodies relating to international open-air museums (the Association for
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Living History, Farm and Agricultural Museums, and the Association of European Open Air Museums, which is affiliated with ICOM, do not appear to have any literature available which discusses them in terms of authenticity and heritage. Due to the large amount of non-official literature on open-air museums, only the most relevant to the topic of their authenticity and status as heritage is reviewed. This is mainly journal articles but there are some books, including excerpts from books reviewed in Section 1.1. The literature is mainly arranged chronologically. This section shows that open-air museums do not usually fully meet the established criteria for authenticity held by international heritage authorities, but they are still considered authentic by many in non-official ways. Whether open-air museums are heritage has received less attention.

The earliest non-official literature on open-air museums I have been able to locate is from the same date as ICOM’s declaration which recognises open-air museums, and is Kai Uldall’s 1957 article “Open Air Museums.” It focuses on open-air museums’ history, typical characteristics, and practical concerns to be considered when establishing new ones.  

While he does not discuss their authenticity or whether they are heritage directly, the article provides useful background to open-air museums. Uldall held roles at the open-air museum Frilandsmuseet, which is a national museum of Denmark.

The first open-air museums were created at the end of the 19th century in Scandinavia and they differed from other museums by concentrating on recent history and objects belonging to the peasant classes because of “the assumption that the old rural way of life, threatened by modern developments, would yield the most important contributions to ethnological research.” Open-air museums’ typical focus on recent history and the lower classes is interesting because Laurajane Smith criticises international heritage authorities for instead privileging old and elite architecture in Section 1.1.
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Uldall explains that initially open-air museums only had interior displays, but later they shifted whole buildings to the museums, and over time different approaches were taken to their arrangement and setting:

In the older museum, the buildings were sometimes arranged in chronological order of development so that buildings differing from each other, from the cultural and geographical points of view, stood next to one another. The grounds available... were often too small and were laid out as an ordinary park or garden, the arrangement and planting of which bore no relationship to the old buildings. Large open-air museums now prefer to distribute their buildings on a geographical basis, and... planting... so as to give them their natural setting.

Uldall believes planning an open-air museum “demands a certain restraint and the temptation of resorting to theatrical settings should be avoided.” He states a building should not be moved if it can be preserved in favourable conditions on its original site, “the emphasis should always be on preservation rather than reconstruction”, and “all work on old buildings should be under the supervision of a specially trained architect and carried out exclusively by the Museum’s own specially trained craftsmen”, principles which accord with those of established international heritage literature, as identified in the previous Section 1.1. However, he states the decision open-air museum staff make between conserving the original buildings as they are found or restoring them with large-scale reconstruction “will depend largely on the aim the museum has set itself.... information for the general public, or... a collection valuable as a source of information to building research”.

More than two decades later, a wave of texts from the 1980s discuss open-air museums and consider their authenticity and status as heritage from a variety of angles.

Historian Michael Wallace’s 1981 article, “Visiting the Past: History Museums in the United States,” focuses on how open-air museums in that country responded to changes that occurred in society from the 1930s. Wallace claims open-air museums in the USA have been created
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“by members of dominant classes”125 from the mid-19th century and interpreted history in a way that perpetuated their power,126 a concept that parallels Smith’s criticism of international heritage authorities.127 However, Wallace notes, from the 1930s the dominant class’s control was increasingly challenged,128 and in the 1960s, urban expansion and destruction of historic buildings resulted in new open-air museums being created, often by amateurs with a non-profit ethos and a non-elite local history focus.129 Wallace notes the 1960s also prompted change to some existing professional open-air museums, with dirt and disorder being introduced, illustrating a desire to be more historically accurate.130 Wallace argues the degree of change at the professional museums was limited, however, as they still did not include struggle or anything political: “a static and falsely harmonious quality”.131

Thomas Angotti’s 1982 article, “Planning the Open-Air Museum and Teaching Urban History: The United States in the World Context,” concentrates on the characteristics of open-air museums in the USA. Angotti is Professor of Urban Affairs and Planning at the City University of New York. Angotti explains while European open-air museums usually favour preservation and are often run by the nation’s authorities, those in the USA usually favour reconstruction, and more are privately owned and not clearly defined as being for education or entertainment.132 He asks whether it is better for open-air museums to display their collections so they are preserved, or so they are used in a living environment, and explains this prompts the question of who the museums serve – experts or the general public, a point that is also made by Uldall. Angotti observes original settlement patterns are usually poorly represented and the common arrangement of buildings in a scattered linear pattern is “primarily to provide ease of access from a meandering footpath.”133

Lowenthal’s 1985 The Past is a Foreign Country, which is reviewed in Section 1.1, also discusses open-air museums and authenticity briefly. Lowenthal claims visitors to open-air museums do not require buildings to be original in order to consider them authentic, a view that departs from that of The Venice Charter and other established international heritage
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literature. He states this is the case, even though authenticity is very important to visitors. He suggests that even when visitors find out buildings have been reconstructed or are replicas, they are rarely disappointed. He goes on to note, however, the way replicas are made is important: “What matters is the delight taken in authentically replicating the past. Indeed, it is this sense only that a replica can be authentic.”

In her 1989 article “Open-Air Museums and Historic Sites”, Debra Ann Reid discusses the authenticity of open-air museum settings. Her survey of 138 open-air museums and historic sites finds almost all of them are trying to be more authentic by developing their landscape. She cites examples of “inauthenticity” at them, including grass treatment that was inappropriate for the time period represented. Reid reports many open-air museums and sites felt their authenticity was being diminished by “modern intrusions” and many were developing methods to offset them:

Screen-planting trees... air conditioning units were concealed by such landscape features as wood piles... moving the intrusions, purchasing land... smaller budgets were often less active, either ignoring the situation or interpreting intrusions as they affected the historic landscape.

In the 1990s there was another large wave of literature discussing open-air museums. Again their relationship to the concepts of authenticity and heritage was discussed in a wide range of ways, but a number focus on specific open-air museums.

Adriaan De Jong and Mette Skougaard’s 1992 “Early Open-Air Museums: Traditions of Museums About Traditions” concentrates on how authenticity could be contradictory at such places. De Jong is involved in the management of the Netherlands Open-Air Museum and Skougaard is Curator of the Lyngby Open-Air Museum in Denmark. In their article they observe achieving popularity without compromising authenticity is an issue current open-air museums face, just as early ones did. They explain open-air museums have dual origins – entertaining world exhibitions, and the serious study of folk culture – and this makes
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problems with their authenticity inevitable. They note however “total authenticity is an illusion” at an open-air museum, for reasons including a museum’s management deciding what period a building is restored to, and the dirt and unpleasantness of life in the past not being able to be really conveyed to visitors.

Eric Gable and Richard Handler’s 1993 article “Deep Dirt: Messing Up the Past at Colonial Williamsburg,” discusses authenticity at Colonial Williamsburg. Gable is Professor of Sociology and Anthropology at University of Mary Washington, USA. Handler is Professor and Director of the Global Development Studies Program at the University of Virginia, USA. Gable and Handler note for the first period of Williamsburg’s restoration, its management believed archaeological fragments could enable replicas to be built and repairs to original structures to be made that would guarantee “visual authenticity”. Visual authenticity meant that modern conveniences could remain, so long as they were hidden. Later Colonial Williamsburg’s managers endeavoured to bring the town to life through engaging senses other than the visual, and creating an experience of the past for visitors. They explain, however, there has been ongoing criticism that Colonial Williamsburg is cleaner than 18th century reality and it presents a sanitised version of history. The museum responded to this by introducing life-like affects in the 1960s, particularly “unmown grass, peeling paint and animal shit,” a similar observation to the one Wallace makes about other open-air museums in the USA in the 1960s.

Gable and Handler propose “a parallel between the way dirt gets incorporated into the aesthetic of Colonial Williamsburg and the way ruin and decay became the Picturesque in Western aesthetic tradition.” They explain the belief that dirtiness needs to be introduced to convey real life at an open-air museum echoes the Picturesque’s belief that ruins communicated un-idealised reality. They caution however that the aesthetic of dirtiness is often focussed on by museum management as a symbol for problematic history in order to
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assure visitors of the authenticity of the museum’s underlying principles. Further, Gable and Handler argue Colonial Williamsburg’s management also self-servingly use visitors’ preference for the historic town to be comfortable and clean as an excuse to avoid problematic aspects of history.

The open-air museum of New Salem is a case-study discussed in Edward Bruner’s 1994 article “Abraham Lincoln as Authentic Reproduction: A Critique of Postmodernism,” which addresses the definition of authenticity. Bruner is Emeritus Professor of Anthropology, University of Illinois. As noted in the thesis Introduction, he uses four definitions for authenticity: historical verisimilitude, genuineness, original and authorised.

Bruner explains New Salem’s staff want it “to be authentic in the sense of giving the appearance of being like the 1830’s”, and that this is the aim of most open-air museums, as well as his first definition of authenticity - “historical verisimilitude”. Bruner’s second meaning of authenticity is “genuineness” - how a particular place being like it would have been in the 1830s, rather than the general look of the 1830s, but he believes this meaning of authenticity is used by only some open-air museums. Bruner’s third meaning of authenticity is an original, rather than a copy, and his fourth meaning is that which is authorised. He notes that New Salem is authentic by this definition as it has been authorised by the state of Illinois. Bruner claims that if an open-air museum is authentic according to historical verisimilitude, most visitors will be satisfied, even when they know it is not original or genuine.

Bruner suggests that authenticity based on ‘historical verisimilitude’ and ‘genuineness’ are in conflict at New Salem as it contains buildings that look older than the original buildings would have done when they were abandoned after ten years of occupation, and dense trees were not at the original settlement. He also explains authenticity based on ‘historical verisimilitude’ or ‘genuineness’ requires constant maintenance and monitoring. However, he
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notes, New Salem also intentionally weakens its authenticity, usually to create a pleasant experience for visitors.\(^{162}\) His ‘authority’ definition of authenticity prompts Bruner to posit that a central question is not whether something is authentic, but who has the power to decide this,\(^{163}\) and points out this changes authenticity from being a fixed or inherent state.\(^{164}\)

Also from the 1990s, Edward Chappell’s 1999 “Open-Air Museums, Architectural History for the Masses” focuses on the differences between European and North American open-air museums. Chappell is Director of Architectural and Archaeological Research at the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation. He describes open-air museums he finds successful as “plausible”\(^{165}\) due to sufficient distancing from neighbouring places, buffer zones existing between buildings from different regions,\(^{166}\) and there not being “distracting juxtapositions.”\(^{167}\) Chappell states that “greater care”\(^{168}\) is taken arranging structures and creating a setting at European than North American museums, and explains this is because they have a visual and scientific, rather than experiential emphasis.\(^{169}\) He believes the convenient access to buildings and the clean and protected settings provided by open-air museums in the USA is “quintessentially American.”\(^{170}\) Messiness is a quality that Chappell believes also assists authenticity, with dirt, plants and livestock being devices, a belief which is consistent with Gable and Handler’s observations about Colonial Williamsburg. However he cautions the pursuit of messiness can also result in a “fetish for the authentic”.\(^{171}\)

Jokilehto’s 1999 *A History of Architectural Conservation*, reviewed in Section 1.1, also briefly discusses Colonial Williamsburg. He explains when the restoration of Colonial Williamsburg was first mooted, it was realised it was necessary to base its reconstruction and restoration on archival documents to avoid it being a “movie set”,\(^{172}\) and to keep original buildings “even when this did not correspond to previously fixed ideals of beauty”.\(^{173}\) Jokilehto notes however, “post-Greek-revival buildings were not considered suitable to the
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ideal picture of a colonial town,” a policy more in line with his description of stylistic restoration. Interestingly, Glendinning’s 2013 *The Conservation Movement*, which is also reviewed in the previous section, suggests Colonial Williamsburg mingles “old and new as freely as did *shöpferisch* fascist conservation”, and the historic town is more interested in how it is perceived than intrinsic authenticity. Glendinning claims Williamsburg “was radically ‘restored’ to an idealised perfection... nationalist celebration... expunged... anything later than the mid-19th century, as well as poor housing occupied by black people”, to become what its supporters believed was its most important period of significance, in a process akin to that of stylistic restoration.

In the 21st century a number of pieces of literature that discuss open-air museums have appeared. Like Jokilehto and Glendinning’s observations, they tend to be parts of larger books.

Paul Oliver’s 2001 chapter “Re-Presenting and Representing the Vernacular: The Open Air Museum” is based on his observations of open-air museums in different countries and focuses on vernacular buildings. Oliver is an architectural historian and Professor Emeritus at Oxford Brookes University in the UK. He argues many open-air museums set out to promote or misrepresent a selected history, a claim that echoes Wallace:

> Many are deceptive, their invented, rather than authentic, environments being based on sentimentality, nostalgia, and the falsification of ‘life’ in selected periods by sanitizing, insulating and idealising the buildings and their contents.

Oliver explains a park or village layout is employed by most open-air museums but they have different effects: “buildings are dispersed at intervals that are sufficiently distant so as to preserve their distinct identities... clustered in a village form, simulating, for instance, the relationship of domestic buildings to a church, windmill, smithy, and village green”. He also observes the arrangement is often determined by the circulation of visitors and the
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convenient location of restaurant and other facilities,\textsuperscript{180} a comment accordant with Angotti’s observations. Oliver notes open-air museums usually restore buildings to when they were first built and explains “this is done in the name of authenticity and does not take into account the modification of buildings to meet changing needs and functions,”\textsuperscript{181} a comment which is consistent with the principle of established international heritage literature, like The Venice Charter, that all periods present in a building should be respected.\textsuperscript{182}

In her 2006 article “Villages That Never Were: The Museum Village as a Heritage Genre”, Linda Young focuses on the characteristics of Australian open-air museums and how opinions of them have changed over time. It is particularly valuable for its discussion of volunteers at open-air museums. An earlier article by her, the 1997 “Museums, Heritage, and Things That Fall Between” is also very relevant because it discusses open-air museums in relation to heritage authorities. Young is a Senior Lecturer at the School of Humanities and Social Sciences, Deakin University, Australia.

Young explains all the large open-air museums in Australia contain “a core of relocated original buildings”.\textsuperscript{183} Replicas were built because of the possible damage caused by shifting buildings and the need to recreate less readily available or durable building types.\textsuperscript{184} She suggests today replicas are also built because there are fewer volunteers available to move buildings and because the public no longer approve of the practice.\textsuperscript{185} She proposes that despite replicas now being widely used at open-air museums, their authenticity is questionable because they are of varying standards, and often provide a generalised rather than accurate representation of past structures.\textsuperscript{186} Young observes that the buildings within open-air museums are “almost inevitably understood as villages”\textsuperscript{187} by visitors, regardless of interpretative material explaining otherwise. She concludes however the villages are “artificial and unhistorical” in all cases.\textsuperscript{188}

Young explains because of a paucity of volunteers at open-air museums and the large amount of maintenance most of their collections require, many have needed to turn to the government
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for support. This has had the effect of a large number of open-air museums needing to satisfy official heritage conservation standards.  

Young suggests this has caused a shift in public opinion towards open-air museums from when most were founded in Australia in the 1960s - 1970s, and when moving historic buildings perceived to be threatened by urban development was seen to be a heroic form of heritage conservation.  

She suggests the official standards often devalue the work that was done by amateurs in the past.

Earlier, in her 1997 article, Young surmises that, in Australia, open-air museums are not fully acknowledged by either heritage authorities or museum authorities: “‘heritage’ refers to sites – buildings, ruins, archaeological deposits, landscapes and such – while ‘museums’ take care of artefacts.” She believes this results in some material, such as that contained in open-air museums, not being cared for if it does not meet the priorities of either kind of authority.  

Her observation is particularly pertinent to this thesis’s research because of the apparent lack of official heritage guidelines regarding open-air museums, authenticity and heritage. Young describes the effectiveness of collecting objects in museums as being arguable because while it preserves what is selected, what is chosen is the result of bias. She notes that listing of heritage places could be argued to be biased too, however.

In her 2006 book The Uses of Heritage reviewed in Section 1.1, Laurajane Smith also considers open-air museums and makes conclusions about them from research she conducted at three in England. Smith states the way museums in general began incorporating living interpretation, diverse viewpoints and community outreach programs in the 1960s and 1970s was widely criticised as being inauthentic, sanitized and un-scientific. However, she counters “education and entertainment are not mutually exclusive” and living history interpretation’s interaction with visitors instead assists education.

Smith explains her research shows visitors to open-air museums construct their own messages, sometimes quite definite and political, above and beyond the messages that the
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open-air museums provide. Smith states the importance of remembering and commemorating her findings reveal “makes a mockery of the fetish of material authenticity and the critique of the heritage industry.” Smith notes however her survey shows the ‘place’ of the open-air museums is important for the acts of remembering and commemorating as places allow the processes to happen and mark them as legitimate, significant and valid. This is the case even at ones where artefacts are not in-situ or as dirty as they would have been in the time period represented.

Smith proposes “‘heritage’ is not a ‘thing’ but a cultural process” and it can be considered as an experience, identity, memory, remembering and performance. She believes “meaning, and a sense of authenticity is engendered through constructing a plausible experience and emotional response which is used to affirm or reject the version of history that is offered by the museum”, a theory that is very different to the principles of established international heritage literature.

Sten Rentzhog’s landmark 2007 Open Air Museums: The History and Future of a Revolutionary Idea is the first full-length book dedicated to open-air museums and it contains a high level of detail. Rentzhog is the director of Jamtli, a Swedish open-air museum.

Rentzhog considers the formation of the Association of European Open Air Museums in the 1950s strengthened the position of open-air museums, but restricted their diversity, as did the International Council of Museum’s declaration in 1957 which recognises open-air museums but defined their collections as vernacular and pre-industrial, though he notes this was revised in 1982.

He believes open-air museums are important because they can offer an experience of the past as well as their structures, and that “atmosphere, illusion and fantasy” are just as important as facts. He states in the 1950s many believed visitors should be assisted in
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understanding what is and is not original at an open-air museum, but he thinks this is unnecessary as people realise, because they are at an open-air museum, that things are not totally original. He also thinks any explanation should been given in a way that does not interrupt the experience of a visitor.  

Rentzhog counters criticism, such as by Paul Oliver, that open-air museums show an idealised past by explaining early ones showed the lives of peasants as well as the upper class, and more recent ones show a fuller social history. He also defends open-air museums moving buildings from their original locations by explaining they would have otherwise been altered to accommodate contemporary needs, and smaller out-buildings would have been lost to development.

Rentzhog claims that in the 1970s many open-air museums in the USA began to change to living history interpretation because of competition from Disneyland and the way it transported people back in time, and the recent interest in social history. Living history was seen as a way to let people experience the ways that people had lived – and this was considered more important than the physical buildings, a philosophy noticeably different from the principles of established official international heritage literature like The Venice Charter.

A very relevant article from 2012 by cultural geographer Jillian Rickly-Boyd, called “‘Through the Magic of Authentic Reproduction’: Tourists’ Perceptions of Authenticity in a Pioneer Village,” presents visitors’ perception of authenticity at the open-air museum of Spring Mill Pioneer Village in Indiana, USA.

Rickly-Boyd believes examinations of the authenticity of open-air museums, and other tourism/heritage sites, need to “explore how tourist motivations and experiences relate to their perceptions of authenticity”. Her research at Spring Mill Pioneer Village uses “a mixed-method qualitative approach which includes textual analysis of the village landscape, interpretive signage, printed materials, interviews with village heritage interpreters, and
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participant observation and questionnaires of village tourists”, 213 making it a valuable precedent for the current study of Howick Historical Village.

Rickly-Boyd states her results show visitors to the museum rarely question its authenticity214 and when they do, they usually “address the overall nature of the village community, not individual objects”.215 Her results show visitors believe they are obtaining authentic insight into the lives of past pioneers, and whether they perceive the village as authentic is important for their satisfaction.216 She extrapolates her results to suggest that visitors are more concerned with “symbolic authenticity”217 and are willing to accept “staged authenticity”218 if it allows their visit to be enjoyable. Of Bruner’s definitions of authenticity (historical verisimilitude, genuineness, originality, authority), she finds most visitors to Spring Mill (94%) agreed with the definition of historical verisimilitude, a result that is consistent with Bruner’s expectation. However, genuineness received 87% and originality 83% which are not much lower. Authenticity as authority (expressed through signage identifying structures as original, reconstructed or a replica), was the least accepted definition at 64%. Most visitors picking multiple definitions of authenticity shows they accept more than one approach to it, Rickly-Boyd states.219

She writes “while authenticity and originality do correlate in the minds of tourists, it is their imagination of what the ‘original’ village may have looked like that is the basis of this comparison”.220 She notes this is independent of some items being not original or modified, and is instead based on symbols of pioneer life and Spring Mill’s setting.221 Rickly-Boyd suggests once visitors to Spring Mill are satisfied its buildings, artefacts and setting are authentic, they are able to engage with its narrative and have a “pioneer community experience”.222 Rickly-Boyd proposes Spring Mill’s “stream, forest and wildlife, in particular, set the stage for the village’s narrative. They provide the cohesiveness that ties
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village structures together and allows tourists to move beyond the tangible and visible to the intangible and experiential... a symbolically appropriate landscape.”  

In sum, this article makes several important observations challenging established official assumptions about authenticity.

This section has presented and discussed literature about international open-air museums and reflected on whether the ways in which they can be considered to be authentic and heritage correlate to established official international heritage criteria for these concepts. It found international open-air museums typically do not meet these official criteria, but non-official literature, including that by Edward Bruner, Laurajane Smith and Jillian Rickly-Boyd, maintain this does not affect open-air museums being authentic. Whether open-air museums are heritage was not examined in depth by any literature found aside from Laurajane Smith’s *Uses of Heritage*, which asserted they are places where people experience heritage. All the literature reviewed did consider delivering one understanding of authenticity or another is fundamentally important for an open-air museum. In fact, Jillian Rickly-Boyd posits authenticity is so important to visitors’ satisfaction of their visit, they are willing to accept symbolic or staged authenticity.

Thomas Angotti proposed whether visitors from the general public or an expert audience are catered for by an open-air museum will determine to what degree official criteria for authentic heritage are followed. Linda Young noted that Australian open-air museums have suffered from a lack of acknowledgement by heritage authorities, but they are still increasingly pressured to follow official heritage policies. Michael Wallace explained open-air museums have value when they have a local and non-elite focus, which interestingly are areas which international heritage authorities have been criticised as failing to acknowledge sufficiently by Laurajane Smith in Section 1.1.  

Paul Oliver had a different proposition to this as he believes most open-air museums edit history to further the interests of the parties controlling them. Angotti considered open-air museums’ settings to usually be inauthentic because they do not replicate the characteristics of the settlement they represent sufficiently. However, Jillian Rickly-Boyd, found the symbolic qualities of an open-air museum’s setting
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are conversely what makes it authentic. Edward Bruner noted open-air museums can be considered authentic using a range of definitions for the concept, not all of which require originality. Sten Rentzhog believed open-air museums are authentic because they offer experiences of the past. Luarajane Smith contended they are authentic places because they provoke emotional responses to plausible experiences. Eric Gable and Richard Handler observed authenticity has been pursued at Colonial Williamsburg by using dirt as an aesthetic for it.

Interestingly, many authors in this section noted open-air museums have been created as a response to urbanisation threatening traditional settlements, a circumstance similar to that which Jukka Jokilehto and others note was present when the conservation approach to authentic heritage began to emerge at the end of the 18th century, in Section 1.1.

1.3 Literature on New Zealand’s Heritage Authorities, Open-Air Museums, Authenticity and Heritage

This section aims to investigate New Zealand’s situation regarding authenticity and heritage compared to international circumstances by investigating literature on its open-air museums and relating to its heritage authorities. It looks at both official and non-official texts and arranges them to some extent chronologically, but makes exceptions to place similar types of text next to each other when it will assist comparison. Due to the large volume of legislation that has some relationship to this section’s topic, only the most relevant has been reviewed. This section finds there are many similarities between New Zealand’s situation and the international one, but a few important differences.

The landmark 2000 book Common Ground edited by Alexander Trapeznik does not focus on authenticity but is included in this section first because it provides a valuable history of New Zealand’s official heritage requirements and its conservation history. The chapter “Where Sheep May Not Safely Graze: A Brief History of New Zealand’s Heritage Movement 1890 – 2000” by Gavin McLean has the most relevance to this thesis, but the perspective of an architect is also provided by Jeremy Salmond in the chapter “From Dead Ducks to Historic Buildings”. McLean works for the History Group of the Ministry for Culture and Heritage.

---

McLean explains interest in New Zealand’s natural environment and early colonial events characterised the first phase of European engagement with heritage in New Zealand, and was confined to New Zealand’s very small elite class. Interest in heritage grew sharply in the 1890s following the Jubilees celebrating fifty years of colonisation with early settler associations being formed. As part of this some New Zealanders supported the conservation side of the conservation versus restoration debate in Britain. 226 The Centenary celebrations of 1940 further developed community interest in heritage and marked the beginning of a greater heritage conservation programme by heritage authorities. 227 There was further large growth in interest in New Zealand’s historic places from 1960 – 1980 and during this time the number of local history societies grew. 228

McLean explains the New Zealand Historic Places Trust started in 1955, and was based on the UK’s National Trust Model, “but with the important modification of seeing history as a continuum from the earliest habitation of New Zealand.... includ[ing] not just buildings, but - unusually for the time – also sites.” 229 A classification system was developed in 1966 which initially measured only architectural merit, but after internal discussion, ‘intrinsic’ historical and environmental merit was also included. 230

A number of non-government and professional organisations started in the late 1980s and 1990s McLean observes. ICOMOS New Zealand began in 1987 and “achieved an influence out of proportion to either its membership numbers or its activities” 231 through the publication of its New Zealand Charter in 1993. Salmond explains this document accommodates approaches to heritage that are particular to Maori, and prior to it, New Zealand’s conservation practitioners had referred to the Burra Charter for conservation principles relating to local conditions as The Venice Charter was too Eurocentric. 232
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and Trapeznik suggest that up to the time of publication, professional and public interest in heritage in New Zealand had focussed almost entirely on buildings of the elite.\(^{233}\)

The 1993 *ICOMOS New Zealand Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Heritage Value* (1\(^{st}\) edition) is New Zealand’s first set of official conservation guidelines. It is intended for heritage professionals, heritage authorities and tradespeople involved in the conservation of heritage. It has been highly influential in New Zealand and its principles have been widely employed.

The *Charter* states it is “following in the spirit of the... Venice Charter”\(^{234}\) and mirrors it by including the principles of involving heritage professionals, respecting original fabric from all periods, avoiding relocation of structures if at all possible, avoiding conjecture if reconstruction is performed, and new work being sufficiently different from original work so as to be distinct.\(^{235}\) As is suggested by its full title, the *Charter* is intended for places of cultural heritage *value*. It defines cultural heritage value using terms very similar to the 1978 UNESCO *Operational Guidelines*, as discussed in Section 1.1, and includes “significance”\(^{236}\) as part of this.

However, the *Charter* also makes statements about local values that differ from *The Venice Charter* and are more aligned with *The Nara Document on Authenticity*: “New Zealand peoples have particular ways of perceiving, conserving and relating to their cultural heritage”,\(^{237}\) and recognising the traditional practices of Maori and Maoriori.\(^{238}\) It states indigenous people have responsibility for “their treasures, monuments and sacred places”\(^{239}\) and the conservation of places of indigenous cultural heritage “is conditional on decisions made in the indigenous community”.\(^{240}\)

The national legislation that was present at the time – the 1991 *Resource Management Act* and 1993 *Historic Places Act* – had procedure as their focus and do not provide detailed guidelines on how to approach cultural heritage and authenticity. The *Resource Management*
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\(^{236}\) Ibid., 1993, Definitions.
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Act’s purpose is promoting “the management of natural and physical resources” and it was considered ahead of its time because of the way it dealt with natural resources. It states “intrinsic value” is a reason for protecting heritage, though it does not define it. The 1993 Historic Places Act’s purpose was promoting the identification, protection, preservation, and conservation of the historical and cultural heritage of New Zealand. The Act defined conservation as the processes of preserving, maintaining, and restoring historic places and historic areas so as to safeguard their historical and cultural values. It briefly stated the principles it applied to cultural heritage: a universal heritage exists - “historic places have lasting value in their own right” and minimal intervention to original fabric - “take account of material of cultural heritage value and involve the least possible alteration or loss of it”, principles that are consistent with established international heritage literature. It did recognise Maori culture and traditions however. It was replaced in 2014 by the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act, which is discussed later in this section.

Five years after the ICOMOS New Zealand Charter, the 1998 non-official book Protecting Historic Places In New Zealand by Harry Allen critically reviewed the protection offered by New Zealand’s heritage authorities to its historic places and suggested improvements. At the time of its writing Allen was Associate Professor of Archaeology at the University of Auckland and a member of the Maori Heritage Council of the New Zealand Historic Places Trust. He is currently a board member of the Howick and Districts Historical Society which manages Howick Historical Village and he is interviewed for this thesis.

Allen proposes New Zealand’s “legislation, mechanisms, and institutional arrangement... do not reflect the complex reality of the present society, rather they continue an ‘elitist’ view that is now outdated.” He states Maori heritage is helped by the 1993 ICOMOS New Zealand Charter but there are large gaps in the Resource Management Act 1991 and, the then current, Historic Places Act 1993. Allen explains while Maori heritage is acknowledged by New Zealand’s heritage authorities, it is tacked on to an international and Western approach to
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a comment that is aligned with Laurajane Smith’s conclusions eight years later regarding international heritage authorities, in her book *Uses of Heritage*, which is discussed in Section 1.1.\textsuperscript{251} Indeed, in that book she would also explain that New Zealand is one of the countries that have not ratified UNESCO’s *Convention for Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage*.\textsuperscript{252}

The *Manukau Operative District Plan, 2002* is the current district plan for the area of Auckland in which Howick Historical Village is located. It prescribes ways cultural heritage should be approached and refers to the 1993 *ICOMOS New Zealand Charter* as the standard to be achieved. It is soon to be replaced by the *Auckland Unitary Plan*.

The *Plan* permits lesser interventions such as minor maintenance to heritage buildings listed on its schedules, but more major interventions, such as an alteration or modification are discretionary activities.\textsuperscript{253} It gives assessment criteria for discretionary activities including new work being distinguishable, restoration being to ICOMOS New Zealand’s principles and the affect of relocation being minor.\textsuperscript{254}

Authenticity is defined by the *Plan* and in a way that is consistent with the principles of the 1993 *ICOMOS New Zealand Charter* and established international heritage literature, as described in Section 1.1. Its acknowledgement of the value of craftsmanship also suggests *The Nara Document on Authenticity*’s principles however:

> Authenticity is another determinant of the value or significance of a heritage resource, particularly for buildings. In order to retain the authenticity and integrity of the building, any alterations or modifications should be distinguishable as being new. Historic fabric and craftsmanship are two other elements which define the level of authenticity of the building. Repair promotes the retention of historic fabric, ensuring retention of craftsmanship. The final component of authenticity is setting.\textsuperscript{255}

The *Plan* contains no references to intangible cultural heritage, but it does contain a large number of clauses that make provision for the respect of Maori culture and traditions.

\textsuperscript{250} Allen, *Protecting Historic Places In New Zealand*, 45.
\textsuperscript{251} Smith, *Uses of Heritage*, 55.
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Eight years later in 2010, the *ICOMOS New Zealand Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Heritage Value* was revised. Though its Preamble still only references *The Venice Charter – The Nara Document on Authenticity* is not mentioned – the second addition does include that intangible heritage should be respected,\(^{256}\) which suggests *The Nara Document* was indeed an influence. In line with this, references to significance are removed from its definition of cultural heritage value, though they are still present through the addition of the new definition “cultural heritage significance”.\(^{257}\) Its Article 3, Indigenous Cultural Heritage, is revised to contain more information about Maori cultural heritage. It notes non-professional interested parties should be able to participate in a conservation project.\(^{258}\) The principles that relocation and restoration to a single period have low or no authenticity remain largely the same as the 1993 version.\(^{259}\) The 2010 edition adds that conjectural reconstruction and replicas are not conservation processes.\(^{260}\) Instead of new work being sufficiently different from previous work so as to be distinct, as the previous charter stipulated, it now advocates new work should have a complimentary appearance.\(^{261}\) The 2010 Charter adds a definition for authenticity, which again can be seen as being influenced by *The Nara Document on Authenticity*:

> [T]he credibility or truthfulness of surviving evidence and knowledge of the cultural heritage values of a place. Relevant evidence includes form and design, substance and fabric, technology and craftsmanship, location and surroundings, context and setting, use and function, traditions, spiritual essence, and sense of place, and includes tangible and intangible values.\(^{262}\)

Four years later in 2014, the 1993 *Historic Places Act* was superseded by the *Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act*. This remains a mainly procedural document. The main change that has relevance to this section’s topic of authenticity and heritage is it requires Heritage New Zealand to collaborate with more parties, adding societies, individuals, corporations, tangata whenua, central government agencies and local authorities to those it
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mentions. This is a change that is consistent with The Nara Document on Authenticity’s principle that responsibility for cultural heritage resides with the cultural community that created and cares for it.

Literature about New Zealand’s open-air museums as a whole is limited to the chapter “Where Sheep May Not Safely Graze: A Brief History of New Zealand's Heritage Movement 1890-2000” by Gavin McLean in Common Ground. It focuses on their history and origins. McLean explains the development of open-air museums in New Zealand was pre-figured by an interest in local colonial history and during 1960-1980 several open-air museums were created by community groups. McLean notes “the most controversial” was Shantytown “which blended a few relocated buildings and structures with modern replicas, some of which incorporated material recycled from genuine structures”, presumably because these practices that are not aligned with established conservation principles. McLean’s observations show New Zealand’s open-air museums are recent compared to those in Europe and the USA, as is shown by Section 1.2. However, the way that they were created by community groups is similar to how Michael Wallace explains many were formed in the USA at the same time.

It is clear from the above that this section has shown that New Zealand’s situation has both similarities and differences to the international situation. The country’s heritage legislation and charters have many similarities to established international official heritage literature, with The Venice Charter being cited in the country’s ICOMOS Charter. Its heritage authorities therefore believe the practices of relocation, restoration to a single period, replica buildings and new work imitating original work have little authenticity for heritage. Consistent with international heritage developments to acknowledge that authenticity and heritage are understood differently by individual cultures, New Zealand’s current heritage charters and legislation also acknowledge Maori understandings, and intangible expressions of heritage, as well as requiring collaboration between a wide range of parties. However,
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some past criticism claimed New Zealand’s heritage authorities favour elite buildings, and do not acknowledge Maori or intangible expressions of heritage sufficiently. That the current ICOMOS New Zealand Charter still only references The Venice Charter and not any later international documents that acknowledge cultural diversity, such as The Nara Document on Authenticity, could be argued to be evidence that this criticism still applies. The section also showed New Zealand’s open-air museums are a lot more recent than many of those in Europe and the USA, but many of them being created by community groups from the 1960s is similar to what occurred at the same time in the USA.269

1.4 Conclusions

This chapter reviewed literature which considers the relationship between international heritage authorities, international open-air museums, and New Zealand’s heritage authorities and open-air museums, to the concepts of authenticity and heritage. The chapter showed the way authenticity is understood by international heritage authorities links it fundamentally to their understanding of heritage. The established way authenticity is defined by international heritage authorities has been the topic of some criticism. More recent, but less widely accepted, changes that question the established criteria for authenticity being universally held, and give acknowledgment to how authenticity is understood by different cultures, can be argued to address this however. The chapter also found that the international heritage authorities, on the whole, do not acknowledge open-air museums, or give specific guidance on how authenticity and heritage should be considered at them. The literature on international open-air museums showed these places have a history of using techniques that do not meet the established criteria for authenticity held by international heritage authorities. Despite this, the literature showed many visitors and many commentators consider them to be authentic, and to be heritage. They do so for a wide variety of reasons, such as offering a believable experience of the past. All of the literature reviewed about open-air museums suggested authenticity and heritage are linked. The way in which New Zealand’s open-air museums relate to authenticity and heritage was only able to be investigated to a very limited degree by this chapter, because of a paucity of literature on the topic. The chapter did find, however, that the way in which New Zealand’s heritage authorities consider authenticity and
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heritage holds many similarities to international heritage authorities, and they use criteria that have many similarities to their established ones. New Zealand’s heritage authorities increasingly consider authenticity and heritage in ways that acknowledge culturally diverse understandings, but past criticism believes this was to not a great enough extent.
Chapter 2: Howick Historical Village

This chapter provides a background to Howick Historical Village and investigates literature about Howick Historical Village to see how it discusses the open-air museum’s relationship to authenticity and heritage. To supplement information on the open-air museum available in literature, a section of direct observations of its setting and buildings from the field is also included. This chapter shows Howick Historical Village’s history and characteristics have similarities to other open-air museums in New Zealand and internationally. Official heritage literature and non-official literature often differs in whether it considers Howick Historical Village to be authentic and to be heritage.

2.1 Background to Howick Historical Village

This section provides background information on Howick Historical Village. It focuses on describing the open-air museum and its historical development rather than reviewing the literature from which the information is drawn.

Figure 2.1.1 Alan La Roche, Howick Historical Village, n.d, painting. Howick Historical Village, Auckland.
Howick Historical Village is located in Pakuranga, a suburb four kilometres from Howick’s centre, in south-east Auckland, New Zealand. It was created by volunteer members of the Howick Historical Society, now called the Howick and Districts Historical Society. The society formed in 1962, from a group of volunteers who prepared a collection of artefacts from Fencibles who settled in Howick in the early 19th century, for the All Saint’s Church Centenary Celebrations in 1947, also in Howick. These Fencibles were retired British soldiers who had been part of a New Zealand government sponsored immigration scheme. The group of volunteers remained partially intact following the Centenary and were joined by other interested people. They observed Fencible cottages in the area were being demolished and were interested in preserving them.

In 1972, a large house, Bell House, was donated to the Howick Historical Society. Manukau City Council had recently acquired land next to Bell House and offered the lease of five acres of it to the Society for the open-air museum it wanted to create. The first buildings were moved to the site by the historical society in 1977. Howick Historical Village was officially opened in 1980 and it housed sixteen buildings. By 1990 it contained 25. It later received the lease of an additional five acres of land from the council.

The focus of the Howick Historical Village is the Fencible settlement of Howick, the development of Howick-Pakuranga and surrounding districts, and the Maori history of this area, from 1840 - 1880. The museum uses living history interpretation. Volunteers from the Howick and Districts Historical Society play a major role in Howick Historical Village’s operation though since it opened, a small number of paid staff have also been employed. Volunteer training to the date of writing has been performed by Alan La Roche, a founding
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Society member. Decisions regarding Howick Historical Village’s direction and management are made by the elected board members of the Howick and Districts Historical Society. The open-air museum is funded by visitor revenue and, since it opened, has also received some funding from its local council. Today Howick Historical Village contains 33 buildings.

2.2 Literature on Howick Historical Village, Authenticity and Heritage

This section investigates literature about Howick Historical Village that discusses its relationship to the concepts of authenticity and heritage. Both official and non-official literature is explored. Non-official literature includes both that produced by Alan La Roche, who has long been involved there, and an international text. The literature is partly arranged chronologically, but also clusters it according to type to some extent. This section shows a range of opinions on how Howick Historical Village is authentic, or can be considered heritage, exist.

In 1989 and 1990, what is now the Heritage New Zealand List categorised as heritage Bell House and Bell’s Barn at Howick Historical Village using criteria that were operational at the time. Bell House was listed in 1989 as Category One heritage because it was built for a Fencible officer and is one of only two remaining examples of this type of house. The List also notes that it was moved from Panmure to its current site in 1895 for the Bell family. Bell’s Barn was listed in 1990 as Category Two, but the reasons why are not shown on the List. No other buildings or Howick Historical Village as a whole are on the List.

Heritage New Zealand has internal files on Bell House and Bell’s Barn. Only the parts of the internal files designated as research are accessible to the public. Bell House’s Proposal for Classification (April 1989, author not shown) states it has architectural, historical and townscape/landmark significance. Bell’s Barn’s Field Record Form (March 1989, author Alan La Roche) notes it is significant because it is associated with Bell House and it is a “typical farm barn – the last in Pakuranga expect for Udys’ Barn also in Howick Historical
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Village.” The criteria for classification it is noted as meeting include “whether the building is genuine or intact or has been modified by additions and alterations that are acceptable”, a principle that is consistent with that of established international heritage literature, as is shown by Section 1.1.

Manukau City Council, the local authority for where Howick Historical Village is located, first referred to the open-air museum in the 1980 Manukau City District Scheme Review. Only Bell House is scheduled as heritage to be protected. It achieves Group One (heritage of the greatest value), as it meets the district scheme’s criteria for historic and architectural significance, and with its interior and exterior both being scheduled. No other aspect of Howick Historical Village is scheduled, presumably because most of its other buildings were moved to it, restored to the period when they were first built, or are replicas. Howick Historical Village as whole was scheduled under the Manukau City District Scheme Review of 1984 as Group Two heritage to be protected with its criteria for significance being historic and visual appeal. Bell House retains its Group One scheduling. No other buildings at the open-air museum are scheduled. The scheduling assigned to Howick Historical Village and Bell House is unchanged in the Manukau City Operative District Plan, 1993.

In 1994, Dinah Holman wrote the report Manukau City District Plan: Review of Heritage Items, which was commissioned by the Manukau City Council. This reviews the heritage listing of buildings that were already scheduled by the council, and makes suggestions for new listings. Holman was a heritage planning consultant, historian and biographer.

Holman recommends that Bell’s Barn and sixteen other unscheduled original buildings that were relocated to the museum be newly scheduled as Group One. Not recommended for listing are Bycroft’s Flour Mill, Early Settlers Sod Cottage (her reason being it is a replica), Howick Arms Hotel and Wagstaff’s Forge (which are identified in the open-air museum’s visitors’ guide as reconstructed), Sommerville Cowshed and Creamery and Udys Barn. She
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also suggests Howick Historical Village as a whole is scheduled Group Two, explaining it is important or representative to New Zealand history as it “reflects the early European aspect of New Zealand history... although not based on an actual early village.” Holman explains the museum meets the report’s criteria for rarity and uniqueness as it “is one of the few reconstructed historical villages in Auckland.” Manukau City’s next district plan was not published until 2002, and it is reviewed later in this section.

Alan La Roche has written a number of books which discuss Howick Historical Village. In general, these do not explicitly explore whether the open-air museum is authentic, or whether it is heritage, but discuss it in a way that makes the assumption it is. Often La Roche mentions characteristics of Howick Historical Village which depart from the principles established international heritage literature, and that from New Zealand, hold for authentic heritage. La Roche is a founder of Howick Historical Village and has been involved with it to the present day. He has written widely on Howick Historical Village and is interviewed for this thesis.

The *Winston Churchill Fellowship Tour of Living History Museums of North America and Canada* of 1991 was one of La Roche’s first books, and it is important because it investigates the management, maintenance and visitor policies of open-air museums he visited in the USA and Canada with a view to applying them at Howick Historical Village. La Roche notes the open-air museums on his itinerary are “recognised as leaders in historical interpretation”. He suggests Howick Historical Village could be more authentic if it used some of the methods he saw employed at them. He identifies Old Sturbridge Village as the archetype for Howick Historical Village. La Roche notes the age of the, often reconstructed, buildings in Colonial Williamsburg’s collection are not emphasised, with living interpretation often being relied on to give the impression of 18th century life. He explains a survey of visitors at Old Sturbridge Village conducted by another party shows “3 in 5 want to learn something while having fun and being entertained”. La Roche asserts entertainment needs to be provided as well as education in order for open-air museums to appeal to visitors, but believes they need
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to be careful that they don’t aspire to be theme parks. He believes history should be presented as “realistically as possible”, and to do this, buildings need to be brought to life in a way that engages all the senses and is experiential.

As well as writing about Howick Historical Village relative to an international context, La Roche wrote about it as part of its local context, and wrote a standalone book on it. The History of Howick and Pakuranga, also from 1991, focuses on the history of these areas as well as discussing Howick Historical Village. He mainly concentrates on the social history the open-air museum presents. La Roche usually describes who donated its buildings and the volunteers who performed their restoration when they were bought to Howick Historical Village.

La Roche cites urban expansion as a reason buildings were donated to Howick Historical Village, noting that in 1962, “Howick was developing rapidly and many of the old original buildings were on valuable sites, requiring uneconomic restoration, and the owners were happy for the Historical Society members to take the building away, leaving a clean site”.

La Roche describes Howick Historical Village’s setting only in terms of its planting: “cottage flower gardens, vegetable gardens... complement the buildings.” The buildings are described by La Roche as being conserved “using techniques and materials similar if not the same, as those used when they were constructed. Detailed records are maintained to assist future conservation....Ideally pit sawed kauri should be replaced with pit sawed kauri”. He does not give a lot of information on changes that were made to buildings after they came to Howick Historical Village, other than usually stating they were restored to the appearance of when they were first built. He does not mention some of the buildings are replicas, and describes the replica early settler sod cottage only as “restored”. He states materials from other structures of a similar age were sometimes used to repair, restore and extend buildings, including timber from the Karangahape Road tram tracks being used for the patio next to
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Henry Brindle’s Cottage.\textsuperscript{37} Budget constraints are referred to by La Roche as dictating decisions: “it is only cost that prevents the refreshing of all roofs”.\textsuperscript{38}

La Roche describes Howick in the 1840-1880 Fencible period and includes a photograph by Reverend Kinder showing it in 1863.\textsuperscript{39} He describes the homes that were built for the Fencibles and includes photographs of some of them at their original locations in Howick before it was urbanised, and typical architectural drawings of a Fencible cottage. A map of Howick showing the sections allocated to the Fencibles is included too.\textsuperscript{40}

\textbf{Figure 2.2.1} Rev. J. Kinder, \textit{Howick April 1863}, 1863, photograph. Hocken Collection, Dunedin.

La Roche’s 1997 \textit{An Introduction to the Howick Historical Village} is dedicated entirely to the open-air museum, but it presents a similar type of information to that in his \textit{The History of Howick and Pakuranga}. He considers Howick Historical Village from the viewpoint of visitors, asserting its “historical interpreters brings history alive” and noting “we hope visitors will enjoy the living history atmosphere”.\textsuperscript{41} Members of the Howick Historical Society are identified by La Roche as creating Howick Historical Village, and the success of its ongoing functioning “is due largely to the many enthusiastic volunteers”.\textsuperscript{42}

He provides detail on the circumstances leading to the donation of many of the Fencible cottages: “Letters were sent to owners of Fencible cottages in the area and as a result of those letters many of the cottages were offered up”.\textsuperscript{43} He relates that all but one of the 400
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Fencible cottages are now gone from Howick because of urban expansion. He describes their relocation as the best means for ensuring their survival: “deposit them in the custodial care of the Howick Historical Village.”\textsuperscript{44} He explains Gallagher’s Cottage was not restored at Howick Historical Village so “visitors are able to ‘feel’ the history in this cottage….It has been left as it was found”, \textsuperscript{45} and also explains that when it was given to the museum it was in a condition similar to when it was first built.\textsuperscript{46}

\textbf{Figure 2.2.2} Alan La Roche, \textit{Howick Historical Village}, n.d. from the out of print Howick Historical Village Visitor Brochure, n.d.

An out of print and undated Howick Historical Village visitor brochure by Alan La Roche also usually does not state whether its buildings were relocated, restored, altered or are replicas but focuses on the history of the Fencibles and Howick. It advocates the open-air museum’s village-like qualities: “a restored Settlement of 1840-1880 period, including 26 authentic cottages, homesteads, shops, courthouse, schools, church and other village buildings”.\textsuperscript{47} It lists as “authentic”\textsuperscript{48} the replica buildings, and the reconstructed forge, hotel and village store. The brochure includes a map of Howick Historical Village from when one of the buildings, Puhi Nui, number 21 on the visitors’ map, was in a different location than it is currently.

The current Howick Historical Village visitor brochure by Alan La Roche is similar to the earlier one reviewed. The brochure’s front cover describes the open-air museum as a
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“heritage experience”.\textsuperscript{49} It usually concentrates on when a building was first built and the first family that lived in it. The only building it discloses is a replica is Private Hanson’s Tent, and only some buildings are described as being in different locations originally. The brochure states the open-air museum’s buildings have been “restored by volunteer members of the Howick and Districts Historical Society”\textsuperscript{50} and explains that they maintain the buildings and gardens too.\textsuperscript{51} Its map shows Puhi Nui, now number 33, in a new location to what it had been in earlier, and a charcoal burner’s camp, number 22, is also added.

\textit{Figure 2.2.3} La Roche Alan, \textit{Howick Historical Village}, n.d. from the current Howick Historical Village Visitor Brochure, n.d.

As well as his published writing on Howick Historical Village, La Roche has distributed unpublished memos to the Board of the Howick and Districts Historical Society. His 2003 memo, “Concerns About Authenticity Within the Howick Historical Village,” is particularly relevant to this thesis’s topic. In it he asserts for authenticity to be achieved at Howick Historical Village it is necessary that no modern materials or technology are visible, because they belong to a later period than that which the museum represents. He notes this as not being done recently and claims “the appropriate unique ambiance of the village has been badly violated... do not represent the 1850 period country village image or atmosphere.”\textsuperscript{52}

The memo was not originally intended for wider publication by La Roche, but he gave his approval for it to appear in this thesis.\textsuperscript{53}

\begin{itemize}
\item\textsuperscript{49} Alan La Roche, “Howick Historical Village, Auckland, New Zealand.” (Brochure) Auckland, n.d.
\item\textsuperscript{50} Ibid.
\item\textsuperscript{51} Ibid.
\item\textsuperscript{52} La Roche, “Concerns About Authenticity Within the Howick Historical Village.”
\item\textsuperscript{53} Alan La Roche, email message to the author, 1 December, 2014.
\end{itemize}
Eight years after Dinah Holman’s review of the 1993 *Manukau City District Plan*, the 2002 *Manukau City Operative District Plan* superseded it, though it too is soon to be superseded, this time by the *Auckland Unitary Plan*. It is still the current local council plan controlling Howick Historical Village, and is also reviewed in Section 1.3 with regard to New Zealand’s heritage authorities and authenticity.

The 2002 *Plan* does not follow all of Holman’s recommendations and, unlike the 1984 and 1993 *Plans*, the 2002 *Plan* no longer schedules Howick Historical Village as a whole, rather only “buildings within” it, though she suggested the open-air museum should be. The 2002 *Plan* however schedules as Group One the exterior of all but eleven structures at Howick Historical Village. The exceptions are six replicas, the reconstruction depicting Wagstaff’s Blacksmith Shop, and the original buildings of the Coach-house, Udy’s Barn, and Bycroft’s Flour Mill. The reason the original buildings are not scheduled is not clear, particularly Bycroft’s Flour Mill, as Holman recommended it should be. Bell House retains its Group One exterior and interior scheduling.55

However, one year earlier, independent of both Alan La Roche and New Zealand’s heritage authorities, Paul Oliver’s 2001 “Representing and Representing the Vernacular: The Open-Air Museum” briefly discussed Howick Historical Village as a whole and found it to be authentic. His chapter is also discussed in Section 1.2 with regard to international open-air museums. Oliver describes Howick Historical Village as an exception to how he believes most open-air museums present idealised buildings that are cleaner and in better condition than comparable buildings outside the museum precinct.56 He explains that Alan La Roche “sought to keep every building in the condition in which it was obtained, with layers of soiled and peeling wallpaper... splintered floor boards”.57 Oliver’s reasons suggest dirtiness is an indication of authenticity, as Gable and Handler observe has been the case at Colonial Williamsburg in Section 1.2.58

Also autonomous of La Roche and New Zealand’s heritage authorities is the 2006 Master of Anthropology thesis “Historic Howick: A Question of Place and Identity” by Lucy Schwaner.

---

54 Manukau City Council *Manukau Operative District Plan*, 2002, Chap. 6, Sch. 6A.
55 Ibid., Chap. 6, App. 6A.
57 Ibid., 203.
It is the most recent literature I could find that discusses Howick Historical Village in relation to authenticity and heritage. Schwaner concentrates on the relationship between place-based history, heritage and identity in the suburb of Howick and briefly discusses Howick Historical Village as part of this. Her thesis differs from the current study as it does not consider the open-air museum in relation to heritage authorities or other open-air museums, and it does not investigate the views of visitors and volunteers to the museum on authenticity and heritage.

Schwaner describes Howick Historical Village as “fabricated”\(^59\) because it does not fully acknowledge Maori perspectives in the history it tells, it is not located in Howick, and it does not present all the time periods its buildings have existed in.\(^60\) She explains different opinions about authenticity are held by Alan La Roche, Brian Mossman (then the General Manager of Howick Historical Village), and Deborah Davies (then employed by Howick Historical Village as a historical interpreter), though they all want the museum to be more authentic.\(^61\) Schwaner relates La Roche and Mossman want to achieve this by making the experience of visiting more authentic, while Davies “...wanted the display to be more authentic too, by adhering to the time period in the materials and methods used”.\(^62\) She quotes La Roche as explaining:

...it would be impractical to be truly authentic because that would require a one acre section per building. The layout of the Howick Historical Village was not based on Howick but intended to have a logical sequence and the pond, although Howick never had one... restful effect on people so they can absorb more of history.... also attracts ducks, which gives a more authentic appearance to the place.\(^63\)

In sum, this review of the literature on Howick Historical Village has shown there are different views on how the open-air museum relates to the concepts of authenticity and heritage. It has also shown that there is limited information on this topic as there are no official assessments that are recent or address the whole open-air museum, and non-official

\(^{60}\) Ibid., 116, 117.
\(^{61}\) Ibid., 118.
\(^{62}\) Ibid.
\(^{63}\) Ibid. 119.
literature is also restricted because most of it is by Alan La Roche and it focuses on particular issues.

New Zealand’s heritage authorities differ on the degree to which they think Howick Historical Village is authentic heritage. The parts that they do judge authentic heritage have characteristics which are consistent with the criteria of The Venice Charter and other established international official heritage literature, but it is less clear why some aspects are not included, such as Udy’s Barn. There has not been an official assessment of whether Howick Historical Village is authentic heritage for some time.

Alan La Roche makes many references to practices at Howick Historical Village that are not consistent with the policies of New Zealand’s heritage legislation and charters or established official international heritage literature. These include relocating and restoring buildings to the period when they were first built, and constructing replicas. However, these practices are part of what Sten Rentzhog explains has happened at international open-air museums throughout their history in Section 1.2. ICOM’s declaration also suggests that sometimes it is not possible to conserve buildings in-situ, and the situation La Roche describes in Howick is consistent with how Kai Uldall and Michael Wallace observe international open-air museums were often created because urban expansion threatened communities. What La Roche describes as authentic indicates a different understanding to established official policies. His reference to the benefits of the pond’s restful effect on visitors is consistent with Jillian Rickly-Boyd’s suggestion that the American open-air museum of Spring Mill’s landscape features allow visitors to engage in the intangible and experiential however. La Roche focusing on Howick Historical Village’s volunteers indicates he also considers them an important aspect of Howick Historical Village. Other non-official literature presents a mixed opinion as to whether Howick Historical Village is authentic or heritage but this is limited to two sources.

---

2.3 Direct Observation of Howick Historical Village in the Field

This section supplements information on Howick Historical Village that is available in literature in order to help the reader form a fuller impression of how it relates to understandings of authenticity and heritage. It does so using direct observation in the field and information that is presented to visitors – the visitor brochure and interpretation panels at the open-air museum. In using this method this section also has the objective of observing what information about the open-air museum is available to visitors. Selected terms for authenticity and heritage from the literature, both official and non-official, inform the observation. This section first presents a textual description of the observations, then a table analysing its buildings and finishes with a series of photographs. This section shows Howick Historical Village has qualities that are both in accordance with and contradict terms for authenticity and heritage that are present in the literature reviewed in Chapter One. It also shows not all information about the buildings is communicated to visitors.

In terms of setting, Howick Historical Village has planting around its perimeter which shields views of the neighbouring suburb and park. Buildings are located closely on either side of paths which form a loop at their centre creating the effect of a village, as is shown by Figure 2.3.3. Buildings representing the building types associated with a village are present, such as houses, school, church, court, and shops, as is demonstrated by Table 2.3.1. Two open areas create the impression of village squares. The landscape is mainly grassed and there are isolated mature trees, a pond with ducks, and picnic areas. Gardens which are kept slightly overgrown are associated with most of the buildings, as Figure 2.3.4 shows. There is a more densely treed area to the south of the park without any buildings though paths run through it. Features that would have been present in Howick in 1840 – 1880 are present such as woodpiles. Other features are present that would not have been present in 1840 – 1880 Howick, but have an old-fashioned style such as streetlamps, as Figure 2.3.10 illustrates. The setting is presented with a slightly unkempt or un-manicured style.

Howick Historical Village’s buildings are mainly original with only around one fifth being replicas. Most cottages are associated with the first Fencible family that inhabited them. A small number have been adapted or altered to a new use, such as an exhibition space, as Table 2.3.1 shows. White’s Homestead had relatively large additions to accommodate uses including a cafe and offices. A small number of Fencible buildings have been used to depict another Fencible building, such as White’s Store. All original buildings aside from one have
been restored to a single period, which is almost always when they were first built. The exception to this is the Maher/Gallagher Cottage, whose interpretation panel also states it was found in a condition close to when it was first built anyway. A small number of buildings also include and interpret features from other periods like small areas of paint and wallpaper. Almost all of the original buildings are from the Howick/Pakuranga/Panmure area, but not all, as is also shown by Table 2.3.1. The majority of buildings are modest, or non-elite, with the exceptions of Puhi Nui and Bell House, which could be considered somewhat elite. All buildings have a slightly worn appearance and some have areas of peeling paint, as Figure 2.3.9 shows.

Interpretation panels are usually associated with the buildings, not features in the setting. When features in the setting are interpreted, such as the post-and-rail fence, general historical information is usually given, not whether the feature is an original item from 1840 – 1880 Howick. Interpretation panels at buildings most often focus on the social history of the family that were its first occupants, or the building’s first use. Interpretation panels only sometimes explicitly state if a building is original or a replica, if it was moved to the open-air museum, or restored to the Fencible period. It usually is not explained if a building has been adapted, reconstructed or added to, and interventions that were made to original buildings at Howick Historical Village are often in the same style as the original, so it is sometimes difficult to tell. When it is explained, the information supplied usually partly focuses on the volunteers who performed the work. White’s Homestead and Sergeant Ford’s Cottage are noted to have been donated to Howick Historical Village by descendents of the Fencibles that originally lived in them. Most interpretation panels are hand painted by Alan La Roche and use a style of text similar to that which was used by people in Fencible period Howick, as is shown by Figure 2.3.7
Table 2.3.1 Buildings at Howick Historical Village and ways in which information about them is disclosed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and visitor map number (refer Figure 2.2.3)</th>
<th>Photograph</th>
<th>Original/Replica/</th>
<th>Adapted/Altered/Reconstructed</th>
<th>Restored? (single/all periods)</th>
<th>Relocated to HHV? (Original site)</th>
<th>Elite building?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Private Hanson’s Tent</td>
<td></td>
<td>Replica</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Not applicable/Howick Historical Village where originally built</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Private Briody’s Raupo</td>
<td></td>
<td>Replica</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Not applicable/Howick Historical Village where originally built</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 &amp; 4 Briody/ McDaniel Cottage</td>
<td></td>
<td>Original</td>
<td>Represents an original use</td>
<td>Restored (single period chosen for each side) [Source: interpretation panel]</td>
<td>Relocated from Panmure [But not explicitly disclosed]</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Sergeant Ford’s Cottage</td>
<td></td>
<td>Original</td>
<td>Represents an original use</td>
<td>Restored (single period) [Source: interpretation panel]</td>
<td>Relocated from Panmure [Source: interpretation panel]</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and visitor map number (refer Figure 2.2.3)</td>
<td>Photograph</td>
<td>Original/Replica</td>
<td>Adapted/Altered/Reconstructed</td>
<td>Restored? (single/all periods)</td>
<td>Relocated to HHV? (Original site)</td>
<td>Elite building?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Captain C.H.M. Smith’s Homestead - Bell House</td>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Photo" /></td>
<td>Original</td>
<td>Adapted to a function space [But not explicitly disclosed]</td>
<td>Not able to be accessed</td>
<td>No (relocated to site from Panmure in 1895) [Source: Heritage NZ interpretation panel]</td>
<td>½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 &amp; 8 Maher/ Gallagher Cottage</td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Photo" /></td>
<td>Original</td>
<td>Represents an original use</td>
<td>Not restored [Source: visitor brochure]</td>
<td>Relocated from Panmure [Source: interpretation panel]</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 The Parsonage (Howick Vicarage)</td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Photo" /></td>
<td>Original</td>
<td>Adapted internally to a caretaker’s residence [But not disclosed]</td>
<td>Not able to be accessed</td>
<td>Relocated from Howick [Not disclosed]</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 &amp; 11 Howick Arm’s Hotel/White’s Store</td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Photo" /></td>
<td>Original</td>
<td>Reconstructed using a different original Fencible building to the shop/hotel [Source: visitor brochure]</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Relocated but the location of the original building is not known</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and visitor map number (refer Figure 2.2.3)</td>
<td>Photograph</td>
<td>Original/Replica</td>
<td>Adapted/Altered/Reconstructed</td>
<td>Restored? (single/all periods)</td>
<td>Relocated to HHV? (Original site)</td>
<td>Elite building?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Ngamapu’s Raupo</td>
<td>Replica</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Not applicable/Howick Historical Village where originally built</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Sergeant Barry’s Cottage</td>
<td>Original</td>
<td>Represents an original use</td>
<td>Restored (single period) [Source: interpretation panel]</td>
<td>Relocated from Howick [Source: interpretation panel]</td>
<td>Relocated from Paparoa [Source: visitor brochure]</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Somerville’s Cowshed &amp; Creamery</td>
<td>Original</td>
<td>Represents an original use</td>
<td>Restored (single period) [But not explicitly disclosed]</td>
<td>Relocated but not known where from</td>
<td>Not able to be accessed</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 The Coach House</td>
<td>Not able to be accessed</td>
<td>Not able to be accessed</td>
<td>Not able to be accessed</td>
<td>Not able to be accessed</td>
<td>Relocated but not known where from</td>
<td>Not able to be accessed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.3.1 Buildings at Howick Historical Village and ways in which information about them is disclosed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and visitor map number (refer Figure 2.2.3)</th>
<th>Photograph</th>
<th>Original/Replica</th>
<th>Adapted/Altered/Reconstructed</th>
<th>Restored? (single/all periods)</th>
<th>Relocated to HHV? (Original site)</th>
<th>Elite building?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16 Ararimu Valley School</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Original</td>
<td>Represents an original use</td>
<td>Restored (single period)</td>
<td>Relocated from Ararimu</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[But not explicitly disclosed]</td>
<td>[Source: visitor brochure &amp; interpretation panel]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Machinery Display</td>
<td>Not currently at the museum</td>
<td>Not currently at the museum</td>
<td>Not currently at the museum</td>
<td>Not currently at the museum</td>
<td>Not currently at the museum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Udy’s Barn</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Original</td>
<td>Not able to be accessed</td>
<td>Not able to be accessed</td>
<td>Relocated from Pakuranga</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Source: visitor brochure]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Howick Methodist Church</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Original</td>
<td>Represents an original use</td>
<td>Restored (single period)</td>
<td>Relocated from Howick</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[But not explicitly disclosed]</td>
<td>[Source: visitor brochure]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and visitor map number (refer Figure 2.2.3)</td>
<td>Photograph</td>
<td>Original/Replica/Adapted/Altered/Reconstructed</td>
<td>Restored? (single/all periods)</td>
<td>Relocated to HHV? (Original site)</td>
<td>Elite building?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Early Settler’s Sod Cottage</td>
<td>Replica [Not disclosed]</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Not applicable/Howick Historical Village where originally built</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Bycroft’s Flour Mill</td>
<td>Original</td>
<td>Represents an original use but has a new mill pond [which is not disclosed]</td>
<td>Restored (single period) [But not explicitly disclosed]</td>
<td>Relocated from Manurewa/Onehunga [Source: visitor brochure &amp; interpretation panel]</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Charcoal Burner’s Camp</td>
<td>Replica [Not disclosed]</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Not applicable/Howick Historical Village where originally built</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Pakuranga School</td>
<td>Original</td>
<td>Adapted internally to an exhibition space [but not disclosed]</td>
<td>Restored (single period) [But not explicitly disclosed]</td>
<td>Relocated from Pakuranga [But not explicitly disclosed]</td>
<td>×</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and visitor map number (refer Figure 2.2.3)</td>
<td>Photograph</td>
<td>Original/ Replica/</td>
<td>Adapted/ Altered/ Reconstructed</td>
<td>Restored? (single/all periods)</td>
<td>Relocated to HHV? (Original site)</td>
<td>Elite building?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Bishop’s Creek Dame School</td>
<td><img src="Image" alt="Photo" /></td>
<td>Original</td>
<td>Represents an original use</td>
<td>Restored (single period)</td>
<td>Relocated from Remuera</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Hemi Pepene’s Whare</td>
<td><img src="Image" alt="Photo" /></td>
<td>Replica</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Not applicable/ Howick Historical Village where originally built</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Wagstaff’s Blacksmith’s Shop</td>
<td><img src="Image" alt="Photo" /></td>
<td>Original</td>
<td>Reconstructed using a different original Fencible building to the blacksmiths [but not disclosed]</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Relocated but the location of the original building is not known</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Johnson’s Cottage</td>
<td><img src="Image" alt="Photo" /></td>
<td>Original</td>
<td>Adapted to represent a children’s museum [Source: visitor brochure]</td>
<td>Restored (single period) [But not explicitly disclosed]</td>
<td>Relocated from Parnell [Source: visitor brochure]</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and visitor map number (refer Figure 2.2.3)</td>
<td>Photograph</td>
<td>Original/Replica</td>
<td>Adapted/Altered/Reconstructed</td>
<td>Restored? (single/all periods)</td>
<td>Relocated to HHV? (Original site)</td>
<td>Elite building?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Colonel De Quincey’s Cottage</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Colonel De Quincey’s Cottage" /></td>
<td>Original</td>
<td>Altered internally to an exhibition space &amp; visitor toilets</td>
<td>Restored (single period) [But not explicitly disclosed]</td>
<td>Relocated from Pakuranga [But not disclosed]</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Eckford’s Homestead</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Eckford’s Homestead" /></td>
<td>Original</td>
<td>Represents an original use</td>
<td>Restored (single period) [But not explicitly disclosed]</td>
<td>Relocated from Maraetai [Source: visitor brochure &amp; interpretation panel]</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Howick Courthouse</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Howick Courthouse" /></td>
<td>Original</td>
<td>Represents an original use</td>
<td>Restored (single period) [Source: interpretation panel]</td>
<td>Relocated from Howick [Source: interpretation panel]</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Private Brindle’s Cottage</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Private Brindle’s Cottage" /></td>
<td>Original</td>
<td>Adapted to an exhibition space &amp; large veranda added [but not disclosed]</td>
<td>Restored (single period) [Source: interpretation panel]</td>
<td>Relocated from Howick [Source: interpretation panel]</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and visitor map number (refer Figure 2.2.3)</td>
<td>Photograph</td>
<td>Original/Replica/</td>
<td>Adapted/Altered/Reconstructed</td>
<td>Restored? (single/all periods)</td>
<td>Relocated to HHV? (Original site)</td>
<td>Elite building?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Fitzpatrick’s Cottage</td>
<td><img src="image1.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Original</td>
<td>Adapted internally to the Education Department’s office [but not disclosed]</td>
<td>Exterior restored to single period (interior not accessible) [but not disclosed]</td>
<td>Relocated from Pakuranga [Source: visitor brochure &amp; interpretation panel]</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Puhi Nui</td>
<td><img src="image2.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Original</td>
<td>Represents an original use</td>
<td>Restored (single period)</td>
<td>Relocated from Puhinui [Source: interpretation panel]</td>
<td>½</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 White’s Homestead</td>
<td><img src="image3.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Original</td>
<td>Adapted, altered &amp; added to entrance, offices &amp; visitor facilities [Source: visitor brochure]</td>
<td>Exterior restored to single period (interior mainly not restored)</td>
<td>Relocated from Pakuranga [Source: visitor brochure &amp; interpretation panel]</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell Barn</td>
<td><img src="image4.jpg" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>Original</td>
<td>Not able to be accessed</td>
<td>Not able to be accessed</td>
<td>No – has always been at present site [But not disclosed]</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2.3.1: Jennifer Walling, Woodpiles and carts in the open area in front of Fitzpatrick’s Cottage, 2015, photograph.

Figure 2.3.2: Jennifer Walling, Picnic area beside the path looking towards Howick Courthouse, 2015, photograph.
Figure 2.3.3: Jennifer Walling, Buildings and their gardens lining the access path, 2015, photograph.

Figure 2.3.4: Jennifer Walling, Sergeant Barry’s Cottage and slightly overgrown garden, 2015, photograph.
Figure 2.3.5: Jennifer Walling, *Pond with Pakuranga School in the background*, 2015, photograph.

Figure 2.3.6: Jennifer Walling, *Densely treed area with access path*, 2015, photograph.
Figure 2.3.7: Jennifer Walling, *Current-day interpretation panel in the style of Fencible-period Howick*, 2015, photograph.

Figure 2.3.8: Jennifer Walling, *Interpretation panel giving information on Sergeant Ford’s Cottage including its relocation to Howick Historical Village*, 2015, photograph.
Figure 2.3.9: Jennifer Walling, *Worn wall paint to Colonel de Quincey’s Cottage*, 2015, photograph.

Figure 2.3.10: Jennifer Walling, *Old-fashioned park bench, streetlamp, and post and rail fence*, 2015, photograph.
2.4 Conclusions

This chapter has presented background information on Howick Historical Village to provide context, and has reviewed literature on the open-air museum’s relationship to the concepts of authenticity and heritage.

The background to Howick Historical Village showed the open-air museum is like other New Zealand open-air museums, in that it was created in 1980, and it was formed by a community group – the Howick Historical Society. It was created as a response to urbanisation threatening a community, as is shown was the case for many international open-air museums in Section 1.2. The historical society still manages the open-air museum with the support of voluntary work by its members. Howick Historical Village has always received funding from its local council as well as its visitors. The open-air museum has expanded during its history.

Literature showed New Zealand’s heritage authorities judge only some buildings at Howick Historical Village to be authentic heritage, and not the open-air museum as a whole. This appeared to be because only some buildings are original and have had lesser degrees of intervention, but this was not entirely clear or consistent. Howick Historical Village has not been assessed by a heritage authority recently. Literature on Howick Historical Village by Alan La Roche, who has had a long involvement with the open-air museum, focused on how it is authentic and heritage because of the experience of the past it offers, the social history of the Fencibles it tells, and the work done by its volunteers. His literature also revealed Howick Historical Village was modelled on open-air museums in the USA. Literature from other non-official sources is very limited and was mixed in its opinion of how Howick Historical Village relates to the concepts of authenticity and heritage.

Direct observations of Howick Historical Village from the field showed that Howick Historical Village contains a mixture of original and replica buildings, that most were relocated to the open-air museum and restored to the period when they were first built. These are characteristics shared by many international open-air museums, as Section 1.2 shows, but not practices that are associated with authentic heritage by established official international heritage literature or New Zealand’s legislation and charters, as Sections 1.1 and 1.3 demonstrate in turn. Most of the buildings are from the local area and hardly any could be regarded as elite, characteristics that align Howick Historical Village with amateur open-air museums formed from the 1960s in the USA, characteristics which are held to indicate
authenticity by some historians, as the literature on international open-air museums shows. The direct observations also showed that Howick Historical Village possesses attributes that align it with some of the non-official understandings of authenticity and heritage discussed in this section such as an open-air museum being authentic because it has a worn or dirty style.
PART II – OFFICIAL AND NON-OFFICIAL VIEWS ON
HOWICK HISTORICAL VILLAGE, AUTHENTICITY AND HERITAGE

Chapter Three: Interview and Questionnaire Responses

This chapter aims to investigate views on authenticity and heritage, and how these concepts relate to Howick Historical Village, from heritage officials and heritage non-officials associated with the open-air museum. To do this, it gathers key responses to the sub-questions to the main research question, ‘how does Howick Historical Village relate to the concepts of authenticity and heritage from official and non official viewpoints?’ Interviews and questionnaires are used to gather the responses. The research sub-questions are as follows:

1. What does authenticity mean?
2. What does heritage mean?
3. Does something need to be authentic to be heritage?
4. Is Howick Historical Village authentic?
5. Does the involvement of volunteers at Howick Historical Village contribute to it being authentic?
6. Is Howick Historical Village heritage?

As discussed in the methodology section of the thesis introduction, the heritage officials whose views are researched are representatives of the heritage authorities with jurisdiction over Howick Historical Village - Auckland Council and Heritage New Zealand. The heritage non-officials researched are Howick Historical Village’s visitors and volunteers, and two Board Members of the Howick and Districts Historical Society.

The responses to the research sub-questions are presented for each group and in the following order:

3.1 Heritage officials
3.2 Howick and Districts Historical Society Board Members
3.3 Building maintenance and living history volunteers
3.4 Visitors
The chapter shows how each group understands the concepts addressed by the research sub-questions, and so gives insight into their understandings of authenticity, heritage and how they correspond to Howick Historical Village.

3.1 Heritage Officials

This section aims to discover the views of the heritage officials towards the concepts of authenticity and heritage, and how they regard Howick Historical Village in relationship to them. It presents key responses from interviews with representatives of Auckland Council and Heritage New Zealand. Robin Byron, Heritage Advisor Architecture of Heritage New Zealand’s Northern Regional Office was interviewed on 8 October 2014, and George Farrant, Principal Heritage Advisor (Central) of Auckland Council was interviewed on 2 December 2014. Both Byron and Farrant are familiar with Howick Historical Village though Byron notes “I don’t know much about the background” and Farrant explains “I haven’t been out there for a couple of years.”

This section shows that, on the whole, the views of Robin Byron and George Farrant regarding the issues discussed are relatively consistent.

Research Sub-Question 1: What does authenticity mean?

Responses Byron and Farrant make show they understand authenticity to mean original fabric, in-situ structures and buildings not restored to a single time period, as Byron notes, to “do as little as possible to disturb original features or fabric.”

However, Farrant proposes with some buildings the requirements of authenticity are a little different:

Some buildings it is critical it both appears and is [authentic].... The alternative example is the Civic Theatre, where what is important... is the illusion, the skin, the surface of the paint.... You have to make a decision as to where a particular place sits in that.

Byron believes for her, personally, authenticity also means “you can see the patina of age. It’s not falling down but it hasn’t been cleaned within an inch of its life.”
Byron also remarks: “The Venice Charter talks about the authenticity of the original materials whereas in Japan they tend to renew buildings all the time... but using the same craft and so it [The Nara Document on Authenticity] recognises authenticity can mean different things in different cultures”.

Farrant also discusses the Japanese approach to authenticity: “The tangible isn’t hugely valued in Japan... parallel in Maori carving” but adds “I’m not sure how it will apply to European artefacts.”

**Research Sub-Question 2: What does heritage mean?**

Farrant explains he prepared a definition of heritage a few years ago:

[I]t is the process of identifying, assessing, where relevant protecting, items from our architectural, social and cultural past while leaving room for the community to live and breathe and create future heritage. Representative items.... doesn’t mean only a token sampling....

Farrant also relates defining heritage “answers a lot of questions” but “it’s a notoriously difficult thing to do.”

Farrant explains Auckland Council assessed heritage using fixed criteria but this is changing: “We had, horror of horrors, a numeric assessment system. A highly refined one... The new district plan [the upcoming Auckland Unitary Plan] takes a slightly more flexible view... we will get challenged”.

Byron again gives a more personal response which interweaves heritage’s meaning with her understanding of authenticity:

Have you been to Hawthorne Dene?... something about the place feels anachronistic... there is a patina of old trees, and a house, just a little run down... that is much more resonant for me of historic place and time than being at Howick Historical Village. It’s because it’s not contrived in any way....

When discussing heritage, both heritage officials refer to heritage value and heritage significance. Byron gives remarks like this which concerns a building’s original location: “integral to the values and the significance of a place, that the moment you extract something from that original setting, in my view, and the view of the Charter, it automatically demotes
its heritage value.” Farrant makes comments such as “it’s not quite the same thing as having heritage value.”

Research Sub-Question 3: Does something need to be authentic to be heritage?

Both Byron and Farrant give responses which show they believe something does need to be authentic to be heritage, with Farrant noting “authenticity is a key factor of the assessment process.”

Byron refers to the pioneer museum at Silverdale, stating it is a “similar sort of situation” to Howick Historical Village, and suggests “there are real opportunities...: interpreting them in a way that you understand where they come from.... talk about their different ages”.

Research Sub-Question 4: Is Howick Historical Village authentic?

Byron suggests aspects of Howick Historical Village have varying authenticity:

Some things genuinely have some significance to that place, or may have come from areas around there... but then there might be ones that have... been replicated, or brought from more of a distance.

Byron does not think present-day elements at Howick Historical Village imitating the Fenclible period are authentic, including its interpretation panels: “You need to be clear about what is modern that you bring to the place, and what is genuinely old”.

Byron believes it is important what is authentic and what is not at Howick Historical Village is disclosed, but currently thinks they are not fully enough: “setting it up as if it’s real”. She also considers buildings of varying authenticity being located next to each other is problematic: “you are treating them as equals, as it were.”

Farrant observes the degree that Howick Historical Village’s setting imitates the original Howick settlement is not highly important: “this is a synthesised place, it’s not a real place, as long as the components of it are sympathetic to the idea of a colonial village, you probably can’t go far wrong.” However, he also notes “it’s important they do have a context; they have lawns, they have gardens, they have a streetscape, however synthetic.”

Byron explains when it is necessary to move a building to save it, care must be taken to move it to a new site which keeps as many of the original site’s relationships in order to retain as
much of its authenticity as possible: “Provide a setting which is similar, which maintains those values”.

Both Byron and Farrant make responses which show they believe buildings being moved to Howick Historical Village diminishes their authenticity. Byron indicates however “there was more of a laissez faire attitude in the 80s” to moving buildings and “maybe we should be grateful those buildings were saved because a lot of heritage was lost in the period of time, in the name of development.” Farrant imparts, like Byron, there has been “a firming of some things that were maybe quite permissible in 1980” in terms of relocating buildings. He observes that there may be reasons Howick Historical Village’s buildings needed to be moved which are valid and, if this was the case, “it’s better to have them in a museum context rather than... demolished.”

Both Byron and Farrant give remarks which demonstrate they believe the replicas at Howick Historical Village are not authentic and do not assist the open-air museum being authentic either. Farrant notes the building at Howick Historical Village which was altered to represent Wagstaff’s Blacksmith Shop “will have interest, social, perhaps environmental interest, maybe fill a gap literally and metaphorically, but it doesn’t create heritage.”

Both Byron and Farrant comment that most of the buildings at Howick Historical Village being restored to the Fencible period diminishes their authenticity, with Byron noting “they may have been stripping away fabric from later periods that actually would have been quite lovely to be able to interpret in terms of the way the place had evolved”. In line with this, Farrant comments “restore everything to an arbitrary date... you actually demoted the role those buildings can play.”

**Research Sub-Question 5: Does the involvement of volunteers at Howick Historical Village contribute to it being authentic?**

Neither Byron or Farrant believe the involvement of volunteers at the open-air museum contribute to it being authentic.

Farrant explains “I don’t think it affects whether council regards it as heritage, that’s an independent thing. It doesn’t matter who did it.” However, he also notes “in many cases these places wouldn’t be there if it wasn’t for volunteer labour.” Farrant later also notes when discussing *The Nara Document on Authenticity*, “if the craft skills that are being kept alive through that add to the authenticity, that’s value” however.
Byron notes volunteers need professional direction: “When you are dealing with original fabric you should have somebody who has some knowledge... sometimes you do get volunteers... and they do the right thing... but not often enough.”

**Research Sub-Question 6: Is Howick Historical Village heritage?**

Byron’s and Farrant’s responses to this question are very similar to their responses to the sub-question, is Howick Historical Village authentic? When discussing whether Howick Historical Village is heritage, both heritage officials discuss the open-air museum in terms of its value and its significance. An example is Byron’s remark that “some things genuinely have some significance... I think there are different hierarchies of values associated with them.”

Byron notes she believes buildings being in a museum compromises their heritage value: “You are mummifying it to a certain extent... the way they change is absorbed as part of their significance.”

Farrant observes it is possible Howick Historical Village has heritage significance but it needs to be freshly assessed, both as a whole, and the individual buildings in its collection: “The concept of a historic village may turn out to be an artefact in itself. You mightn’t do it again but you might say, this is something that is representative of thinking and value systems of the time.”

As this section showed, heritage officials Robin Byron of Heritage New Zealand and George Farrant of Auckland Council usually have similar views towards authenticity and heritage and their relationship to Howick Historical Village. Both believe in-situ and original buildings that have not been restored to a single time period have the highest authenticity. Byron believes a real patina of age is authentic, and new work should not imitate original fabric. Farrant takes the view, however, that on some buildings it is important that new work does not disrupt the illusion or atmosphere created by original work. Heritage is defined by both in a way that addresses the past and refers to significance and value. Both believe something needs to be authentic to be heritage. Byron and Farrant share the belief that Howick Historical Village is not fully authentic and could not fully be considered heritage because it contains buildings that were relocated and restored to a single time period, and replicas. Byron finds Howick Historical Village having new work which emulates original
Fencible period Howick artefacts problematic. Both believe the involvement of volunteers does not contribute to its authenticity unless it means traditional practices are being kept alive. Farrant proposes Howick Historical Village as a whole could have some heritage value if it is found to represent the beliefs of its time, but both heritage officials think open-air museums in general are questionable in terms of heritage.

3.2 Howick and Districts Historical Society Board Members

This section presents the views of members of the Howick and Districts Historical Society Board towards the concepts of authenticity and heritage and how they regard Howick Historical Village in relationship to them, on the basis of interviews with Harry Allen and Alan La Roche. Allen and La Roche are identified as not being heritage officials but both have had experience with heritage authorities. Allen has also taught conservation-related material at tertiary level and has been a board member for the last few years. La Roche was one of the founders of Howick Historical Village and has been continuously involved with it in roles including volunteer training and building restoration as well as being a board member. He was also Chairman of the Auckland Regional Committee of the New Zealand Historical Places Trust for a period. The interviews with Allen and La Roche were conducted on 1 September 2014 and 9 September 2014 respectively.

This section shows Allen and La Roche’s views sometimes differ from each other in response to the research sub-questions, and sometimes are consistent.

Research Sub-Question 1: What does authenticity mean?

Allen’s overall responses show he believes authenticity means original fabric and historical accuracy.

La Roche had prepared a definition to bring to the interview: “a genuine, a reliable or an honest history, as close to the original, as we see it in a later time.”

La Roche relates he has been to many open-air museums, including ones in New Zealand, Britain, North America and Scandinavia: “I keep an eye on what is happening overseas, because they are a good guide to how living history museums should be operating, and how to improve our presentation to visitors.”
La Roche notes the comfort of visitors and their quality of experience is very important to him:

I had been to Scandinavia and been through their living museums... you did a long tramp between buildings... I’m not sure that was good for visitors. They wanted something they could see in an hour or two and have an enjoyable experience.

La Roche also explains if material looks like the original, usually people do not notice the difference: “I put fibrolite shingles on Shamrock Cottage in Howick so they could use the fire... within the month I had lots of lichen and moss on it and nobody even notices that they aren’t wooden shingles.”

**Research Sub-Question 2: What does heritage mean?**

Allen’s response is made in relation to Howick Historical Village: “Conserving those buildings, those artefacts, is very important in terms of the knowledge of Auckland and in terms of the knowledge of Fencible history.”

La Roche had prepared his definition to bring to the interview: “Heritage is what we inherit from the past, and its evidence of the past, but to call it heritage we must know, accurately its history.”

**Research Sub-Question 3: Does something need to be authentic to be heritage?**

Allen is not asked this question, but it can be deduced he does think authenticity is necessary for heritage from his responses that it is the original artefacts that are both authentic, and heritage.

La Roche responds indirectly to this question, and suggests he does think authenticity is necessary for heritage:

We have very little material that is genuine, of the 1850 period, in our Village. But we have from buying material from antique shops... we are able to recreate a similar appearance to what it was. Now, that’s not authentic but it’s very old.

**Research Sub-Question 4: Is Howick Historical Village authentic?**

Allen believes only Howick Historical Village’s original buildings are authentic: “The individual buildings are artefacts – but the Village itself is a created artefact.” He also
considers that Howick Historical Village as a whole is “not set in stone, it’s not a historic artefact itself. So it can be changed.” He notes, however, “there would be resistance to that.”

Allen believes Howick Historical Village does not resemble the original Fencible period Howick settlement: “I don’t think any Howick village ever looked like this.... like a somewhat Anglo-fied concept of a village.” He also believes most volunteers and visitors “don’t want it to be too neat.”

Allen thinks the original buildings at Howick Historical Village are in an authentic condition: “There hasn’t been the money to undertake major renovations, or major display items, or major conservation projects.... the buildings haven’t been mucked up by previous poor efforts.”

Allen believes there is a conflict between visitors’ preferences and historical authenticity:

I believe visitors largely come here, not with a serious interest in history... to get a feeling for what it might have been like in the past. So there is a tension between that aspect and the historical authenticity, but it has to be played out... we have to get the punters turning up at the gate.

Many of La Roche’s comments show he thinks Howick Historical Village can be authentic, but also that this depends on whether the Howick and Districts Historical Society Board decides to prioritise historical accuracy:

I have trouble with our Board here trying to convince them that authenticity matters.... They don’t see that as being very important... we’ll go the Disney way... we’ll make it up... No, we want good, researched, honest history and there are ways of making that pay. Visitors want to see that sort of thing.

For La Roche, the impressions of visitors are also a primary driver for decisions at Howick Historical Village: “In 1850 our Fencible cottages all faced away from the street. That would not be good for visitors.” As part of this, he suggests changes were sometimes made to buildings to improve the open-air museum from a visitor’s perspective: “most of the cottages had turned the porches round to face the street, in due course.... taken a wall out and filled in the other one. So, that was one of the compromises we had to make.”

La Roche cites a lack of money and building materials that were originally used no longer being available as reasons why buildings at Howick Historical Village are not entirely like
they were when they were first built. However, he does not link these to it being inauthentic: “I get criticised because some of them have iron roofs, well that’s an economic situation... We don’t have enough kauri or totara shingle makers in New Zealand to satisfy that demand.”

La Roche believes modern conveniences at Howick Historical Village should be hidden: “Toilets and all those facilities have to be part of the Village but you have to conceal those to a degree.”

La Roche remarks it is explained to visitors what aspects of Howick Historical Village are not original if they enquire, but otherwise they are endeavoured to be concealed. Speaking of iron sheets which are concealed within thatched roofs for waterproofing he explains, “we try to hide it, but if they ask...”

La Roche indicates he thinks interpretation panels should be like they were in Fencible times but there is disagreement about this on the Howick and Districts Historical Society Board: “Painted signs are what the Fencibles, in a Village like this, would have had. And they are also done in the 1850 style.”

Both Board Members give responses which show they do not believe most of Howick Historical Village’s buildings being relocated there affects their authenticity. Allen thinks the buildings being moved to the museum is not problematic because “at the time... local government didn’t have very good heritage policies, and largely the option was relocation or demolition”. Now, he thinks “having been moved, these buildings should be regarded as artefacts.” La Roche explains moving the buildings was the only way to stop them being demolished: “would have been demolished, the whole lot”. He relates that the buildings were donated by their owners: “We have this old cottage, would you like it for the Village”. However, La Roche notes “I got a lot of criticisms for moving them off from The Historic Places Trust in those early years”.

Whether the replica buildings at Howick Historical Village are authentic is an issue the two Board Members appear to have subtly differing opinions on. Allen does not respond directly, but from his comments that it is the original artefacts that are authentic, and it can be deduced he does not think the replicas are. La Roche also responds indirectly, saying the replicas are not authentic but very historically accurate as a lot of research was done into the original
structures as they were in Fencible period Howick: “We have made replicas of the real things.”

Whether most of the original buildings at Howick Historical Village being restored to the Fencible period makes them authentic is an issue the Board Members have views that depart more on. Allen asserts the buildings being restored to the Fencible period diminishes the role they can play at the museum: “sometimes it affects the story that can be told.” La Roche however does not see restoring them to the Fencible period as being inauthentic: “We tried to restore them back....we did remove the post 1850 additions to those cottages.”

La Roche gives some pertinent comments that address authenticity in terms of the way Howick Historical Village was created. He explains Old Sturbridge Village in Massachusetts, USA, was used as a precedent for Howick Historical Village: “We based our museum, before we even got started here, we were communicating with Old Sturbridge”. He relates he did a lot of research on each of the buildings that were moved to Howick Historical Village: “Files that I did on each of the buildings here”, and that he used many different methods to do this because there usually was not a lot of documentation. La Roche explains Howick Historical Village was modelled on a photograph by Kinder of Howick in 1860 and that many other open-air museums have used the same technique:

I use that as a good plan for the layout of the Village, and also the way we restored our cottages....we’ve got the church at the end of the street.... there are many museums around the world, Williamsburg for one... where they have taken old photos and tried to recreate the way it was....

This photograph appears in The History of Howick in Pakuranga and is reproduced in Section 2.2 of this thesis.

**Research Sub-Question 5:** Does the involvement of volunteers at Howick Historical Village contribute to it being authentic?

Allen acknowledges creating Howick Historical Village was a huge task for volunteers to have achieved; “I give them full credit for what they did”. He also observes “there was an original vision for what this place would be like, and what it would operate like, and I think that original vision is still there.” In keeping with this, Allen explains most of the volunteers at Howick Historical Village do not refer to it as an open-air museum, rather as ‘the Village’. Further, he notes that amongst the volunteers there is “a reluctance to go down the avenue of
professionalization. And that is a philosophical reluctance.... to concede that is the future for the Village.” While Allen believes “there is very good volunteer training taking place”, he cautions:

When it comes to actual work on the buildings, I would be happier with a greater amount of professional direction.... conflict maintaining the original fabric... is often the expensive option, and replacing things with modern materials that look like the original is the cheaper option....

La Roche responds many times that he thinks the volunteers are important to Howick Historical Village, though he doesn’t say in as many words they contribute to its authenticity. When discussing the volunteers, he praises the practical skills and historical knowledge they hold: “His ability at making buildings square and straight.... he read a lot.... They are no dummies!”

La Roche explains some volunteers have a direct connection to Fencible Howick: “Arthur White was our carpenter and he helped me with every project. And he was a descendant of James White, the Fencible in Howick, so he had a long, local history.”

La Roche also explains sometimes people working at Howick Historical Village with professional heritage-related qualifications lacked practical knowledge: “their interest was very narrow and they didn’t have an interest in the total conservation of the buildings here, theirs was basically paper-based.”

Research Sub-Question 6: Is Howick Historical Village heritage?

Allen’s various answers show he believes Howick Historical Village should have greater official heritage recognition due to the age, condition and originality of many of its original buildings and artefacts: “It is a very valuable collection....easily of national significance and should get more support.”

Allen also believes moving the original buildings from their original locations should not affect whether they are officially regarded as authentic heritage: “There is a fundamental philosophical difference... Heritage New Zealand and its Act relate to place-based heritage.... Whereas being moved, these buildings should largely be regarded as artefacts.”

Allen believes Howick Historical Village could be used to tell a wider Auckland history than that of Fencible Howick as its artefacts “can be handles for stories.... there is huge potential.”
La Roche does not respond to this question directly but many of his other responses show he thinks Howick Historical meets his definition of heritage.

La Roche is interested in Howick Historical Village only telling the history of Fencible Howick: “No one else can do Fencible history. We have to see that as our priority.... museums must be unique.”

In sum, Howick and Districts Historical Society Board Members Harry Allen and Alan La Roche sometimes have similar views towards authenticity and heritage and their relationship to Howick Historical Village, but sometimes different. Allen believes authenticity means original fabric, but for La Roche originality is not necessarily required and he also has other criteria for authenticity, including techniques used at other, international, open-air museums. Both refer to the past when discussing heritage but Allen is alone in referring to its conservation. Both believe something needs to be authentic to be heritage. Both consider Howick Historical Village to be authentic, but Allen focuses on its individual original buildings, while La Roche believes it can be authentic as a whole. Neither thinks its buildings being relocated to the open-air museum affects this, but Allen feels the replicas and buildings being restored to a single period diminishes Howick Historical Village’s authenticity. La Roche believes the volunteers do assist Howick Historical Village being authentic but Allen considers some ones that are dealing with original fabric to not have enough knowledge of its importance. Allen and La Roche both judge the open-air museum to be heritage, Allen for reasons that include it being unique and having old and rare buildings in its collection. The section also identified that while the Board Members are not heritage officials, both Allen and La Roche have had some involvement with heritage authorities, and Allen had conservation related training.

### 3.3 Building Maintenance and Living History Volunteers

This section presents the views of Howick Historical Village’s building maintenance and living history volunteers towards the concepts of authenticity and heritage and how they regard Howick Historical Village in relationship to them. These volunteers are identified as not being heritage officials, and it being unlikely they have experience of heritage authorities. This section outlines pertinent responses obtained from questionnaires which were distributed
on 10 September 2014 to the building maintenance volunteers, and 21 September 2014 to the living history volunteers at the open-air museum. All of the volunteers present responded. Responses which show the volunteers’ profile are given at the end of the section.

This section shows that the views of this group are sometimes are held in common, but sometimes there is less of a unanimous opinion.

Research Sub-Question 1: What does authenticity mean?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The convincing general look of a time period</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How a particular place or thing would have looked at a particular time</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A place or thing that is original</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A place or thing certified as authentic an official organisation (eg. council)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant selected both ‘The convincing general look or a time period’ and ‘How a particular place or thing would have looked at a particular time’</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The volunteers define authenticity most often as the convincing general look of a time period. Almost one third define it as how a particular place or thing would have looked at a particular time, and a small number as a place or thing that is original, or a place or thing certified as authentic by an official organisation. None of the self-defined definitions given under ‘other’ responses are very different from the four set definitions for this question.
Research Sub-Question 2: What does heritage mean?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme of responses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did not respond</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History or past ways of life</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting of past and present through a personal link</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinctly old</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning about history or past ways of life</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining/preserving history or past ways of life</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserving the past for future understanding</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representing history or past ways of life</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rare and protected history</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiencing history or past ways of life</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History from the local area that is important</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National identity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A high number of the volunteers did not respond to say what heritage means to them and the themes of the responses that are given are varied, though all refer to the past in some way. The most common theme, for just over one fifth of visitors, gives heritage the meaning of history or past ways of life. Meeting of past and present through a personal link and distinctly old are the next most common themes. Comments representing each theme are:

History, customs, work practices, home life. (History or past ways of life)  
(Volunteer 9)

What we inherit from earlier generations. (Meeting of past and present through a personal link)  
(Volunteer 18)

Over 100 years old. (Distinctly old)  
(Volunteer 3)

Some of the responses under themes that are less common are particularly interesting:

Old or made to look old.  
(Volunteer 11)

‘Step back in time’ experience.  
(Volunteer 20)

Local history that has some degree of importance.  
(Volunteer 29)
Research Sub-Question 3: Does something need to be authentic for it to be heritage?

Table 3.3.3 Volunteers:
Do you think a place or thing needs to be authentic for it to be heritage?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not respond</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Just over a half of the volunteers think a place or thing needs to be authentic for it to be heritage.

Research Sub-Question 4: Is Howick Historical Village authentic?

Table 3.3.4.1 Volunteers:
Do you think Howick Historical Village is an authentic place?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not respond</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The volunteers mostly think Howick Historical Village is an authentic place.

Table 3.3.4.2 Volunteers:
Do you think visitors find Howick Historical Village to be an authentic place?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not respond</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Almost all of the volunteers think visitors find Howick Historical Village to be an authentic place – a number that exactly matches those who think it is authentic themselves.

Interestingly, a volunteer who is unsure spontaneously comments “I think most people don’t think about it” (Volunteer 1).

Responses to questions that gauge whether particular aspects of Howick Historical Village affect whether the volunteers consider it is authentic are presented under this research sub-question. The questions address the open-air museum’s buildings being restored to a single
time period, the way its buildings and gardens are maintained, and its living history interpretation.

Table 3.3.4.3 Volunteers:
Were you involved in the restoration of buildings when they first came to Howick Historical Village?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of the volunteers were not involved in restoring buildings when they first were first moved to Howick Historical Village.

Table 3.3.4.4 Volunteers:
Do you think the way the buildings were restored helps show their history?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question was not applicable but responded yes</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question was not applicable but responded no</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question was not applicable but responded not sure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not respond</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question was not applicable and did not respond</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the volunteers who did perform the restoration of the buildings when they first came to Howick Historical Village and responded to this question think the way they were restored helps show their history. A lot of volunteers respond to this question even though they had not restored the buildings. They mostly think the way it was done helps show the buildings’ history.

Table 3.3.4.5 Volunteers:
Are you involved in the maintenance of the buildings and gardens at Howick Historical Village?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of the volunteers do not perform maintenance of the buildings or gardens.
Table 3.3.4.6 Volunteers:
Do you think the way the buildings and gardens are maintained help Howick Historical Village be like Howick in the 1840-1880 period?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question was not applicable and responded yes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question was not applicable and responded no</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question was not applicable and did not respond</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question was not applicable and responded not sure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The volunteers involved in the maintenance of the buildings and gardens all think the way it is done helps the museum be like Howick in the 1840-1880 period. A lot of volunteers respond to this question even though it was not intended to apply to them, and their responses are highly supportive of the way it was done too.

Table 3.3.4.7 Volunteers:
Are you involved in the living history interpretation at Howick Historical Village?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of the volunteers are involved in living history interpretation.

Table 3.3.4.8 Volunteers:
Do you think the living history interpretation makes visitors find Howick Historical Village more authentic?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question not applicable and do not respond</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question not applicable and respond yes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question not applicable and respond not sure</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question not applicable and respond yes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of the volunteers who are involved in living history interpretation think it makes the museum more authentic for visitors. A lot of volunteers respond to the question even though it is not intended to apply to them, and they are just as unanimous in thinking it makes Howick Historical Village more authentic for visitors.
Research Sub-Question 5: Does the involvement of volunteers at Howick Historical Village contribute to it being authentic?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.3.5.1 Volunteers: Do you think volunteers creating Howick Historical Village and having ongoing involvement with it contributes to it being an authentic place?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not respond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Almost all of the volunteers think they, as volunteers, contribute to Howick Historical Village being authentic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.3.5.2 Volunteers: How do you think volunteers contribute to Howick Historical Village being an authentic place?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theme of responses</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing atmosphere and activity of the period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Their period appearance as living history interpreters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflects community involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing maintenance to make/keep the Village authentic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because the volunteers themselves are having an authentic experience of the period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because of their training and accuracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not respond or question n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Themes in the volunteers’ comments show a high proportion think they contribute to its authenticity by providing atmosphere and activity of the period. Responses representing this theme include:

Volunteers make the Village come alive. (Volunteer 9)

Add interest to the feel of the place. Make it come to life. (Volunteer 16)

On Live Days the Village is a ‘real village’ adding action to otherwise 'museum' pieces. (Volunteer 19)

They help to create an atmosphere like that of the 1800's. (Volunteer 25)
A volunteer who is not sure comments: “Volunteers help to create a sense of community ownership but not necessarily to its authenticity.” (Volunteer 1)

Research Sub-Question 6: Is Howick Historical Village heritage?

| Table 3.3.6 Volunteers:  
Do you think Howick Historical Village is heritage? |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not respond</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The volunteers almost all think Howick Historical Village is heritage.

Profile: Building Maintenance and Living History Interpretation Volunteers

| Table 3.3.7.1 Volunteers:  
What are your reasons for volunteering at Howick Historical Village? (Please select as many answers as are applicable.) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in local history</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give back to the local community</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social reasons</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation/relaxation reasons</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal link with the history it tells</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for education</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity to gain experience you hope to use professionally</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An interest in local history is the most common reason why people volunteer and giving back to the community is the next most common reason, given by over one half of respondents. Social reasons and recreation/relaxation reasons are chosen by almost one half. A personal link with the history Howick Historical Village tells is a less common reason, but for around one third of the volunteers it is their sole reason, and these are the only occasions only one reason is given.
Table 3.3.7.2 Volunteers: What are your reasons for volunteering at Howick Historical Village? (*other* responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme of responses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal enjoyment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support the Howick Historical Village</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify with atmosphere at Village</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserving heritage that is threatened</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Reasons</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘Other’ reasons for volunteering are elected by almost one quarter of the volunteers. The most common theme for this is personal enjoyment, which reinforces the set responses which elect recreation/relaxation.

Table 3.3.7.3 Volunteers: How long have you volunteered at Howick historical Village?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 1 year</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 3 years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – 6 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 – 10 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 – 20 years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 – 30 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30+ years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not respond</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most significant proportion of the volunteers have volunteered for between one and twenty years.

Table 3.3.7.4 Volunteers: Where do you live?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Howick/Pakuranga</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsewhere in Auckland</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of the volunteers live in Howick or Pakuranga. Cross-referencing with other responses shows 90% of the volunteers who volunteer because they have a personal link the history the museum presents also live in Howick/Pakuranga, and also have a higher length of volunteering (10% for 30+ years, 10% for 20-30 years, 30% 10-20 years, 20% 6-10 years, 20% 3-6 years and 10% 1-3 years).
Table 3.3.7.5 Volunteers: Have you been to other historic village museums in NZ or overseas?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes – 5 or more</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes – under 5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of the volunteers have been to other historic village museums. Over half have been to less than five, and around one third have been to five or more.

Overall, the responses showed most of the volunteers believe authenticity means the convincing general look of a time period, and believe heritage has a meaning which involves the past. Just over a half the volunteers believe something needs to be authentic to be heritage, but around one quarter do not. Almost all volunteers believe Howick Historical Village is an authentic place, and almost all believe visitors think the same. Most volunteers believe the way the buildings were restored helps show their history. Most of the volunteers think the way the buildings and gardens are maintained helps Howick Historical Village be like Howick in 1840-1880. All of the volunteers that responded believe living history makes Howick Historical Village authentic for visitors. Almost all volunteers think Howick Historical Village is authentic and that the involvement of volunteers contributes to this, mainly because they provide atmosphere and activity of the period. Almost all volunteers consider Howick Historical Village to be heritage. The volunteers’ profiles showed most of them volunteer at the open-air museum because of interest in local history and a desire to give back to the local community. The bulk has volunteered for many years, live in the Howick/Pakuranga area and have visited other historic village museums.

3.4 Visitors

This section seeks to unearth the views of visitors to Howick Historical Village towards authenticity and heritage, and how they think the concepts correspond to Howick Historical Village. These visitors are identified as not being heritage officials, and it being unlikely they have had experience of heritage authorities. This section outlines pertinent responses obtained from questionnaires which were distributed on 6, 7 and 21 September and 19
October 2014 at the open-air museum. Seventy-six visitors responded. Responses which show the visitors’ profile are given at the end of the section.

This section shows that the views of the visitors are sometimes very consistent, but sometimes there is less commonality.

**Research Sub-Question 1: What does authenticity mean?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The convincing general look of a time period</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How a particular place or thing would have looked at a particular time</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A place or thing that is original</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A place or thing certified as authentic an official organisation (eg. council)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple answers selected</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not respond</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>76</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Visitors define authenticity most often as a place or thing that is original. Over one quarter define authenticity as how a particular place or thing would have looked at a particular time, and less than this as the convincing general look of a time period, or as a place or thing certified as authentic by an official organisation. Visitors do not give any self-defined definitions that are very different to the four set options for this question.
Research Sub-Question 2: What does heritage mean?

Table 3.4.2 Visitors:
What does heritage mean to you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme of Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting of past and present through a personal link or</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inheritance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History or past ways of life</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rare and protected history</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original items/traditions from the past</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinctly old</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not respond</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining/preserving history or past ways of life</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experiencing history or past ways of life</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representing history or past ways of life</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History or the past from the local area that is</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning about and understanding history or past ways</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indecipherable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>76</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To visitors, heritage does not have a very commonly accepted meaning aside from all responses referring to the past in some way. The most common meaning of heritage, for one fifth of visitors, has a meaning on the theme of ‘meeting of past and present’. The themes ‘history or past ways of life’, ‘history – rare, protected, valuable,’ and ‘original,’ are the next most common themes. Comments representing each theme are:

Heritage means when things relay their history/story of the past to the present. (Meeting of past and present) (Visitor 63)

Traditions. Features of life. Historic building. (History or past ways of life) (Visitor 59)

Anything that has occurred in the past that is not likely to be seen again. (History – rare, protected, valuable) (Visitor 40)

Original condition or original methods used to restore. (Original) (Visitor 67)
Research Sub-Question 3: Does something need to be authentic to be heritage?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes and No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Less than half of the visitors think a place or thing needs to be authentic for it to be heritage.

Research Sub-Question 4: Is Howick Historical Village authentic?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partly</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not respond</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answer unclear</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Visitors mostly think Howick Historical Village is an authentic place.

Around one third of the visitors who respond ‘yes’, they think Howick Historical Village is an authentic place, also spontaneously add comments of their own. Comments that are representative of others or make interesting points are:

- Buildings ‘fit’ the way I imagined/costumed volunteers. (Visitor 11)
- It’s a good representation of how people would have lived and allows us to think how people would have interacted with each other. (Visitor 12)
- Yes – admittedly some copies but life-like! (Visitor 13)
- It looks old and like it hasn’t been touched due to the dust and what not. (Visitor 16)
- Yes, the cottages are (at least partly) original, as built back in the 1800’s. (Visitor 25)
Yes I do, I always enjoy bringing my children here to learn about history.  
(Visitor 26)

Things look very much as possible from the original period.  
(Visitor 32)

Yes. The feel and surroundings and buildings.  
(Visitor 43)

It earns an authentic title just because of the ‘feel’ of the place. They have done a fantastic job of recreating it. The volunteers are amazing!  
(Visitor 68)

Its arrangement looks like an authentic village, and it’s done really well.  
(Visitor 71)

Responses to questions that measure whether particular characteristics of Howick Historical Village inform whether the visitors consider it is authentic are presented under this research sub-question. The questions address the open-air museum’s buildings being relocated, replicas and restored to a single time period, and whether visitors are aware of this.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not respond</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>76</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Just under two-thirds of visitors know most of the buildings at Howick Historical Village were moved from their original locations where they may have otherwise been destroyed, one quarter do not know and a small number are not sure.
Table 3.4.4.3 Visitors:
How can you tell the buildings have been moved from their original locations?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme of responses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation panels</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings’ arrangement and types are different to the original Howick settlement</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self evident as Howick Historical Village is a museum</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical clues the respondent cites on the buildings</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The buildings are authentic and old</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past knowledge of Howick Historical Village</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indecipherable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not respond though answered yes to question 8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>47</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interpretation panels at Howick Historical Village are clearly the most common theme for how visitors know most of the buildings were moved from their original locations, with less knowing because the buildings’ arrangement and types are different to the original Howick settlement, because it is self evident as Howick Historical Village is an open-air museum, or because of physical clues on the buildings.

Comments that are representative or make interesting points are:

- No foundations. (Visitor 15)
- How they are placed in the village (close together, etc). (Visitor 28)
- Can’t tell. The signs tell you! (Visitor 31)
- I know that a homestead would be distant from a village... (Visitor 49)
- I am familiar with the early village. (Visitor 65)
Table 3.4.4.4 Visitors:
Did you know some of the buildings are replicas that may not have otherwise survived or could not be moved to Howick Historical Village?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not respond</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>76</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over one half of visitors do not know some of the buildings are replicas that may not have otherwise survived or could not be moved to Howick Historical Village. Over one quarter does know, and a smaller number are not sure.

Table 3.4.4.5 Visitors:
How can you tell which buildings are replicas?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme of response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did not respond</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation (both written and Living History)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure how they know</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common sense - their original fabric is perishable/non-transportable</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common sense (unqualified)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical clues present on the buildings</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most visitors did not respond how they know which buildings are replicas. About one fifth know because of interpretation panels. A small number know but are not sure how they know, or know because it is common sense, with some qualifying that the originals would perish or would not be transportable. Another small number know because of physical clues on the replica buildings.

Table 3.4.4.6 Visitors:
Did you know most of the cottages have been restored to the Fencible period?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not respond</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>76</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Just over a half of visitors know most of the cottages have been restored to the Fencible period. Just over one third do not know and a small number are not sure.

---

1 The two participants who did not respond to question presented in Table 3.4.4.4, did respond to this question and their answers have been included, giving a total of 23 responses.
Table 3.4.4.7 Visitors:
How can you tell the cottages have been restored to the Fencible period?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes of responses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation panels</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not respond</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The cottages have physical features of the past</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The cottages have been cared for and are in good condition</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The cottages are authentic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The general look or styling of the cottages</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>38</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interpretation panels are the theme why almost a third of the visitors know the cottages have been restored. The buildings having physical features of the past is the theme for the reason around one fifth of the visitors give. Almost one third of visitors do not respond to this question.

Comments that are representative of the themes include:

Old wallpaper and scrim tells age. (The cottages have physical features of the past) (Visitor 38)

The items in the cottages and the cottages have been carefully presented and looked after. (The cottages have been cared for and are in good condition) (Visitor 1)

**Research Sub-Question 5:** Does the involvement of volunteers at Howick Historical Village contribute to it being authentic?

Table 3.4.5.1 Visitors:
Did you know volunteers created Howick Historical Village and partly maintain it?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>76</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over a half of visitors know volunteers created Howick Historical Village and partly maintain it. One quarter does not know and a small number are unsure.
For most visitors, volunteers creating and partly maintaining Howick Historical Village does contribute to whether they think the open-air museum is authentic. One fifth are unsure if it contributes, and for a small number it does not contribute.

**Research Sub-Question 6: Is Howick Historical Village heritage?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.4.6 Visitors: Do you think Howick Historical Village is heritage?</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not respond</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>76</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of visitors think Howick Historical Village is heritage.

**Profile: Visitors**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.4.7.1 Visitors: What are your reasons for visiting Howick Historical Village? (Please select as many answers as are applicable.)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal link with the history it tells</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most visitors are visiting Howick Historical Village for recreation and just over a quarter are visiting for education.
Table 3.4.7.2 Visitors:
What are your reasons for visiting Howick Historical Village?
('other' responses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes of responses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support family or friend performing or volunteering at the Village</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outing organised by a group they belong to</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest in seeing open air museums &amp; historical settlements</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family experience</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience village life</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One fifth of visitors are visiting Howick Historical Village for ‘other’ reasons, with the most common theme for this being visiting to support family or a friend performing or volunteering at Howick Historical Village.

Table 3.4.7.3 Visitors:
Have you been to Howick Historical Village before?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes – 5 times or more</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes – under 5 times</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not respond</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most visitors have not visited Howick Historical Village before. Over one quarter have, but less than five times.

Table 3.4.7.4 Visitors:
Have you been to other historic village museums in NZ or overseas?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes – 5 or more</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes – under 5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not respond</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most visitors have visited less than five other historic villages in New Zealand or overseas.
Table 3.4.7.5 Visitors:  
Where do you live?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Howick/Pakuranga area</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsewhere in Auckland/NZ</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia/North America/Europe</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>76</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most visitors live elsewhere in Auckland or New Zealand, just over one fifth live in the Howick/Pakuranga area, and a small number come from other places in the world.

Overall, the responses showed most visitors believe authenticity means a place or thing that is original, and believe heritage has a meaning which involves the past. Almost half of visitors believe something needs to be authentic to be heritage, but around a third do not. Almost three-quarters of visitors feel Howick Historical Village is an authentic place. That buildings were relocated to the open-air museum because they might have been destroyed at their original location is known by almost two-thirds of visitors, with most knowing because of interpretation panels. Less than a third of visitors know there are replicas that may not have otherwise survived or have been able to be moved, and, again, interpretation panels are the reason the greatest number of them know. Just over a half of visitors know most of the buildings have been restored to the Fencible period with interpretation panels again being the most common reason why. Almost two-thirds of visitors know volunteers created and partly maintain Howick Historical Village, and for two-thirds of visitors, this does contribute to its authenticity. Most visitors consider Howick Historical Village to be heritage. The visitors’ profiles showed most are visiting Howick Historical Village for recreation, have not been there before, have not been to many other open-air museums, and live in wider Auckland.

3.5 Conclusions

This chapter presented responses and comments from the selected heritage officials and groups of heritage non-officials - visitors, volunteers and Board Members of the Howick and Districts Historical Society – to the thesis’s research sub-questions. In doing so, it gained insight into each of the different groups’ views on authenticity, heritage and how these
concepts relate to Howick Historical Village. This showed there is a wide range of ways each group understands these issues. The chapter also showed there is sometimes commonality to the opinions within a group, but other times not. How the views of the different groups compare to each other is explored in the next chapter, along with discussion of how their opinions relate to concepts in the literature.
PART III

Chapter Four: Discussion and Conclusions

This final chapter aims to bring together the responses gathered from the heritage officials and heritage non-officials to interpret and compare them, and then to discuss them in relation to concepts present in the literature. This has the goal of reaching conclusions to the thesis’s research question. The chapter begins by restating the thesis’s initial hypothesis, research question and research sub-questions. It then draws together the views of the four groups of people researched; heritage officials from Auckland Council and Heritage New Zealand, and heritage non-officials who are visitors and volunteers to Howick Historical Village, and Howick and Districts Historical Society Board Members. The chapter then discusses their views by integrating them with concepts found in the literature. Conclusions and implications, and suggestions for further research follow.

4.1 Restatement of Hypothesis, Research Question and Sub-Questions

This thesis’ initial hypothesis was: Heritage non-officials understand authenticity and heritage differently to heritage authorities.

This resulted in the research question: How does Howick Historical Village relate to the concepts of authenticity and heritage from official and non-official viewpoints?

The six research sub-questions that developed are as follows:

1. What does authenticity mean?
2. What does heritage mean?
3. Does something need to be authentic to be heritage?
4. Is Howick Historical Village authentic?
5. Does the involvement of volunteers at Howick Historical Village contribute to it being authentic?
6. Is Howick Historical Village heritage?
4.2 Discussion

This section summarises the viewpoints of the heritage officials towards each research sub-question that are presented in Chapter Three. The viewpoints of the three groups of heritage non-officials are then compared to this, with points of similarity and difference being noted. Responses that are different to the heritage officials’ view are subsequently identified. Key points from the examination of the literature in Chapters One and Two are recapped briefly. Ways in which the viewpoints of the heritage officials and the heritage non-officials are consistent with or contradict the literature are then discussed.

This section shows the groups of people researched hold a wide range of views in response to the research sub-questions, and that there is often difference between the beliefs of the heritage officials and heritage non-officials. The section also demonstrates that most of the views held by both the heritage officials and the heritage non-officials are reflected within the literature.

Research Sub-Question 1: What does Authenticity Mean?

Both heritage officials assign authenticity the meaning of original physical fabric that has not been moved from its site, or restored to a single period, as is shown in Section 3.1. Related to this, heritage official Robin Byron makes the point that new work should not imitate being original fabric. Both heritage officials also acknowledge that authenticity can be understood in different ways in different cultures, and refer to craft indicating authenticity in Japan. Both heritage officials also believe authenticity has meanings that the other heritage official does not mention. Heritage official Robin Byron refers to buildings which are not highly cleaned as being authentic. Heritage official George Farrant suggests that when some buildings are repaired or restored, their illusion or impression has primary importance, rather than whether the same materials that were originally used are again employed.

Only some of the heritage non-officials’ viewpoints on what authenticity means are aligned with those of the heritage officials. Howick and Districts Historical Society Board Member Harry Allen’s understanding of authenticity is similar to the heritage officials, as is shown by Section 3.2. Most visitors also define authenticity as meaning something original, but their responses do not qualify that it also has not been relocated or restored to a single period, as Table 3.4.1 shows. Howick and Districts Historical Society Board Member Alan La Roche and almost all of the volunteers understand authenticity differently than the heritage officials.
These non-official understandings of authenticity have a number of different meanings. The convincing general look of a time period indicates authenticity for most of the volunteers, as is shown in Table 3.3.1. Having the appearance of historic items at a particular time and place (but not necessarily their original fabric) denotes authenticity for Board Member La Roche and a large number of volunteers, with La Roche also noting the need for this to be informed by thorough research. A believable experience of the past being delivered to visitors also signals authenticity for La Roche. International open-air museums which La Roche believes successfully appear like, or give the experience of a specific historic period and place, are examples of authenticity to him. La Roche has a thorough knowledge of methods international open-air museums employ to these ends and he considers the practices authentic.

The literature examined in Chapter One contains a variety of positions on what authenticity means. Established international heritage literature, such as The Venice Charter, has fixed criteria for authenticity and states they are universally held. These include something being old, original, tangible, in-situ, and not being restored to a single time period. Other, arguably less accepted international heritage literature, like The Nara Document on Authenticity, proposes there are not fixed criteria for authenticity, and that authenticity is understood differently by different cultures. Section 1.3 demonstrates New Zealand’s official heritage literature has a similar definition of authenticity to established international official heritage literature, except it considers intangible expressions and Maori understandings of heritage as authentic. Non-official literature which discusses international open-air museums contains a large number of meanings for authenticity. They are included in Edward Bruner’s discussion of the open-air museum New Salem, Eric Gable and Richard Handler’s observations about Colonial Williamsburg, as well as books by David Lowenthal and Sten Rentzhog which reflect on open-air museums more generally.

Both the heritage officials’ and the heritage non-officials’ understandings of authenticity have precedent in the literature.

The heritage officials’ view that original physical fabric that has not been moved from its site, or restored to a single period, is authentic is consistent with the position found in established international heritage literature and New Zealand’s official heritage literature,\(^1\) as is expected.

---

\(^1\) Second International Congress of Architects and Technicians of Historic Monuments, Venice 1964

*International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites (The Venice Charter)*,
Their acknowledgment that authenticity is a concept which is understood differently by different culture shows that their views are also consistent with more recent and inclusive international heritage literature, such as *The Nara Document on Authenticity.* Their use of fixed criteria for authenticity is not consistent with this however. Surprisingly, the meanings heritage officials Byron and Farrant individually assign authenticity are instead consistent with concepts in non-official literature about open-air museums. Byron finding something not being highly cleaned indicates authenticity is a view she shares with Gable and Handler and their observation that dirtiness has been an indicator of authenticity at Colonial Williamsburg. Farrant believing the illusion or affect of some buildings when they are repaired or restored is more important than their original fabric is consistent with Rentzhog’s view that “atmosphere, illusion and fantasy” are just as important as facts at an open-air museum. Farrant’s belief also suggests consistency with Gable and Handler, who note Colonial Williamsburg was considered authentic when it followed policies which pursued the appearance of authenticity, or “visual authenticity”. Gable and Handler explain that so long as buildings at Colonial Williamsburg appeared visually authentic, modern elements could be included, if they were hidden.

The non-official understandings of authenticity are also consistent with positions in the literature, particularly that which is non-official and discusses open-air museums. Authenticity not necessarily requiring original material, as is believed by many of the heritage non-officials, is consistent with Lowenthal’s view that open-air museums are considered authentic by their visitors, even if their collections are not original. Authenticity meaning something appearing like the general look of a time period is a view of authenticity which is aligned with Bruner’s “historical verisimilitude” definition of authenticity. This is an expected result for most volunteers, as Bruner remarks historical verisimilitude “is the

---


3 Ibid., art. 11.


5 Rentzhog *Open Air Museums,* 369.


7 Ibid., 3 - 7.


objective of most museum professionals,”\textsuperscript{10} or people working at open-air museums. Authenticity instead having the definition of how something was at a specific place and time for other heritage non-officials, is consistent with Bruner’s “genuineness”\textsuperscript{11} definition of authenticity, and with the visual authenticity based on exhaustive research Gable and Handler observe was pursued at Colonial Williamsburg.\textsuperscript{12} Comments Board Member La Roche makes about the importance of research into Fencible Howick are particularly aligned with this. Authenticity meaning genuineness for some heritage non-officials is an unexpected result, as Bruner claims only some museum workers aspire to meet this definition of authenticity as it is more onerous to achieve.\textsuperscript{13} Authenticity being aligned with originality for most visitors is a finding that is also not predicted by Bruner, or by Lowenthal. However, though Rickly-Boyd’s survey at Spring Mill Pioneer Village also finds historical verisimilitude is the most accepted definition of authenticity for its visitors, it too shows genuineness and originality not scoring much lower.\textsuperscript{14} Authenticity being signified by an open-air museum delivering a believable experience of the past is aligned with Rentzhog’s belief that open-air museums are important for this same reason.\textsuperscript{15} International open-air museums that Board Member La Roche believes are examples of authenticity, and his knowledge that they use methods including relocating buildings, restoring them to a single time, and replicas to deliver this, is consistent with Rentzhog’s observation that these techniques have a history of use at open-air museums, and his assumption that they are authentic throughout his book.\textsuperscript{16}

**Research Sub-Question 2: What does heritage mean?**

Both heritage officials respond that heritage has meanings associated with the past, and discuss it in terms of original tangible evidence, significance and value in Section 3.1. Heritage official George Farrant also refers to heritage being assessed using a fixed system, and, where appropriate, being protected. Heritage official Robin Byron also comments that heritage is not contrived.

\textsuperscript{10} Bruner, “Abraham Lincoln as Authentic Reproduction,” 399.
\textsuperscript{11} Ibid., 400.
\textsuperscript{12} Gable and Handler. “Deep Dirt,” 4 - 14.
\textsuperscript{13} Bruner, “Abraham Lincoln as Authentic Reproduction,” 399.
\textsuperscript{15} Rentzhog *Open Air Museums*, 386.
\textsuperscript{16} Ibid., 182 - 415.
The heritage non-officials responses are all consistent with the heritage official’s meaning of heritage, in terms of it having a meaning associated with the past. Visitors and volunteers often define heritage in ways that do not make reference to original and tangible artefacts however, as Tables 3.3.2 and 3.4.2 show. Heritage not being contrived is suggested by Howick and Districts Historical Society Board Member Alan La Roche’s definition of heritage: “to call it heritage we must know, accurately, its history”. Heritage being that which is significant and eligible for protection is an understanding shared by Board Member Harry Allen because he believes Howick Historical Village’s collection of original buildings are “very important in terms of the knowledge of Auckland and... Fencible history,” and he considers this needs to be officially recognised so they are safe-guarded. Heritage meaning significant is a belief also shared by the small number of visitors who refer to rarity, protection, preservation and local importance in their definitions, as is shown by Table 3.4.2.

Heritage is defined by the heritage non-officials in a number of ways that are different to the definitions given by the heritage officials. Heritage means a personal link or inheritance with the past, past ways of life, and experiencing history or past ways of life, for the majority of volunteers and visitors, as is presented by Tables 3.3.2 and 3.4.2, and by comments like “‘step back in time’ experience” from Volunteer 20. Being local is also referenced by Volunteer 29: “local history that has some degree of importance.”

The literature evaluated by the thesis contains a range of opinions on what heritage means. Established international heritage literature defines heritage as being universally important. It encourages international lists of heritage it judges as outstanding to facilitate its protection, as Section 1.1 shows. Established international heritage literature also fundamentally ties the concept of authenticity to that of heritage, and therefore the same characteristics it uses to define authenticity, such as being original. Other heritage literature refers to heritage as being diverse and culturally specific, and does not include any fixed criteria for it. New Zealand’s official heritage literature defines heritage in a similar way to established international heritage literature, but it does make allowance for intangible heritage, and Maori heritage. The non-official literature that discusses international open-air museums, which is examined in Section 1.2, includes less definitions of heritage than it does of authenticity. Laurajane Smith, however, does argue that heritage is a cultural process that includes experience, identity, memory and performance, and claims that her research at open-air museums corroborates this. Michael Wallace also makes observations about the historic worth of open-air museums in the USA.
Like the responses to Research Sub-Question 1, many of the meanings the heritage officials and the heritage non-officials give to heritage are reflected in the literature.

Heritage having a meaning that is associated with the past is consistent with all of the official heritage literature reviewed in Chapter One. It having a meaning that refers to original and tangible fabric is consistent with established international heritage literature, and that from New Zealand\textsuperscript{17}, but not necessarily with heritage literature which acknowledges cultural diversity, like The Nara Document on Authenticity.\textsuperscript{18} Heritage being associated with values and significance is also consistent with established international heritage literature and New Zealand’s heritage literature. For example, the 1978 UNESCO Operational Guidelines for the Implementation of the World Heritage Convention refer to the characteristics of being unique, rare and influential as indicating outstanding value.\textsuperscript{19} The 2010 ICOMOS New Zealand Charter also associates heritage with these concepts as its full title indicates (ICOMOS New Zealand Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Heritage Value), as do its references to “cultural heritage significance”.\textsuperscript{20} The use of fixed criteria to assess heritage significance is not consistent with heritage literature that advocates cultural differences are acknowledged, with The Nara Document on Authenticity stating it is “not possible to base judgments of values and authenticity within fixed criteria”.\textsuperscript{21} That New Zealand’s heritage authorities use this method, however, is aligned with Laurajane Smith’s criticism of international heritage authorities: she asserts that they have not changed to become flexible and inclusive enough.\textsuperscript{22}

The meanings for heritage which are different to those assigned by the heritage officials, also are reflected in the literature. Heritage being defined in a way that does not mention it being original or tangible is consistent with Laurajane Smith’s proposal that heritage is a cultural process,\textsuperscript{23} and The Nara Document on Authenticity’s policy that heritage can have a range of culturally diverse meanings.\textsuperscript{24} Localness indicating heritage is consistent with Wallace’s

\textsuperscript{17} ICOMOS The Venice Charter, arts. 1, 3, 7, 9, 11; UNESCO Convention Concerning the Protection of World Cultural and Natural Heritage, 1972, Preamble; UNESCO Operational Guidelines, 1978, Introduction, arts. 7, 9; Manukau City Council Manukau Operative District Plan, chaps. 6.9.2, 6.12.2; ICOMOS New Zealand Charter, 2010, arts. 6, 10, 17, 19, 20.


\textsuperscript{19} UNESCO Operational Guidelines. 1978, art. 7.

\textsuperscript{20} ICOMOS New Zealand Charter, art. 2.

\textsuperscript{21} ICOMOS The Nara Document on Authenticity, art. 11.

\textsuperscript{22} Laurajane Smith, Uses of Heritage (New York: Routledge, 2006), 55.

\textsuperscript{23} Smith, Uses of Heritage, 44 - 84.

\textsuperscript{24} ICOMOS The Nara Document on Authenticity, arts. 5 - 7.
view that American open-air museums often provide a genuine version of history when their focus is local and non-elite.25

**Research Sub-Question 3: Does something need to be authentic to be heritage?**

The heritage officials both believe something needs to be authentic to be heritage.

Heritage non-officials vary in whether they share the heritage officials’ opinions. Howick and Districts Historical Society Board Members Harry Allen and Alan La Roche also think something needs to be authentic to be heritage. A significant number of volunteers and visitors do not think something needs to be authentic to be heritage though.

The literature, both official and non-official, established and less accepted, is unanimous in taking the position that something needs to be authentic to be heritage. The two conditions are tied together in the *Venice Charter*,26 which in turn is the foundation New Zealand’s official heritage literature.27 All of the non-official literature on open-air museums also links the two concepts, when it addresses heritage. This is despite most of this literature defining authenticity and heritage in very different ways from established official literature.

The view that heritage does not need to be authentic which is held by many visitors and volunteers is unprecedented as none of the literature reviewed showed this, and so it is a very unexpected finding.

**Research Sub-Question 4: Is Howick Historical Village authentic?**

The heritage officials’ responses in Section 3.1 show they believe only parts of Howick Historical Village that are original built fabric, and that have not been moved or restored to a single period, are fully authentic. Linked to this, heritage official Robin Byron believes new work imitating being original fabric form Fencible Howick is not authentic, and that Howick Historical Village does not disclose to visitors what is and is not original sufficiently. She believes this is problematic because it has the effect of “setting it up as if it’s real.” Heritage official George Farrant considers that Howick Historical Village’s setting only needs to be “sympathetic to the idea of a colonial village” since he does not think this aspect of it is original or authentic. Byron however believes the open-air museum’s setting, and the way its
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26 ICOMOS *The Venice Charter*, 1964, Preamble.
27 ICOMOS *New Zealand Charter*, Preamble; Manukau City Council *Manukau Operative District Plan*, chap. 6.9.2.
buildings are arranged in it, should acknowledge that Howick Historical Village is not a real place, and that the buildings vary in how authentic they are. Both heritage officials note that if the historic buildings had not been moved to Howick Historical Village, it is likely they would have been demolished, as there was little official protection for them at their original sites at the time. Many of the criteria the heritage officials use to discuss whether Howick Historical Village is authentic are the same as they use when discussing what authenticity means generally, under Research Sub-Question One.

Most of the heritage non-officials’ views differ from those of the heritage officials on the question of whether Howick Historical Village is authentic. Most visitors, volunteers, and Howick and Districts Historical Society Board Member Alan La Roche believe the whole of Howick Historical Village is authentic, as is shown by Section 3.2, Table 3.3.4.1 and Table 3.4.4.1. La Roche and most of the volunteers, as is suggested by them thinking the way Howick Historical Village is maintained helps it be like Howick during the Fencible period (Table 3.3.4.6), do not share heritage official Byron’s view that is not authentic for new work to imitate original Fencible fabric. However, Byron’s belief that disclosure is important may be supported by the tentative result that interpretation panels are the most common reason why visitors know buildings were relocated, restored to the period when they were first built, or are replicas, as is shown in Section 3.4. Many of Board Member La Roche’s responses in Section 3.2 show he disagrees with heritage official George Farrant’s opinion that the open-air museum’s setting is not authentic, and that it only needs to be like the concept of a colonial village. However, Visitor 71’s comment, “its arrangement looks like an authentic village,” can be seen as being aligned with Farrant’s view, as it refers to a generalised village, rather than the specific settlement of Fencible period Howick. Board Member Harry Allen, holds a similar view to the heritage officials as to whether Howick Historical Village is authentic, though he departs from it on the point that he does not think the buildings being relocated to the open-air museum diminishes their authenticity.

The heritage non-officials think Howick Historical Village is authentic for a large range of reasons that differ from those the heritage officials use to judge its authenticity. Importantly, some of the two groups’ reasons directly contradict each other.

Howick Historical Village is authentic because it looks like, and gives the impression of, Howick during the Fencible period, Board Member La Roche and a number of visitors spontaneously explain, with comments like “things look very much as possible from the
original period” from Visitor 32. La Roche includes items that were not originally from Fencible Howick, such as the interpretation panels, having the look and giving the impression of Fencible Howick, as reasons Howick Historical Village is authentic. Linked to this, La Roche does not believe what is original, and what is not, at Howick Historical Village should actively be disclosed to visitors: “we try to hide it.”

Howick Historical Village’s original buildings being restored to when they were first built makes them more authentic La Roche and most of the volunteers believe, as is indicated by Table 3.3.4.4. Its replica buildings are authentic because of their high level of accuracy, La Roche believes, as is Howick Historical Village’s layout because it was based on a historic photograph of Howick. These are practices La Roche considers to be authentic and believes have been used to successful effect at international open-air museums, though some contradict the heritage officials’ criteria for authenticity.

It is noted that a significant number of visitors may not realise there are buildings that were relocated, restored to a single period, and replicas, at Howick Historical Village, and therefore their opinion that it is authentic could change. It is also noted, however, as is discussed in the Methodology, that these responses, may instead indicate that the visitors do not realise the reason there are replicas at the open-air museum, or the reason the original buildings were moved. Some of the visitors’ comments, such as those on the theme of it being common sense replicas are present, as the original fabric is perishable or non-transportable, as are shown in Table 3.4.4.5, suggest this. In addition, comments such as “Yes – admittedly some copies but life-like!” by Visitor 13, also suggest Howick Historical Village is still considered authentic by some heritage non-officials who know it has replicas.

The affect of the open-air museum as whole, including its setting, makes it authentic for many of the heritage non-officials, as is suggested by most of the volunteers thinking the way it is maintained helps it be like Fencible Howick (Table 3.3.4.6), and comments from visitors such as “the feel and surroundings and buildings” (Visitor 43). Visitor 11’s remark that Howick Historical Village is authentic because its “buildings ‘fit’ the way I imagined” suggests Howick Historical Village matching their preconceived idea of what the Fencible Howick settlement was like makes it authentic. Visitor 16’s comment that the open-air museum is authentic because it looks “like it hasn’t been touched due to the dust and what not” suggests that Howick Historical Village not being highly cleaned indicates authenticity.
The experience of visiting Howick Historical Village makes it authentic for some visitors, as is shown by spontaneous comments like Visitor 26’s “I always enjoy bringing the children here to learn about history.” In line with this, living history interpretation is a factor that most volunteers believe contributes to the open-air museum being authentic for visitors, as is shown by Table 3.3.4.8. Howick Historical Village delivering a believable experience of the past for visitors is an important measure of the open-air museum’s authenticity for Board Member La Roche, though he also mentions interventions he made to the open-air museum to assist this goal which contradict the heritage officials’ view of authenticity, such as re-orientating cottages’ porches to face the access path.

Howick Historical Village is authentic but not in a fixed or inherent way, a number of Board Member La Roche’s remarks in Section 3.2 suggest. He considers its authenticity something that can be improved, but is also able to be diminished, as his comments about aiming for the high standards set by international open-air museums, and his concern over some decisions made by other members of the Howick and Districts Historical Society Board indicate.

The literature reviewed in Chapters One and Two holds different positions on whether Howick Historical Village is authentic.

International heritage literature does not specifically address Howick Historical Village, or open-air museums, implying its established policy that buildings which are original, in-situ, not restored to a single time period are authentic would apply to the open-air museum. More recent heritage literature, which promotes judging authenticity in a flexible way that acknowledges different cultural understandings, also does not make mention of open-air museums, and so it is not clear how its principles would be applied. As is shown by Section 2.2, New Zealand’s official heritage literature does not find all of the buildings at Howick Historical Village, or the open-air museum as a whole, to be authentic, and though the reasons why are not always entirely clear, on the whole it is likely to be because they do not meet its criteria for authenticity. These include structures being original, in-situ, and not restored to a single time period.

Non-official literature that discusses whether Howick Historical Village is authentic is mainly that which is authored by Alan La Roche and this does not question the open-air museum’s authenticity. Texts by Paul Oliver and Lucy Schwaner also briefly discuss the issue, and they come to varying conclusions.
Much of the non-official literature about international open-air museums contains ways they are understood to be authentic that could also be applied to Howick Historical Village. These include Edward Bruner’s discussion of New Salem, Jillian Rickly-Boyd’s findings at Spring Mill Pioneer Village, and Linda Young’s observations about Australian open-air museums. The way authenticity is addressed at Colonial Williamsburg, as discussed by Eric Gable and Richard Handler, Jukka Jokilehto, and Miles Glendinning has relevance to Howick Historical Village. Sten Rentzhog, Laurajane Smith and David Lowenthal’s discussion is also pertinent to the open-air museum.

Many of the views of the heritage officials and the heritage non-officials on whether Howick Historical Village is authentic relate to positions found in the literature. The heritage officials’ view that the parts of Howick Historical Village which are original built fabric, and have not been moved or restored to a single period, are the most authentic is consistent with established international heritage policies and New Zealand’s official heritage literature, as is expected. This is interesting because the heritage officials also note that at the time the open-air museum was created, there were different official policies to buildings being conserved in-situ in New Zealand. Linda Young reiterates this observation, noting that when many Australian open-air museums were created, moving historic buildings to avoid their destruction was widely regarded as a heroic act, and it is only more recently that it has become disapproved of. Young also argues that buildings being collected and not being in-situ should not mean they are not acknowledged by heritage authorities. That buildings cannot always be conserved in-situ is a point also made by the International Council of Museum’s declaration regarding open-air museum. Heritage official Robin Byron’s view that it is important that what is and is not original is disclosed at Howick Historical Village also aligns with official heritage policies that new work should not emulate original fabric, though its appearance may still be sympathetic to it. Heritage official George Farrant’s view that Howick Historical Village’s setting only needs to be like the concept of a pioneer

32 ICOMOS The Venice Charter, arts. 12, 13; ICOMOS New Zealand Charter, art. 21.
village since it is not original is not found in official heritage literature, but is referred to by non-official literature about open-air museums, and is discussed later under this research sub-question.

Most heritage non-officials having the view Howick Historical Village is authentic also has precedent in the literature, though mainly in that which is non-official and discusses open-air museums.

Howick Historical Village being authentic because it looks like the original Howick settlement during the Fencible period, including items that were not originally from there, is consistent with literature that discusses the appearance of originality being an indication of authenticity. Edward Bruner proposes authenticity can be defined as historical verisimilitude and genuineness, concepts that do not require original fabric, rather its appearance, either from a generalised past time period, or a specific past time and place. Eric Gable and Richard Handler observe that Colonial Williamsburg has been considered authentic when it pursued a policy of visual authenticity that was not reliant on original building fabric. David Lowenthal also concludes that an open-air museum’s collection does not need to be authentic in order for visitors to find it authentic.

Restoring the original buildings to when they were first built having the effect of making the open-air museum more authentic, and the replica buildings being authentic because of the high level of research and historical accuracy that was employed on them, are views that are aligned with Jokilehto and Gable and Handler’s observations about Colonial Williamsburg. They note that the historical research that informed how the town’s buildings were restored to a single period, or replicated, meant they were widely regarded as authentic at the time. Related to this, Jokilehto also observes that stylistic restoration was commonly regarded to improve authenticity in the 18th century, and that many people still find the practice authentic today, particularly in relation to tourism. Bruner also discusses the degree of historic accuracy that is brought to non-original items at open-air museums. He notes that achieving the appearance of genuineness (how something looked at a specific time and place) is more onerous to achieve than historical verisimilitude (the generalised look of the past), and
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35 Lowenthal, The Past is a Foreign Country, 354, 355.
therefore something less museum workers aim for.\textsuperscript{38} It is important that restoring the buildings to the Fencible period and having accurate replicas can be seen to improve an open-air museum’s authenticity by this literature, as they are processes that are not considered authentic by established official heritage literature, or that from New Zealand.

Whether the practices of relocating buildings, restoring them to the period when they were first built and creating replicas that were used at Howick Historical Village are authentic, is indirectly discussed by Sten Rentzhog. He observes there is a long history of these practices being used at international open-air museums, and being regarded as authentic.\textsuperscript{39} This is important because Board Member La Roche’s responses show he is aware of this history. Though these practices contradict established conservation policies, the presence of this tradition at open-air museums could however mean they are considered authentic under \textit{The Nara Document on Authenticity}, because of its principle that authenticity is understood differently by different cultures and their traditions.\textsuperscript{40}

The impression Howick Historical Village gives as a whole making it authentic is consistent with Jillian Rickly-Boyd’s observation that visitors to Spring Mill Pioneer Village find it authentic because of it having the overall nature of a village community, rather than the qualities of its individual objects.\textsuperscript{41} The open-air museum being authentic because it fits the way the original Fencible Howick community is imagined to be like is aligned with another of Rickly-Boyd’s proposals: that an open-air museum is authentic if it matches what people imagine the original settlement was like.\textsuperscript{42} Howick Historical Village being not highly cleaned or manicured making it authentic is aligned with Paul Oliver’s observation that the un-cleaned condition of Howick Historical Village’s buildings makes them authentic,\textsuperscript{43} and with Gable and Handler’s reflection that dirt is an aesthetic that can be seen to indicate authenticity at Colonial Williamsburg.\textsuperscript{44}

Rickly-Boyd also finds an open-air museum’s setting adds to its authenticity because it provides the cohesion and symbolism that allows visitors to move past the visible and

\textsuperscript{38} Bruner, “Abraham Lincoln as Authentic Reproduction,” 401.
\textsuperscript{39} Rentzhog \textit{Open Air Museums}, 182 - 415.
\textsuperscript{40} ICOMOS \textit{The Nara Document on Authenticity}, arts. 5 - 7.
\textsuperscript{42} Ibid., 137, 138.
\textsuperscript{44} Gable and Handler. “Deep Dirt,” 4 - 14.
tangible to the experiential and intangible. This, and her proposal that an open-air museum is authentic because it is like what someone imagines the original settlement to be like, relate to heritage official George Farrant’s belief that Howick Historical Village’s setting only needs to be like the concept of a colonial village. Interestingly, other non-official literature about open-air museums also differs from this view. Thomas Angotti and Debra Reid take the position that an open-air museum’s setting should replicate more closely the actual original settlement. The layout of Howick Historical Village being authentic for La Roche because it is like the village arrangements he saw at the international open-air museums he visited in North America could be seen as consistent with the process of stylistic restoration that Jokilehto describes, whereby specific forms are altered to match a universal one, and Glendininning proposes occurred at Colonial Williamsburg. This is interesting, as Howick Historical Village having a village arrangement also indicates its buildings have been relocated for some heritage non-officials, such as one who remarks “I know that a homestead would be distant from a village”.

The impression Howick Historical Village gives as a whole also relates to the issue of whether what is, and is not, original at the open-air museum should be disclosed. Unlike heritage official Robin Byron, Board Member La Roche holds the opinion it should not actively be communicated. While his opinion is not consistent with official heritage literature, it is consistent with Rentzhog’s view. Rentzhog believes it is self-evident not everything is completely authentic at an open-air museum, and pointing that out diminishes the impression of being in the past given by an open-air museum, as well as being unnecessary. The high number of visitors that are tentatively noted as not knowing its buildings are relocated, restored to a single time period, or are replicas, or only know because of interpretation panels, questions Rentzhog’s common-sense claim however.

Howick Historical Village being authentic because of the experience of visiting it and its living history interpretation, is aligned with Rentzhog’s position that open-air museums are authentic because they offer experiences of the past, and with Laurajane Smith’s theory that
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47 Jokilehto A History of Architectural Conservation, 18, 158, 159, 302, 303.
49 Rentzhog Open Air Museums, 387.
50 Ibid., 386.
cultural processes including visiting, and having emotional responses to plausible experiences, make something authentic.\textsuperscript{51}

It is important that literature asserts the experience given to visitors by an open-air museum can make it authentic, because Board Member La Roche mentions some interventions that were made at Howick Historical Village in the interest of a visitors’ experience, but contradict established international and New Zealand’s official heritage literature. This conflict is discussed by Kai Uldall and Thomas Angotti, who both conclude it is necessary for an open-air museum to decide who it primarily serves - officials and heritage experts, or visitors from the general public.\textsuperscript{52} In line with this, the other Board Member, Harry Allen, expresses concern that meeting the needs of visitors means Howick Historical Village’s authenticity is diminished.

The question of whether or not the visitors consider Howick Historical Village to be authentic when their knowledge, or lack of, that many of its buildings were relocated and restored to the Fencible period, or are replicas, is taken into account, may relate to Rickly-Boyd’s observation that most visitors want their visit to an open-air museum to be enjoyable, and it being authentic is a key ingredient of this. She notes that many visitors are willing to accept staged authenticity to enable this.\textsuperscript{53}

**Research Sub-Question 5:** Does the involvement of volunteers at Howick Historical Village contribute to it being authentic?

The heritage official’s remarks in Section 3.1 show they do not believe the involvement of volunteers contribute to Howick Historical Village being authentic. Responses made by both of them, in fact, show they believe they may be doing the opposite by damaging its original fabric. Heritage official George Farrant notes that if the volunteers are employing traditional skills however, they would add to the open-air museum’s authenticity. Both also recognise that Howick Historical Village and places like it often would not exist if volunteers had not created them and kept them going.

Howick and Districts Historical Society Board Member Harry Allen to some extent shares the view of the heritage officials on this question. All the other heritage non-officials

\textsuperscript{51} Smith, *Uses of Heritage*, 44, 45, 66 - 73.
researched, however, disagree and do believe the volunteers assist the open-air museum to be authentic. This is shown by Board Member Alan La Roche’s remarks, and the visitor and volunteer responses presented in Tables 3.3.5.1 and 3.4.5.2.

The visitors, volunteers and Board Member La Roche believe the volunteers play a part in Howick Historical Village’s authenticity for a number of reasons that differ from that suggested by heritage official Farrant. Adding atmosphere and activity of the Fencible period is the reason for the majority of volunteers, as is shown by Table 3.3.5.2. Comments like “the cottages have been carefully presented and looked after,” by Visitor 1, indicate the attention the volunteers give is conducive to Howick Historical Village being authentic. La Roche believes volunteers help the open-air museum to be authentic for reasons including their commitment to the place, and some having ancestors that were Fencibles or part of Howick’s history, factors that are also reflected by the volunteers’ profile in Tables 3.3.7.1 – 3.3.7.4. The volunteers having their own culture and vision for Howick Historical Village is also acknowledged by Board Member Allen’s remarks in Section 3.2.

The literature reviewed by the thesis holds different opinions on whether the volunteers at Howick Historical Village aid its authenticity. Established international official heritage literature does not address Howick Historical Village specifically, but generally states only trained professionals and tradespeople should deal with heritage fabric. International heritage literature that advocates authenticity as being culturally relative, however, acknowledges the culture that produced and cares for heritage material, but it does not include reference to open-air museums. New Zealand’s official heritage literature states only people with training should work with original heritage fabric. Some of the non-official literature does suggest that volunteers add to an open-air museum’s authenticity however, including that by Michael Wallace, Linda Young, and David Lowenthal.

The heritage officials’ opinion that the volunteers do not help Howick Historical Village to be authentic is, unsurprisingly, consistent with established international official heritage literature, and that from New Zealand, as the volunteers are not known to have heritage training as it requires. Aside from George Farrant’s comment regarding their use of traditional skills, the heritage officials’ belief may not be consistent with The Nara Document on Authenticity’s policy that the culture that created or cares for something is responsible for
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it,\textsuperscript{55} if the volunteers are considered to have this relationship to Howick Historical Village. The volunteers having their own vision for the museum, some having ancestral ties to the Fencibles or Howick’s history, along with the long period of time many have been involved with the open-air museum, could also be seen as evidence of a culture.

Most of the heritage non-officials thinking the volunteers contribute to Howick Historical Village being authentic is consistent with Linda Young’s observations that the work volunteers did to create Australian open-air museums, was performed in ways that were authentic at the time.\textsuperscript{56} It is also relevant to her reflection that work at open-air museums now being required to meet official standards has the unfortunate consequence of devaluing work by volunteers.\textsuperscript{57} Volunteers being praised by Board Member La Roche can be seen as acknowledgement of the non-official worth of the volunteers. The view that the volunteers do help the open-air museum to be authentic is also aligned with Michael Wallace’s view that open-air museums created by amateurs in the 1960s in the USA were often authentic because of their local, non-profit and non-elite focus.\textsuperscript{58} The commitment of the volunteers making Howick Historical Village authentic is an opinion which is also reflected in David Lowenthal’s belief that it is the care that is taken making a replica that renders it authentic, not whether something is original.\textsuperscript{59}

**Research Sub-Question 6: Is Howick Historical Village heritage?**

The heritage officials believe only the parts of Howick Historical Village which are original built fabric that has not been moved or restored to a single period are significant heritage. These are the same criteria the heritage officials use when discussing what heritage means generally, under Research Sub-Question Two. Heritage official George Farrant reflects Howick Historical Village as a whole could be heritage if it represents value systems of the time it was created, but that this would need to be assessed. Heritage official Robin Byron believes the original buildings are isolated from change, and the open-air museum is “mummifying” them, and diminishing their value as heritage. Their view of whether Howick Historical Village is heritage is also very intertwined with their opinion of whether the open-air museum is authentic.

\textsuperscript{55} ICOMOS *The Nara Document on Authenticity*, Articles 7 and 8.
\textsuperscript{56} Young, “Villages that Never Were,” 321, 322, 326, 335, 336.
\textsuperscript{57} Ibid., 335, 336.
\textsuperscript{58} Wallace, “Visiting the Past,” 85, 86.
\textsuperscript{59} Lowenthal, *The Past is a Foreign Country*, 356.
Most of the heritage non-officials hold an opposing view, that all of Howick Historical Village is heritage, as is shown by Howick and Districts Historical Society Board Member Alan La Roche’s responses in section 3.2, and the volunteers’ and visitors’ responses, presented in Tables 5.3.6 and 5.4.6. Board Member Harry Allen focuses on the original aspects of the open-air museum and whether they are significant, like the heritage officials however, but asserts their age and condition. Significance is also reflected in Board Member La Roche’s responses which refer to only Howick Historical Village being able to present Fencible history.

The Board Members both comment that they think the open-air museum is heritage because of its ability to tell historic stories. The visitors’ and volunteers’ responses to the question of whether Howick Historical Village is heritage do not also provide the reasons why.

The literature reviewed by the thesis in Chapters One and Two holds varying positions on Howick Historical Village, and authenticity and heritage. Established international heritage literature does not address Howick Historical Village, but, in line with it intertwining the concepts of heritage and authenticity, it generally considers structures which are original, in-situ and not restored to a single time period as having the most universal heritage value. Later heritage literature which acknowledges culturally diverse understandings also does not address Howick Historical Village, but refers to heritage as being diverse and culturally specific. Literature which discusses international open-air museums and heritage includes that by Laurajane Smith, and it holds observations that can be seen as pertinent to Howick Historical Village. Entries relating to Howick Historical Village on the Heritage New Zealand List and the Manukau City Council Schedule of Buildings and Objects to be Protected only consider two of its buildings as significant heritage. Non-official literature about Howick Historical Village only briefly discusses whether it is heritage.

The heritage officials’ view that only the parts of Howick Historical Village which are original built fabric that has not been moved, or restored to a single period, are significant heritage is consistent with the policies of New Zealand’s official heritage literature and established international heritage literature, as is expected. The heritage officials’ discussion of parts of the open-museum in relation to the question of whether it is significant heritage, rather than the whole (aside from Farrant’s observation that this could be done)
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relates to the *Manukau City Operative District Plan* and how it expressly schedules “buildings within”\(^{61}\) Howick Historical Village. The heritage officials’ view may not be consistent with *The Nara Document on Authenticity*, however, because of the way it proposes heritage can be diverse and culturally specific.\(^{62}\) Heritage official Robin Byron’s belief that the open-air museum is not heritage because it is “mummifying” the original buildings is consistent with Paul Oliver’s view that most international open-air museums are deceptive in their practice of placing buildings within their enclosures, and restoring them to a single time period, because they are selecting and controlling history.\(^{63}\) Importantly though, Oliver does not believe Howick Historical Village is guilty of these practices, instead explaining it is unusual because it does not present a sanitised version of history.\(^{64}\)

Most of the heritage non-officials considering Howick Historical Village to be heritage is aligned with Laurajane Smith’s proposal that open-air museums are heritage because they are places where the intangible experience of heritage is allowed to happen, and is marked as significant, even if their buildings have been moved there.\(^{65}\) The Board Members believing Howick Historical Village is heritage because of the historic stories it can tell is also aligned with this theory of Smith’s. Howick Historical Village being considered heritage is a view that is aligned with it being judged a valid response to the potential destruction of historic buildings caused by urbanisation. This belief could be possibly argued to be consistent with Glendinning observing the conservation movement, and its policies on authenticity and heritage, was a response to a situation with similarities to this at the end of the 18\(^{th}\) century.\(^{66}\)

This section has shown that views of the heritage officials and non-officials on authenticity, heritage and their relationship to Howick Historical Village are often different, and sometimes contradictory. The views of the heritage officials are usually consistent with established international heritage literature, and New Zealand’s official heritage literature. The frequently varying opinions of the heritage non-officials are often reflected in non-official literature that specifically discusses open-air museums, and sometimes with official heritage literature which proposes understandings of authenticity and heritage are culturally

\(^{61}\) *Manukau City Council* *Manukau Operative District Plan*, Chapter 6, sch.6A.

\(^{62}\) ICOMOS *The Nara Document on Authenticity*, arts 5 - 8.

\(^{63}\) Oliver, “Re-Presenting and Representing the Vernacular,” 202, 207.

\(^{64}\) Ibid., 203.

\(^{65}\) Smith, *Uses of Heritage*, 236.

diverse. In broad terms, the heritage officials’ position on these concepts means they consider that Howick Historical Village has marginal authenticity, and low status as heritage. Also in un-detailed terms, the bulk of the heritage non-officials’ beliefs on authenticity and heritage mean that they however think that Howick Historical Village is authentic, and is heritage.

4.3 Conclusions and Implications

This section brings the investigation together to now arrive at conclusions to the over-arching research question: How does Howick Historical Village relate to the concepts of authenticity and heritage from official and non-official viewpoints? In doing so, it considers the key points stemming from the heritage officials’ and heritage non-officials’ opinions, and their implications.

This thesis concludes that, on the whole, Howick Historical Village relates to the concepts of authenticity and heritage differently for the heritage officials and heritage non-officials that it investigates.

The study shows the heritage officials hold general understandings of heritage and authenticity that are very often consistent with established international heritage literature, and New Zealand’s heritage literature. In line with this, the heritage officials fundamentally link authenticity to heritage. They also note that authenticity and heritage are concepts understood differently by specific cultures.

When the heritage officials consider Howick Historical Village in relation to authenticity and heritage, they employ the same terms of reference that they use to assess places generally. This means they use criteria including originality, being in-situ, restoration respecting all time periods, and new work not emulating being original work. The heritage officials do not readily see Howick Historical Village as an intangible expression of heritage or a specific cultures’ understanding of authenticity.

Issues specific to open-air museums do not alter how the heritage officials consider Howick Historical Village relates to authenticity and heritage. They therefore do not consider that buildings being relocated, restored to the period when they were first built, replicas, and new work having the appearance of historic fabric, are typical and traditional practices at them.
This is a point that may also reflect there being no official heritage literature specific to open-air museums.

The heritage officials consider these aspects of Howick Historical Village often not being disclosed to visitors deceptive as they believe it creates the misleading impression that Howick Historical Village is a real place. The fact buildings are collected at Howick Historical Village at all diminishes their authenticity and heritage value for the heritage officials, because they believe it means they have been isolated from outside changes.

The heritage officials suggest that if Howick Historical Village as a whole is found to be an expression of the value systems at the time it was created, it could possibly have some authenticity and heritage value. This reason does not consider the role Howick Historical Village and other open-air museums could be argued to still have in saving buildings from destruction. They do not weigh up this method as being a valid alternative to the conservation-based response. Along similar lines, the heritage officials do not consider that restoring buildings to the period when they were first built and arranging them as a village could be considered authentic as stylistic restoration.

There are multiple reasons the heritage non-officials believe Howick Historical Village is authentic and is heritage. The effect of the open-air museum as a whole, not the qualities of its individual buildings is one reason, and it giving the experience of being in the past is another. Possessing the look of a general time in the past, or having the appearance of the original Howick settlement, with a high degree of research and accuracy informing this, are other reasons. Matching what they imagine Fencible Howick or an authentic generalised village to be like are other reasons why. Its volunteers caring for and being committed to the place, as well as their links to Howick and its history are also contributing factors. All of these reasons suggest the heritage non-officials think Howick Historical Village is authentic, and is heritage, because it has characteristics that make it like a real place to them, even if that is an imaginary real place.

Sometimes the heritage non-officials appear to alter the meanings they give to authenticity and heritage when the concepts are connected to Howick Historical Village. An example of this is most visitors believe something original is authentic in general, but most of them also believe Howick Historical Village is authentic. This could indicate they understand terms like originality differently to the heritage officials, but it could also indicate they understand authenticity and heritage differently when they are associated with the open-air museum.
Slightly more volunteers and visitors think Howick Historical Village is heritage than believe it is authentic. This suggests that the open-air museum’s characteristics are slightly more aligned with their concept of heritage than it is their understanding of authenticity. The variance is also interesting when the large numbers of these groups not linking the concepts of authenticity and heritage is considered, because it suggests this gives them the freedom to make specific judgments on whether the open-air museum has one quality or the other.

There is occasionally commonality between the views of the heritage non-officials and the heritage officials about heritage and authenticity in general, but their views depart more when they are applied to Howick Historical Village. One discrepancy is the non-officials’ belief that restoring buildings to when they were first built for the Fencibles improves their authenticity and status as heritage, while the heritage officials contend it diminishes it. In finding these points, the initial hypothesis of this thesis: Heritage non-officials understand authenticity and heritage differently to heritage authorities, is confirmed, but particularly when it applies to Howick Historical Village.

Almost all of the reasons the heritage non-officials believe Howick Historical Village is authentic and is heritage have precedence in the non-official literature about international open-air museums. This is important because it shows there is a history of open-air museums having similar characteristics to Howick Historical Village. This is also significant since open-air museums in the USA were models for the open-air museum. It does however suggest there may sometimes be a dilemma over whether Howick Historical Village follows this tradition or official heritage policies.

It is my conclusion therefore, that the heritage officials’ view should not necessarily be assumed to have precedence over that of the heritage non-officials when considering how Howick Historical Village relates to the concepts of authenticity and heritage. This is particularly essential because the opinions of the two groups sometimes diverge. The question of whether Howick Historical Village is a real place is just one example of many moot points.

In the end, I can only finish by saying that there are not simple answers to these questions, and certainly this thesis offers none. It does hope however that the process of weighing up issues, such as whether something needs to be authentic to be heritage, and finding some people believe it does not indeed necessarily need to be so, have provided increased insight and potentially signalled ways forward.
4.4 Suggestions for Further Research

This thesis opens up new areas for further research. This section concentrates mainly on opportunities outside Howick Historical Village but observes there is a wealth of areas within it also.

Following the implications that were noted in Section 4.3, further research into the development of official heritage guidelines specific to open-air museums may be very useful. Issues that the research suggests would be beneficial to address include traditional practices at open-air museums and the viewpoints of the range of people associated with them. It is likely these guidelines would differ from heritage guidelines for other types of places.

It would be valuable to investigate whether the findings at Howick Historical Village apply at other open-air museums both in New Zealand and outside of it. It would also be worthwhile to look at whether the same results are found when the research is applied to other places than open-air museums, though it is suspected there will be less cross-over due to open-air museums having a particular set of characteristics.

Analysis of the existing Heritage New Zealand List and what is categorised as significant heritage by Auckland Council to see whether gaps or bias exists on what is represented would be useful to build a wider picture of how New Zealand’s heritage authorities acknowledge culturally diverse understandings of authenticity and heritage, non-elite heritage and intangible heritage.

No literature was found which discusses ways in which other open-air museums have successfully dealt with official heritage requirements for authenticity and heritage. Contacting the management of some to research this question could be illuminating. It would be particularly relevant to contact the open-air museums Howick Historical Village took its inspiration from, including Old Sturbridge Village in Massachusetts, USA.

The timing of this thesis is fortuitous as it coincides with the Howick and Districts Historical Society Board investigating making changes to Howick Historical Village, including adding a new building to exhibit items from their collection of artefacts. I hope this study can usefully inform the future development of the place.
Appendix A: Questionnaire for Visitors to Howick Historical Village

PLEASE FEEL WELCOME TO NOTE ANY ADDITIONAL COMMENTS YOU WOULD LIKE

1. What are your reasons for visiting Howick Historical Village?
   (Please tick as many boxes as are applicable)
   □ Recreation
   □ Education
   □ Personal link with the history it tells
   □ Other (please describe in the box below):

2. Have you been to Howick Historical Village before?
   □ Yes – 5 times or more
   □ Yes – under 5 times
   □ No

3. Where do you live?
   □ Howick/Pakuranga Area
   □ Elsewhere in Auckland/N.Z.
   □ Asia
   □ Australia/North America/Europe
   □ Other (please state in the box beside):

4. Have you been to other historic village museums in NZ or overseas?
   □ Yes – 5 or more
   □ Yes – under 5
   □ No

5. Did you know volunteers created Howick Historical Village and partly maintain it?
   □ Yes
   □ No
   □ Not sure

6. Did you know Howick Historical Village represents the 1840 – 1880 Fencible period?
   □ Yes
   □ No (please go to question 8)
   □ Not sure (please go to question 8)
7. How can you tell Howick Historical Village represents the 1840 – 1880 Fencible period?  
(Please comment in the box below):  

8. Did you know most of the buildings were moved from their original locations where they may have otherwise been destroyed?  
   - Yes  
   - No (please go to question 10)  
   - Not sure (please go to question 10)  

9. How can you tell the buildings have been moved from their original locations?  
(Please comment in the box below):  

10. Did you know most of the cottages have been restored to the Fencible period?  
    - Yes  
    - No (please go to question 12)  
    - Not sure (please go to question 12)  

11. How can you tell the cottages have been restored to the Fencible period?  
(Please comment in the box below):  

12. Did you know some of the buildings are replicas of buildings that may not have otherwise survived or could not be moved to Howick Historical Village?  
    - Yes  
    - No (please go to question 14)  
    - Not sure (please go to question 14)
13. How can you tell which buildings are replicas? (Please comment in the box below):

14. What does ‘authentic’ mean to you? (Please tick one box only.)
   - The convincing general look of a time period
   - How a particular place or thing would have looked at a particular time
   - A place or thing that is original
   - A place or thing certified as authentic by an official organisation eg. council
   - Other (please describe in the box below):

15. Do you think Howick Historical Village is an authentic place? (Please comment in the box below):

16. Does Howick Historical Village being created and maintained by volunteers contribute to whether you think it is authentic?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Not sure

17. Do you think Howick Historical Village is heritage?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Not sure

18. What does ‘heritage’ mean to you? (Please comment in the box below):
19. Do you think a place needs to be authentic for it to be heritage?
   □ Yes
   □ No
   □ Not sure
Appendix B: Questionnaire for Building Maintenance and Living History Volunteers to Howick Historical Village

PLEASE FEEL WELCOME TO NOTE ANY ADDITIONAL COMMENTS YOU WOULD LIKE

1. What are your reasons for volunteering at Howick Historical Village?
(Please tick as many as are applicable.)
☐ Give back to the local community
☐ Interest in local history
☐ Personal link with the history it tells
☐ Opportunity for education
☐ Opportunity to use existing specialist skills
☐ Opportunity to gain experience that you hope to use professionally
☐ Social reasons
☐ Recreation/relaxation reasons
☐ Other (please describe in the box below):

2. How long have you volunteered at the Village?
☐ Under 1 year ☐ 1 – 3 years ☐ 3 – 6 years ☐ 6 – 10 years
☐ 10 – 20 years ☐ 20 – 30 years ☐ 30+ years

3. Where do you live?
☐ Howick/Pakuranga Area
☐ Elsewhere in Auckland/N.Z.
☐ Other – Please state:


4. Have you been to other historic village museums in NZ or overseas?
   - Yes – 5 or more
   - Yes – under 5
   - No

5. Were you involved in the restoration of any of the buildings when they first came to Howick Historical Village?
   - Yes
   - No (please go on to question 7)

6. Do you think that way the buildings were restored helps show their history?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Not sure

7. Are you involved in the maintenance of the buildings and gardens at Howick Historical Village?
   - Yes
   - No (please go on to question 9)

8. Do you think that way the buildings and gardens are maintained help Howick Historical Village be like Howick in the 1840-1880 Fencible period?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Not sure

9. Are you involved in the living history interpretation at Howick Historical Village?
   - Yes
   - No (please go on to question 11)

10. Do you think the living history interpretation makes visitors find Howick Historical Village more authentic?
    - Yes
    - No
    - Not sure

11. What does ‘authentic’ mean to you? (Please tick one box only.)
    - The convincing general look of a time period
    - How a particular place or thing would have looked at a particular time
    - A place or thing that is original
    - A place or thing certified as authentic by an official organisation (eg. council)
    - Other (please describe in the box below):
12. Do you think Howick Historical Village is an authentic place?
   □ Yes
   □ No
   □ Not sure

13. Do you think visitors find Howick Historical Village to be an authentic place?
   □ Yes
   □ No
   □ Not sure

14. Do you think volunteers creating Howick Historical Village and having ongoing involvement with it contribute to it being an authentic place?
   □ Yes
   □ No – please go to question 16
   □ Not sure – please go to question 16

15. How do you think the volunteers contribute to Howick Historical Village being an authentic place?
   Please answer in the box below:
   

16. What does ‘heritage’ mean to you?
   Please comment in the box below:
   

17. Do you think Howick Historical Village is heritage?
   □ Yes
   □ No
   □ Not sure

18. Do you think a place or thing needs to be authentic for it to be heritage?
   □ Yes
   □ No
   □ Not sure
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